

University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

February 19, 2025

3:30pm Zoom

Members in Attendance: Davis Oldham (Chair), Alex Dunn, Kim Kinsley, Sayan Sarkar, Christy Irish, Jennifer Walker, Janine Davis, Mindy Erchull, Kelly Swiney, April Wynn (Parliamentarian), Melina Patterson (Vice Chair), Caitie Finlayson, Mara Scanlon, Michael Benson, Elizabeth Johnson-Young, Patricia Orozco, Jonathan Levin, Karen Anewalt (Secretary)

Guests: Tim O'Donnell (Provost), Filiz Tabak (Dean COB), Keith Mellinger (Dean CAS), Pete Kelly (Dean COE), Shadwick Yoder (SGA), Nabil Al-Tikriti (AAUP), Miriam Liss (UFAC Chair)

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
 - a. Motion to approve the January UFC minutes.
 - i. Unanimously approved.
3. Reports
 - a. President Paino submitted a written report and was ill, so unable to attend. Davis has already emailed President Paino with concerns from faculty related to the Federal Administration's directives and Executive Orders and how those may impact faculty (grants, ICE and students, ...). Hopefully, we'll get additional communication from him sometime soon.
 - i. Questions:
 1. Karen Anewalt: I have a question about the TTIP funding mentioned in President Paino's report and I think Tim will know the answer. The President's report mentioned that this funding may be restored. Do we know the details of the updated metrics that the state will be using to determine funding and do we anticipate getting some of the money back at UMW?
 - a. Provost O'Donnell: We've been told that the money will be restored for this year, so we'll be held harmless for not meeting previous targets while the state re-evaluates the program. The Chief Financial Officers at institutions were instructed to provide some suggestions on how the state might evaluate programs in the future. The suggestions put forward included allowing additional CIP codes to count toward targets, potentially eliminating organic growth as a criteria so we'd just be judged by growth in these critical areas of need rather than by growth of the whole institution, and maintaining funding for permanent commitments (previous hires). These ideas have been

passed along and we expect to hear more. But in the short term, we have some additional wiggle room in the budget this fiscal year because of the TTIP funding.

- b. Provost's Report: Provost O'Donnell's written report is designed to be a companion document that works in concert with his Board of Visitors report, which is on the Board Docs website. The BOV report has some more information on a variety of great work being done by students, faculty, and staff.
 - i. Questions:
 - 1. Caitie Finlayson: I saw the proposals for the two schools have been put forward. I know this, like you said, is a piece by piece kind of process. And so ultimately, will there be more schools or are we only forming a School of Science and School of the Arts?
 - a. Provost O'Donnell: I think that's an open question. And based on the way that SCHEV has worked with us on this, I think they also think it's an open question. The suggestion was to put forward a small number of strong proposals for schools first. This will allow SCHEV to talk to us about what we believe it means to call something a school. I expect that we will submit those the proposal for the School of Science and School of the Arts during the March window. I think the work on these has already been done, so we're just waiting for the window to open.
 - 2. Melina Patterson: What does "being a school" get a group of people? Because my department isn't in a school, I wonder do we really need them? What does it mean to have some but not all?
 - a. I think the original vision was that we'd have several schools. The sense that I got was that there was cachet around a school, particularly something like a School of the Arts. But I certainly think it's an open question. Whether or not we can use the word school is something that SCHEV will weigh in on. I'd like to see how this conversation plays out over the course of the next couple of months with these initial proposals. And then we can talk about whether we gain anything by adding additional schools and also whether we don't want to pursue more schools.
- c. Dean's Reports
 - i. Keith Mellinger submitted a written report.
 - 1. Questions:
 - a. Caitie Finlayson: I had a colleague reach out with some questions about the email about ending the Chinese program. Not to put Tim on the spot but perhaps he can

answer if Keith isn't here. One question is, have we figured out the cost savings of discontinuing these classes and not paying an adjunct instructor, versus the cost of losing students who might have come here specifically because they were excited to study Chinese? It may be a small number of students, but do we know that number and do we know the cost savings? And we were also wondering are other options to revitalize the program rather than just discontinuing it being considered, especially given the good press that our Chinese New Year celebrations just got?

- i. Provost O'Donnell: I may differ from the Dean of CAS on this question. As I understand the conversation, there is not a decision to end the program and to take Chinese out of the catalog. The decision is not to offer some sections of 101 to first year students that fall.
- ii. Nabil Al-Tikiri: I'd just like to advocate for no cuts in any way, shape or form, to Chinese or any other form of language study because that's been happening for years and it is a serious danger to what we do as a liberal arts college and place of the study of humanities. And that really does matter. You can't Google Speech your way through an entire career if you choose to be remotely international. We should see it as our mission to promote study of exactly things like Chinese.
- iii. Provost O'Donnell: I don't disagree with any of that. However, we do have a responsibility to be financially prudent and to offer courses that enroll students in sufficient numbers.
- iv. Caitie Finlayson: I would hope that we do our due diligence and figure out whether it's attracting students who would otherwise make different choices. It seems like we're fairly desperate to get students and retain students. Even if the numbers interested are small, adjunct pay is quite low, and so I hope we are looking at the cost of offering the class versus losing those students. At first year orientation, it's frustrating as an FSEM instructor when students come here excited to take things like Chinese or any number of classes that we offer, and then we no longer offer them.

v. Provost O'Donnell: I think that's a fair point, and I think the conversation would probably benefit from looking at more carefully some of the data that we do have about student interest when they come in. And I'll encourage our colleagues to take some time to look at that and to incorporate that into decision making.

ii. Dean Tabak submitted a written report.

