

## University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

March 19, 2025

3:30pm HCC Digital Auditorium

**Members in Attendance:** Davis Oldham (Chair), April Wynn (Parliamentarian), Kim Kinsley, Sayan Sarkar, Christy Irish, Jennifer Walker, Janine Davis, Mindy Erchull, 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), Kevin Caffrey, Miriam Liss (UFAC Chair), Melissa Wells (Handbook Group)

1. Call to Order
  - a. There are two proxies today Sayan Sarkar for Alex Dunn and Davis Oldham for Kelly Swiney
2. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
  - a. **Motion to approve the February UFC minutes.**
    - i. Unanimously approved.
3. Reports
  - a. President's Report: President Paino and other UMW administrators have been acting in response to the "Dear Colleague" letter sent by the US Department of Education and the Presidential Executive Orders that have been signed recently. They have also been doing their best to respond to questions from students, faculty, and staff. There is still a lot that is not known or clear because some of the federal guidance appears to contradict VA state law or guidelines. UMW plans to continue to support students in the ways we always have. UMW administrators have gone through all of our policies, practices, procedures, and planning and believe we are in compliance. Students have expressed concern about eliminating organizations or groups. However, all of our student organizations are open to all students and don't restrict membership to a particular race, ethnicity, or gender, so these are all in compliance and there are no plans to eliminate or change student clubs/groups. One action we have taken is to change Dr Shorter's title to Associate Provost of Community Relations and Compliance. This decision was made collaboratively with Dr Shorter to represent the role that she already has and career directions she might want to pursue in the future either at UMW or elsewhere. The change was also made to avoid an unnecessary target being placed on this position or the work she does. I'll pause for questions about these issues.
    - i. Questions:
      1. Mara Scanlon: About a year ago, Inside Higher Ed report that VCU and GMU had done away with academic requirements for courses oriented towards diversity. So far, there is no indication

that our requirements or courses at UMW will be targeted after the Executive Orders. Can you tell me where you feel like that stands?

2. President Paino: That's accurate. Our Board has not probed on this issue and has not shown any interest in taking curricular matters on. And in our own review of our requirements, I don't think we run violate any Executive Order in any of our courses. So at least as things stand today, I don't see that as a threat that we need to be concerned about.

President Paino: We are in the season of putting together our fiscal year 2026 budget. The state's budget is now with the governor and is supposed to be signed by him by next week. We haven't heard a lot about it but there not a lot of controversy around the proposed budget as it relates to higher education. We should get some money to support operations (approximately 1.1million), which they now refer to as "affordability money." This is to help us keep costs down for students. We received some one-time money to help us kick off a master's in nursing program. The program will have ongoing expenses, so there's some risk involved in making an investment in this program because we will need to ask for additional money next year. We also received one-time money (around 4.35 million) to help with energy efficiency projects and 3.5 million for upgrades to IT infrastructure. This IT money is something that we requested in collaboration with W&M, Norfolk State, and CNU that may allow us to transition away from Banner. This is a large project and will likely take 3-4 years to make that transition. We are considering options and there is not an emergency need to transition immediately, but we're considering options to transition in the next 5 years. The IT money we received will only fund about 25% of what we actually need to do, so we will be exploring what we can do with the money we received. The state budget also includes a 3% cost of living increase plus a 1.5% bonus for faculty and staff.

We are doing a lot of key leadership searches right now including the CIO, Director of Capital Outlay, and the VP of Student Affairs.

President Paino thanked faculty and staff for their work at recent Admissions events and recruiting events. The next Destination Day for admitted students is in April. Applications are up about 12%. We are not going to admit a larger class and will instead be a bit more selective. We're currently on pace with deposits.

- i. Questions: No additional questions.
- b. Provost Report: Provost O'Donnell added additional details to the previous topics. I want to provide some additional context for the change in Dr. Shorter's title. Conversations about changing the title of the Chief Diversity Officer role began last year and we had conversations about once a month over the past year. The job description itself hasn't really changed. We did remove the implementation of the One Virginia Plan from the original job description, since priorities around this initiative have changed. All of the other pieces including oversight of ADA

compliance, discrimination, and support for the Office of Disability Resources and Title IV Office are all still included. Dr Shorter has been really successful in building relationships with both students and the community beyond campus. The new title recognizes some of the work that's being done to connect to Fredericksburg.

I also wanted to speak to the changes that other universities like VCU and GMU have made in response to challenges made to toward their curricula. One of the reasons for the changes at these other universities is that they previously required students to take a particular course with particular learning outcomes. I don't see those same issues in our curriculum at UMW. Our Diverse & Global Perspectives requirement, both in the 2008 revision of the general education curriculum and the 2020 refinement of the learning outcomes, has a broad range of courses and students can select among these including things like intermediate Spanish. So UMW students have lots of choices about pathways to fulfill certain requirements, so I'm not concerned.