1. No questions.

iii. Dean Kelly submitted a written report.

1. No questions.

d. Student Government Report (Shadwick Yoder): We've been polling students about satisfaction with registration and class availability and collecting that data. SGA will be working with the Provost's Office to gain feedback from that data. SGA is also tabling this week and next week, and we've been getting some good feedback through Eagle Concerns. Most of the feedback is related to dining and residence halls, not things on the Academic Affairs side of things.

e. University Staff Council: There was no report. Davis shared that they will be meeting over Spring Break to make plans involving ASPIRE week.

f. UFC Chair's Report: Davis Oldham shared that he'll be speaking to the BOV soon. His report to them includes work on faculty governance this year including changes to the Faculty Handbook. He'll also be making a presentation about advising including some NSSE data that shows we're doing quite well in this area.

g. UFC Vice-Chair's Report: No report.

h. Faculty Senate of Virginia Report: Patricia Orozco shared that House Bill 1621 has been approved as of Feb 18. This bill requires that every public institution in the state that offers baccalaureate degrees assign a faculty representative to its BOV. They believe this will pass the Senate and not be vetoed by the governor. We already do this at UMW, so we could consider changes to our current operations but it would not require any changes for us.

4. University Committee Minutes:

a. Questions:

i. Alex Dunn: Our COB faculty meeting, our representative from UCC wanted to make sure that we talked about part of the minutes in which

the committee talked about of eliminating the UCC. Is there more information about that and if they wanted to move forward with that, what would the next steps be?

1. Davis Oldham: As far as I know they would bring a motion to UFC to change that section of the Handbook. If UCC didn't exist, each college's curriculum committee would send their minutes to UFC. I also know that there are some people that have said that they would prefer a single university curriculum committee and not having the college committees. So there are different options being considered.
2. Alex Dunn: In the chat, Melissa Wells says the change would have to go through the same three college vote that we've been doing this year.
3. Janine Davis: I thought Arts and Sciences had dissolved their curriculum committee. Is that true or not?
4. Davis Oldham: The CAS Curriculum Committee still exists. It just doesn't send its minutes to the CAS Faculty Council. Instead it sends its minutes to the UCC. And then UCC sends them to UFC.
5. Davis Oldham: Melissa, is the process you're describing a distinction between standing versus advisory committees? We have dissolved advisory committees not utilizing the three college vote.
6. Melissa Wells: That's correct. Yes. Just standing committees.
7. Caitie Finlayson: I don't know if anyone from UCC or the college level committees is here, but I'm wondering does it make more sense to dissolve the college level committees and just have UCC, which reports to UFC. Does it still make sense to have the college committees? I think that's something that I'd love the UCC to weigh in on. I think they've been talking about it for a couple of years because when I was chair of UFAC, we had brought it forward, but I don't think it led anywhere since we had the reorg stuff going on.
8. Alex Dunn: I'm just reading from the committee minutes. It says the committee discussed the UFC's request to eliminate the UCC. This year the committee reviewed that if implemented, the College Curriculum Committees would submit their requests directly to the UFC instead of through the UCC. This would save redundant time and effort for both the faculty members as well as supporting members like the Registrar's Office, who already participate in all college curriculum meetings. So I read that as the committee being in favor of eliminating the university-level.
9. Caitie Finlayson: I think it'd be helpful to hear from the college-level groups to weigh in and summarize any discussion they had.

10. Davis Oldham: As I remember it, UFC has not asked them to dissolve. It's more been the other way around. UFC has pointed out that there's an extra layer to the process.
 11. Kim Kinsley: I just want to clarify. I don't think I've heard anyone from the college-level committees say they wanted to get rid of the college curriculum committee. It has been on the table for several years from the UCC that the UCC be dissolved and that we should stick with richer contributions from the college curriculum committees.
 12. Janine Davis: I am on the curriculum committee in COE and we do a lot of important work and so I would hate to see that go away. And, and if it were to go away, I would need there to be some level above that is going to look at it all. And that level above couldn't possibly be UFC. We already have way too many things to discuss here in any length. So if CAS has a curriculum committee and it doesn't have to then go to CAS-FC, I think that eliminating that level makes some sense. But I feel pretty strongly that we would need to continue having either our curriculum committee in COE or a group that has representation of people who understand things like our state-level regulations and so on.
 13. Kim Kinsley: And in the College of Business, our accreditation actually requires a curriculum committee. It's part of the structures so we would have to retain that as well. So I think the conversation is more about the UCC.
 14. Jonathan Levin: I've been sitting on the Curriculum Committee. In most cases, we thought streamlining would take the form of a single university committee, but this seems to be the exception to the case where the real work is happening at the college-level. And I don't think anybody thinks that work can be removed from the college-level because that's where the insight and the work is getting done. Eliminating the UCC would simply transfer the responsibility for university-level oversight to UFC. I think the reality is things have been coming in in pretty good shape and there's not a whole lot of debate. Things get presented and discussed, but for the most part, especially at the course level, there's rarely anything to say at that level. So I think while the oversight is potentially transferred to UFC, I don't really think that's going to entail a lot of additional work, at least in the vast majority of cases.
- ii. Davis Oldham: Is anybody here from the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committee? We did get a document from the AAUP. Now would be a good time if anybody had any questions regarding either that committee's report or the report from the AAUP looking at sabbaticals and faculty grants. My understanding from the minutes is that the

committee is doing some good work on improving the process, maybe culminating with some rubrics that might be useful in thinking about that process.

1. Mara Scanlon: I appreciated the Faculty Affairs Committee report about the faculty research grants and that AAUP also raised that issue. I think they made a really strong case in that document for the importance of those grants. I'm just noting that I've been in conversations with different faculty members over the last semester, and the question of what happened to our ability to apply for those summer research grants has come up. I think there used to be an option to take summer pay or a course release during the semester. Many people did really rely on them to help seed research or complete a project, and I'm glad that these are being discussed in several places.
- iii. Christy Irish: I want to clarify in the Speaking and Writing Committee minutes, they seemed to have questions about the Handbook changes. I just wanted to clarify for them that the changes to committees, such as combining the speaking and writing committees, is happening in the fall.
 1. Davis Oldham: Yes, that's true. This year we have to operate based on this year's handbook. The changes that we approve for committee structures will happen in the fall.
 2. Melina Patterson: Does that need to be voted on by all three colleges?
 3. Melissa Wells: No, because the WI & SI Committees are not standing committees.
- iv. Motion to approve all the University Committee minutes.
 1. Unanimous approval

5. Unfinished Business

- a. Changes to composition of UFC: Each college approved Handbook section 2.3.4. And now each college has also approved these subsections of 2.3.4. So we are officially ready to have a faculty senate next year, which means when it comes time to start staffing the committees, departments will need to submit the names of the representatives to the UFC. And that is because there are some constraints in some colleges and places throughout the Handbook where serving on multiple committees can be an issue. So UFC needs to know who's going to be on UFC to avoid those conflicts. Thank you all for the hard work on this.
 - i. Questions:
 1. Kim Kinsley: With the move to the senate, are all of us are going to be replaced by new representatives in each of our new departments?
 - a. Davis Oldham: I think, in theory, yes. My advice is that if people who are currently serving on UFC are the only member in their department serving, that they continue.

This will allow us to keep some continuity. If people feel that I need to organize this more, I can do that. But I think it can be done at the department level.

- b. Mindy Erchull: I want to remind people that the way the Handbook update was written, senators can serve two or three year terms. So as long as every department doesn't also decide to do terms of the same length, we will end up with some rotation.

- b. Changes to committee structure: These changes are ones that were put forth by the Handbook Advisory Group this summer. For example, the size of the Faculty Affairs Committee was inconsistent with the size of other committees, so a change was recommended. UBAC had too many members so we are making it smaller.

I did get a question from a faculty member about Section 4, which is about non-grievable offenses. Those have always kind of gone through a process in which data is presented to UFAC and they do an investigation based on the data and information that they receive. Other types of disputes, for example between two faculty members or a faculty member and administrator, are discussed in Section 5. The Section 5 disputes are where the Grievances Committee gets involved. So the proposed change is really just formalizing what's already been expected of that committee.

Some committees reference positions that no longer exist (ex. John Morello). These have been corrected and replaced with other ex officio members when appropriate.

And finally, committees were asked to consider faculty workload. The WI & SI committees independently felt that combining their work would make sense, so they are being merged.

- i. No questions.
 - ii. Motion to approve the changes to the committee structure.
 - 1. Unanimously approved
- c. Allow Faculty Selection of Handbook Year for Promotion & Tenure (Melina Patterson): This is a motion to allow pre-tenure faculty the option to apply under the Faculty Handbook that was in place when they were hired and apply a similar procedure for promotion to full.
 - i. Questions:
 - 1. Janine Davis: I support this idea but there is a separate motion about eliminating the appendices. How will people who are hired in Aug 2025 proceed?

2. Melina Patterson: I don't know the answer. But how will they proceed if the current appendices are in place and they describe conditions and processes that don't apply anymore? If someone is hired in Computer Science and the appendices say they have to publish in these types of journals in the College of Business, that should not apply to them. So to me, not having the criteria is better than having the wrong criteria.
3. Davis Oldham: I don't know the answer, but I know for this to work it's going to require some careful archiving and making sure that we have previous catalogs.
4. Caitie Finlayson: I appreciate Miriam's question in the chat and I had a similar question. Logistically, how would this work? Does it mean that somebody is evaluated by the current structure they're under, or are we asking another college's committee to evaluate a candidate with CAS criteria? I think it's important to articulate the logistics of this would look like.
5. April Wynn: I see the committee and the motion a little bit separately, but I also wanted to clarify the question about the current Faculty Handbook. Are faculty choosing the current handbook in the year they're preparing their file, or is the current handbook the one that would say start in the August in which they put their file in? I would hope current means the year they're preparing, but I think we do need to clarify that. And then I do second returning the issue Caitie brought up about those logistics.
6. Jonathan Levin: We're in a difficult situation because transitions like this are all always hard. And the problem with this proposal is the structures no longer exist. You're saying in three years from now, we're going to go back and form a committee that is built around a structure that no longer exists and will report up to a Dean, presumably, who may be in a different college. So to me, this brings as many complications as our current situation. I think the only answer is to have the colleges work as fast as they can to develop new appendices that are relevant to the faculty that are in the colleges.
7. Christy Irish: From our conversation about Promotion & Tenure and minutes from our last UFC last meeting, I was under the impression that we were going to form a smaller committee to discuss P&T, but that did not happen.
8. Davis Oldham: I thought that it had, but I could be mistaken. I haven't personally been involved in the discussions.
9. Kim Kinsley: Business met with Math, Econ, and Computer Science.
10. Christy Irish: So the discussions are happening at the college-level? Because in the UFC minutes it says Davis will form a group

with representatives from each college. If the plans changed, maybe if we could have an update of what is happening first, that would maybe help lead this discussion.

11. Davis Oldham: There hasn't been any smaller group that includes people from all the colleges. There have been some discussions between some people in College of Business and College of Arts and Sciences, but if I dropped the ball on facilitating a different kind of discussion, I do apologize for that.
12. Jonathan: Miriam raised a good point in the chat. There might be an opportunity for a one year bridge where the current structure and current criteria are locked in place for everything that happens next year. I think that would be hard to do beyond a single year because things are going to change pretty quickly beyond that point. And I don't know that there's a better option than just acknowledging that we need to work within the current structure that we have now to get this done for next year while also working for a new structure and process.
13. Davis Oldham: I think you're right. This motion makes sense for something for people who are currently at UMW. But going forward, it could get messy.
14. April Wynn: I'm going to go the opposite and say, I like this for posterity's sake. I'm fine with the one year bridge, but I see a benefit of this type of motion being in place for future transitions. This can bring a comfort level of when we're hiring somebody and they got hired under a handbook and a handbook can change a lot before they get to tenure. And without something like this, there's no way for them to own that they were hired under kind of this ethos and have that stay with them. So I think there are some protections afforded in this motion to folks going forward, but also when we're trying to recruit new faculty to be able to say you could stick with the old handbook criteria or move forward with a newer handbook. I think that this is a bigger motion than just bridging us into this current change. It would also be good for bridging future changes.
15. Kim Kinsley: We do this for students. When they come in under one catalog, they finish under that catalog or they can opt into the new one. I agree with April and Melina, that we need something. I actually was under the impression we already had something like this so that if a faculty member came in under one handbook, they were able to opt to stay with that handbook.
16. Mara Scanlon: When we allow students to select their catalog, we do make a limited period of time in which that decision has to be made. And it seems like a time limit would make sense for selecting a handbook as well. I'm having a lot of trouble

processing these changes because it's so complicated. There is a whole bunch of things that might be changing but might not be changing. I feel like we need a flowchart with dates on it that says what has to be decided first and which things depend on each other.

17. Karen Anewalt: I think that the bridge is a good idea, but the bridge needs to be longer than a single year. People who are midstream are preparing based on the current criteria and might still be a few years out. We need to have a way to respect that and to honor what we've put forward as our expectations for them.
18. Janine Davis: This feels like a longer project. There's been some pretty significant resistance from different groups about trying to force a combined committee. And I agree, a one year bridge is probably not enough. We've hired people who have started the trajectory of their career in a certain way. It feels like a five year project to me. It feels like something that we could really do well and like think about for the future and make sure that everybody's voices are captured, including people who will be caught up in this change. I advocate for a longer period of time to decide this.
19. Davis Oldham: Just to clarify, when you say to decide this, do you mean to decide on whether or not to formalize this policy? Or are you thinking more a discussion of a one year bridge versus kind of a longer bridge?
20. Janine Davis: I think these issues are all tangled up together. Who is on the P&T committee? What are the criteria? Who goes under which one? Which departments are in which college is decided but it sounds like questions about schools and other organizations are still in play. I would hate to have to say to my colleagues who have been here for two or three years, we don't know what it's going to look like when it's time for you to go up for tenure in two or three years; it might be different from what it says now. To me that doesn't feel fair or honest or genuine. If we have one P&T committee in several years, I think that's a reasonable goal and we can work towards it, but I would hate to see us rush something now when it's already a time of massive confusion, upheaval, and frustration. I want to do the right thing by our new young colleagues who are already in a stressful place.
21. Davis Oldham: So that sounds like support for the motion.
22. Janine Davis: Yes.
23. Davis Oldham: I'm picking up on two issues. There's that issue of the faculty who are currently here and then there's a separate

issue of the faculty who start this fall. I think both are in a difficult situation.

24. April Wynn: I agree with Janine. I think it's good to have something like this motion in place now and then over the next several years we should make a much better, long lived transition plan to support our young faculty. But I do worry that if we don't move with something like this now, we're jeopardizing the current midstream folks that are headed to promotion or tenure. And we want to make sure that we give them as much solid footing as we can in these uncertain times.
25. Caitie Finlayson: I agree that a longer bridge is needed. And I'd like to clarify in the motion, that it would be under your pre-reorg college that you would go up under. I think that's important to specify. But I also want to mention that a colleague reached out to say that they were frustrated that the reorg precipitated this. And many of our colleagues didn't support the reorg or felt that their voice wasn't included in the reorg. And so this colleague felt really frustrated that not only was their voice not taken into account to make this, now we have this broken system that we as colleagues are being to be asked to fix and we don't really know the timeline. I don't know that it should necessarily have to come from us. I think it'd be really helpful to have some administrative support on some issues like, what are the key dates? What do we need to be thinking about? I love this discussion. I appreciate this discussion, but we're all kind of guessing at what needs to take place. I feel like a little bit more guidance would be helpful and a little more support would be helpful.
26. Christy Irish: I think there needs to be clarification. Is this motion talking just about the criteria or is it the committee that will evaluate them. We've talked about this before, but we have people outside our committee evaluating us. It seems like it would only be the criteria that would need to be in this motion. That you would be evaluated by the committee in your current college and if people disagree, that should be in this motion.
27. Melissa: I've been talking with Miriam, whose microphone isn't working. We're on UFAC right now and have been looking into this issue for the past year. One challenge that we've been facing is that if we were sending some things to college votes, they would be under the current structures right now, which would not be how they'd be enacted in the future. So it's possible that we'll be able to have some more productive conversations around this in the fall once reorganization has actually taken place. I think that the one year bridge could be a very helpful thing there. To Christy's question about the criteria versus the committee, I do

think that would need to be clarified here. I think there might not be the possibility to choose a committee as much as there would be to choose criteria. And my last question is one that perhaps, Tim can speak to. What is the legal precedent here? Are we held to the handbook that we come in under, like the catalog for our students, or is it the handbook the year that we go up? I feel like that isn't always super clear and there could be some legal ramifications to some of these decisions. The answer to that might also determine how we solve this situation right now for the bridge.

28. Tim O'Donnell: My suspicion is that that would be determined by case law. Certainly our handbook doesn't make any legal judgments and doesn't draw out any conclusions in that way, but I can certainly consult with University Council to see if there are concerns or any guidance that we might be given on that.
29. Davis Oldham: We could vote on this now. Or we could revise it to clarify some of the questions that were brought up about the committee versus the criteria and the time frame and come back with a different version in March.
30. Melina Patterson: I just want to clarify that I don't know whether I meant be reviewed by the college that you were hired by or to be reviewed by the criteria you were hired by. I think both are really messy. Please free to amend with friendly or unfriendly amendments as much as you want.
31. Mindy Erchull: So this is not a lasting handbook change. It's probably a one-time policy which can be revisited later. So we either need to spend the next 30 minutes workshoping the language to make the proposal we're voting on very clear or we need a subgroup to go away and bring that back next time. In light of our discussion about where the lack of clarity is, I just don't know if spending 30 minutes in whole group is in our best interest.
32. April Wynn: I disagree with Mindy. I think this should go in the Handbook permanently. I think we should allow for folks to go under what the current Handbook from the year when you're putting your file together and have the option of using an earlier Handbook. I'm happy to make a friendly amendment that we separate the criteria away from the committee if we want to approve just that part now. But if we have no appetite for that, then we should make the small group to work on this before the next meeting. But I do see this being not a stopgap.
33. Davis Oldham: I think this sounds like something that goes in Section 7 in the Handbook. And I don't know that this motion is

sufficient to go into the handbook. So I think that we should work on this a little bit more between now and the next meeting.

34. Christy Irish: Could we identify now who that committee is?
35. Davis Oldham: Are there any volunteers other than me?
36. Janine Davis, Karen Anewalt, April Wynn, and Caitie Finlayson volunteered.
37. Davis Oldham: Is anyone from business willing to participate? I think that would be helpful.
38. Kim Kinsley: Can you clarify what this committee will be doing?
39. Davis Oldham: The committee will look at the motion that we have and find a way to essentially to provide additional details in response to some of the questions raised related to this being a one year bridge verses a three year bridge or some other length? Does this go in the handbook or not? Is this permanent? The goal is to come up with something a little bit stronger in terms of intention and clarity.
40. Davis Oldham: So I can reach out to people and we can use this document as a starting point and find the time to get together or work on it electronically.

d. Motion to eliminate Handbook appendices F, G, H, I, J, and K (April Wynn)

i. Questions:

1. Mindy Erchull: Did we ever get clarity over whether the UFC even can eliminate appendices since they are a college-level decision?
2. Davis Oldham: That's a good question. The handbook seems to suggest that the answer that is no, but I think that that's odd for the governing body of the university to not have oversight over the whole handbook.
3. Christy Irish: The Handbook is pretty explicit in that the appendices are maintained by the organizations that create them. It does look a little odd. It doesn't appear that they're necessarily up to date in what all colleges are doing. COE is extremely worried about just getting rid of our appendix on how we're governed. We've already started looking at where we will need to make changes for our new college. But we have major concerns about this motion.
4. Davis Oldham: I think that is something that's been kind of an issue over the years is that there's very little guidance on the time frame for approving the appendices.
5. April Wynn: I think also it's odd that we have appendices that we reference from our Handbook and we approve the Handbook, but then have no ability to edit appendices. So my question is maybe more philosophical: why are we having appendices in a Faculty Handbook if those appendices are going to live at the colleges?

Can we divest that to the colleges as college handbooks or policies or procedures or whatever, and take them out of the university Handbook, particularly because we cannot operate under these appendices starting in August? And I don't know that anybody has capacity to update them in a way that is meaningful until after the departmental shifts occur to the new colleges. So I guess my question is maybe philosophical. Why do we have stuff in our handbook that isn't the purview of this body? If the appendices represent colleges, can we have college handbooks and these policies live there?

6. Melina Patterson: I understand that the College of Education and the College of Business want to have their governing documents, but they also don't apply to the new structure. No one is saying there are no more rules or there are no more guidelines, but right now these guidelines do not apply to everyone who will be in the college in August. Am I wrong?
7. Caitie Finlayson: I agree with Melina and with April as well. And I want to draw attention to section 1.12.3 in the Handbook about changes to the appendices. It says material in each appendix is created and maintained by separate offices or groups. It doesn't actually specify that colleges have control over these. It just says offices or groups. So to me, the Handbook doesn't preclude us making changes to that section or to the appendices.
8. Jonathan Levin: This is in response to April. The handbook does explicitly refer to the appendices in key places when referencing criteria and processes associated with tenure and promotion in particular. I'm sure there are other places as well. The Handbook essentially recognizes that there are certain decisions that will be made in the colleges to reflect the interests of the colleges. So the handbook itself doesn't want to be too explicit about those things. But I think the fact that the handbook references those appendices is part of what makes it important to maintain the appendices. They obviously have to be revised, the faster the better. And nobody knows as well as I do and the other people who served on the Handbook Committee last summer how gargantuan these tasks are. To do them well will take another summer group probably in each college. I think that's just the work that has to be done to ensure that these are up to date and reflect the interests of the colleges as they're now going to be formed.
9. Janine Davis: I think of the line in our Handbook that says something like you are held to your contractual obligations and the appendices lay out transparently and clearly what those obligations involve. So I'm neutral on what it says in the CAS

appendix. However, the rules of order and the description of sort of how the college is run and what committees exist and who serves on them and how, I do find that to be important to state publicly because then people know what expectations there will be for them in a more specific way than the criteria layout. I do think it is important to be speedy in revising the rules of order appendix to identify the departments that will then fall within each college. I think the P&T is a separate appendix and that's a different issue. But I think the rules of order do need to be changed rapidly.

10. April Wynn: I want to respond to Jonathan point. Part of the reason that this motion came up now is because if we're going to pull these out, we would need to pull out the references to them from the Handbook proper, which is an expedient thing. I hear a lot of concern about pulling them out and I hear that maybe we need to double down on revising these six appendices so that they can be ready to go for August. I think that that would shore up some of the concerns we have about policies and procedures. But I don't know who, for lack of a term, would be the instigator of making sure that that happens. But I do think it is important that we are continually hiring people and we will hire new people that start in August and the Handbook with the appendices we have now is not tenable for everyone that will be coming into this university. So I think there needs to be a sense of urgency. And so part of getting rid of the appendices is that we ditch them for a year so we're not out of compliance and we work next year to make a replacement. I'm all for that. If we have the capacity to put in something better now, then I can get behind the urgency. But I think we need to make sure that we have that plan solid. My understanding is they don't have to go through the Board of Visitor for approval so we can have a little bit more time. But we're losing time quickly. And I would hate for us to not have this done and then be in a bind come August.
11. Karen Anewalt: I wanted to add that the current appendices for COE and COB really represent great structure that their internal groups use right now to work effectively. But they really are not going to apply to everybody who's in their new college. There might be a different way of the work. And so it feels like we need to start from scratch. Certainly, I think that both groups have done a lot of work in determining how it makes sense for them to do business efficiently. And nobody's saying you can't have that. Within my department, we have particular procedures or committees that work on curriculum or different things. But it's just our department committee. Our department committee

doesn't need to be in the Handbook. And so I'm in favor of starting with a blank slate and carefully thinking through this over the next year.

12. Melina Patterson: I agree with Karen. The current appendices are a mix of college-level procedures and department-level procedures and program-level issues. And I agree with what Janine said earlier. I think that we need a slow, deliberate conversation to figure out the best way of having policies both at the college and at the university level. It's hard because there are unknown things. Maybe we're going to stay with college-level P&T committees, and if we do, then we need to revise what those committees look like. But maybe we're going to move to a university P&T Committee which isn't like the CAS P&T Committee. We should be starting to have those conversations but even if we start those conversations now, we are not going to be ready by August. They're big conversations that lots of different people need to have and that in the meantime, we need to not have documents that cannot apply to the people in the college. April saying this is super urgent, and it is urgent, but I also don't want us to rush and not do the best job we could. Instead, I want us to have time to think about what makes sense. And in some ways, we can't make those decisions until people are actually meeting with the colleges that they're going to be in. Until we know what it means to have some people in schools and some people not in schools. Having those conversations is hard when you don't even know who you're meeting with. I don't know how we do this well and do it fast. But I'm pretty sure that what exists right now is not going to be appropriate.
13. Melissa Wells: I think a lot of us are saying the same thing, but in different ways. It's important to us that we have a clear, transparent process and that we are doing that in an efficient way. So the Handbook Committee over the summer made a timeline of all of this, and we did suggest that the appendices would need to be updated by their corresponding units, which, going back to 1.12.3, it does explicitly state that they are created and maintained by separate offices or groups. That is plural. It does not state UFC even though UFC is named as having authority of other aspects. So, I think that the language being different is the clear assertion that UFC does not have the agency to change the appendices. That is clearly delegated to the colleges. And the most efficient way to do this, which is what the Handbook Committee suggested, is that the appendices need to be revised. We are not suggesting that the Handbook is going to go forward as it currently stands with the appendices and with Section 7.

Revisions need to be made. You're also talking about the importance of talking with new constituents, and we are doing that. I know in COE, I am the Chair of COE Faculty Affairs, and we are working through our appendices to revise those to reflect what's going to happen in the fall. I think it's also important that we keep these in the Handbook for now for transparency. As the Handbook Committee was going through, we were finding that sometimes there were references made to things that were supposed to be maintained by departments that weren't in the handbook, and we didn't know where to find them. We did see that our UMW Faculty Handbook is very extensive, but also that extensiveness helps us have clarity in the work that we're doing. So the timeline has been stated, the work is being done. We all agree that changes need to be made. Changing the appendices also needs to involve the new constituents that are coming in next fall.

14. Kim Kinsley: I think I agree with Melissa that we're all in agreement, at least on principle here. I also agree with April that that to just to leave appendices in there that are no longer relevant just seems like something that we should fix, so I understand April's motion. However, I think with Melina's motion to create this bridge that will really help us so that instead of just deleting the appendices right now, we can take time to put together new appendices. I know Computer Science, Math, Economics and College of Business, we have already had a meeting about P&T so we're already making progress, but we're not ready to put together appendices tomorrow. My bottom line is that I think this bridge is what we need to focus on right now.
15. April Wynn: I have two questions. Are we thinking that the bridge would be for both P&T and structure, so the bridge would apply to both appendices? And also Melissa mentioned the timeline for appendices. What's the drop dead time? When do the appendices have to be updated to go live in August?
16. Provost O'Donnell: The Provost's Office generally publishes the Faculty Handbook on July 1st or thereabouts. But there have been some years where it is later due to a late appendices. I do need to say something here that is kind of critical to this discussion. The appendices hold no force because they're not approved by the university faculty and they're not approved by the Board of Visitors. And so they are just operational guidance for colleges and how to conduct business within colleges, but the Board hasn't approved them, and the faculty haven't approved them. And so whether or not they sit as appendices or they sit as governing documents within a college or a department, it doesn't matter.

We're the only university that I can find that have college appendices stuck at the back of their faculty handbook. And that has become a real challenge, especially when the Faculty Handbook is the contractual language under which our faculty, all of them, operate.

17. Kim Kinsley: Perhaps our new colleges going forward, all of them, can create bylaws that define our own committee structures.
18. Davis Oldham: Given what Tim and Melissa have shared regarding the Handbook, I think the bridge might be a little bit different. The bridge might be agreeing to revise the handbook, but legally because these documents don't go through the same process and don't really matter. We have a handbook that's too big. And so maybe the bridge is to fix the appendices in a way that will work for next year but also agree that next year the colleges agree to update the appendices.
19. Caitie Finlayson: But to Karen's point, is that even possible, given that departments are moving into these colleges? It might be easy enough for us in CAS who are just losing departments to figure it out and keep things roughly the same. But it's taken us so long to even get the Senate model and we're still not there on P&T. We have all these appendices that are going to be out of compliance pretty soon. And I don't know if it's reasonable to say that we're quickly going to make changes that are going to be amenable to the departments that are moving into new colleges.
20. Davis Oldham: I think that's a good point. I'd like to think that it's doable, but I share the concern.
21. April Wynn: Can I ask what happens if the appendices don't get updated before August? What's the safety valve if they don't get updated by July 1st or close thereof? Because part of putting this here is to give us a conversation now to talk about what we want to do, but also how do we not end up with a handbook that is just wrong in August? So what happens if we don't get it done?
22. Melissa Wells: Well, my first advice would be to trust your colleagues. We have been working on this for months in COE, and I won't speak for COB, but this has been on our radar since literally August. So we are looking at making revisions that will meet the needs of everybody. So it will get done. We know this is important. It's important to us too. It will get done.
23. Jonathan Levin: I just think there's going to be a gray period and the shorter that period will be, the better. I don't have that degree of confidence that it'll be done in CAS. Maybe if we organize ourselves right now, we could get it done before the start of next year. When I raised my hand, I actually wanted to reinforce something else that Melissa said in the chat. The best

thing that we could do right now that would have the biggest impact is to agree that those coming up for tenure and promotion next year will be reviewed under the structures and the criteria that are in place this year by the committee in the college in which they're in this year. So if you were going to a new college, at least for next year, you would be reviewed by the committee in CAS. I just think we need to bring clarity to that issue. That's the thing that worries me more than anything else. I think the other stuff will happen and we're just going to have to live in an ambiguous state for a while.

24. Davis Oldham: I think the best way to handle that would be for a subset of us to revise the motion that we had to deal with the P&T. I think if we can get something for the next UFC meeting and agree what P&T will look like next year, then I think that would work.
25. Alex Dunn: I want to address the question about if COB has started working alongside colleagues in the department. We are having P&T discussions with everybody and there is a New College Transition Task Force that is meeting and next week they are starting on bylaws and determining committees for the new college. So just like Melissa said, this work has been going on and will continue to go on. But then I also had a question for Tim. So when you said the thing about the appendices not being approved by the BOV, if somebody sued us for something related to P&T, what information do they use? Because I thought the criteria was laid out in the appendices partially for that reason.
26. Tim O'Donnell: I think you've identified an issue that needs to be addressed.
27. Davis Oldham: I'm not getting the sense that there's interest in putting this motion up for a vote. Somebody can correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm not getting that sense based off the comments that I've heard. I do appreciate the sense of urgency to get the appendices in terms of committee structure, curricular structure, and all of that ready for next year.
28. April Wynn: Can I ask that we keep this on our agenda then so we can check in with all three colleges as a way of just keeping that in the forefront of our brains and then maybe ask to have documents to review or something like that so we can learn from each other how they're putting things together? I think that there's some really good things that colleges are doing that we maybe want to steal for the College of Arts and Sciences, but also just for a transparency thing it would be good to know who is working on them and what everyone is thinking about.

29. Davis Oldham: Yes, we can ask people from all three colleges to give an update at next UFC meeting to explain who is working on the changes, where they are, and what sort of changes they've already considered for their appendices.
30. April Wynn: Yes, knowing who is doing the work would be good in case anyone has feedback or ideas to share with those groups.
31. Davis Oldham: I encourage all three colleges to continue the work that they have been doing with the appendices, and we'll report back at the next UFC meeting.

6. New Business – Curriculum Action Items

a. Questions:

- i. Mara Scanlon: Is Tim still here? I should have asked this with the minutes. I'm completely unclear about who will be teaching all these nursing classes.
 1. Provost O'Donnell: If the program is approved and we get state support, then we will hire the faculty to teach the courses. We do have some faculty who could offer some of the courses but we will be hiring if we get the support.
- ii. Motion to approve University Curriculum Committee items
 1. Unanimously approved.
- iii. Motion to approve Distance and Blended Learning Committee items
 1. Unanimously approved.
- iv. Motion to approve Honor Program Committee items
 1. Unanimously approved.
- v. Motion to approve Speaking Intensive Committee and Writing Intensive Committee items
 1. Unanimously approved.
- vi. Motion to approve Digital Intensive Committee items
 1. Unanimously approved.

7. Announcements: Davis Oldham stated that he does not have any announcements. I see in the chat a question about the AAUP statement. I think there was support from faculty members for some of the points that were raised from AAUP, and I think that will continue to be a part of the discussion at UFAC and other committees as well.

- a. Nabil Al-Tikriti: I'll just say that we're going to try and do that every meeting, if we, if we can

Meeting adjourned at 5:25pm