The VP of Student Affairs candidates are coming to campus in April on the 7th, 8th, 9th and 14<sup>th</sup>. We'll have an open forum in Dodd Auditorium at 3 o'clock and everyone is welcome to participate.

Finally, I've started to hear some news of current students losing internship opportunities. For example, as I understand it, NSWC Dahlgren has pulled back on a number of internship offers that were made for this summer. This is something we're regularly talking about in Academic Affairs with the goal of trying to come up with some alternative experiences, whether it's volunteer opportunities for students through the Center for Community Engagement or opportunities to take free courses through Coursera. We are considering ways that students might be able to replicate some of the learning that could happen in an internship and help them build some new skills. So we hope to have something pulled together soon that not only addresses our current students and the challenges they might face in the coming months, but also our alumni because they're coming back to the Career Center and saying they need help taking their 20-year old federal resume and turning it into something to find another job or opportunity with. And so we're working both with Alumni Relations and the Center for Career and Professional Development to think through some of those things. There's no better time to activate the Mary Washington network, which Alumni Relations has been doing, because our alums are going to be the best support for each other as they navigate the uncertainty in the job market.

i. Questions:

- a. Mara Scanlon: So Shavonne was Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Provost for Equity and Inclusion. Do I understand that her title change is not equivalent to UVA closing its Diversity, Equity and Inclusion office?
  - i. Provost O'Donnell: We did not close an office.

- ii. Mara Scanlon: I don't understand what "Community Relations and Compliance" means. I'm trying to figure out what that office does and I'm taking at your word, that actually a lot of what Shavonne does will be the same.
  - iii. Provost O'Donnell: For example, one of her big responsibilities for the last three years has been to implement the Constructive Dialogue Perspectives curriculum for all first year students as they come in over the summer and also in the first couple of weeks on campus. That program is designed to have students engage in community difference and to be able to work together, to function together, to learn, to live and work and learn together. This is a program that she'll continue. She'll continue to support and draw together the James Farmer Multicultural Center, the Safe Zone Team, Office of Disability Resources and Title IX.
  - iv. President Paino: And there are significant differences between what UVA did and this title change. One, the BOV did not direct anyone to do this, nor did the President. This is something Dr. Shorter was in conversation about and she was driving this. We haven't shut anything down. It is a title change, in part so that she can focus on her work without becoming an unnecessary target due to title.
- b. Miriam Liss: I wondered if you could comment on the elimination of the Search Advocates Program. Is it true that it's getting eliminated? And is there any way we can rebrand it as advocating for fair searches?
  - i. Provost O'Donnell: I think we have an opportunity to do that. We have suspended the current version and we'll change the search procedures if there are any searches next year. In reviewing all the current materials, I think that it was a smart move to make that decision at this point in time.
- c. Caitie Finlayson: Have we received any pushback on our ASPIRE values at all?
  - i. Provost O'Donnell: Not that I've heard.
  - ii. President Paino: I've received no pushback on that from the BOV or anyone else.
- d. Mara Scanlon: Can you explain the Virginia Office of Education Economics that was mentioned in your report?
  - i. Provost O'Donnell: I did that to point our attention there. It's an emerging office that will shape the future in terms of the way that we are able to advocate for new program development. They will be the single authority that the State Council of Higher Education of Virginia (SCHEV) will look at to determine whether or not UMW could

support more nurses or UVA could support more geographers. It used to be that the program approval process required us to get multiple different measures of that, including data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and job ads. They've simplified that and moving forward we use this new office's data. I haven't had a full viewing of their website and the way that they'll provide data to us. I expect that it will come online very quickly because the new program approval process is set to launch in early April.

- ii. Mara Scanlon: I'm one of many people here who comes from a field that is producing fantastic workers for all kinds of jobs, but that nobody would look at data and say, "what we really need is more English majors." So to be clear, it's not your sense that this marks any shift away from recognizing the value of liberal arts?
- iii. Provost O'Donnell: No, this is focused on the future labor market needs of Virginia over the next 10, 20, or however many years. And will help the state to understand whether universities should build programs in areas of need.

c. Deans' Reports

- i. Dean Mellinger: The tenure track position in studio art has been filled successfully with their first choice candidate. And the RTA position in mathematics has been filled. We're still working to hire somebody in biological sciences to start a kinesiology program.

Grant Woodwell awarded \$155,000 in supplemental grants (\$189,000 was requested). Most of these requests were for travel.

180 students applied from 16 different departments for undergraduate research grants. \$126,000 was awarded (of \$172,000 requested). We are gearing up for the summer programs. Betsy Lewis is working with the two faculty directors for the Irene Piscopo Rodgers' Summer Science Institute and the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Summer Institute to get the planning underway. And the plans for the Summer Enrichment Program are also underway.

- 1. No questions.
- ii. Dean Tabak submitted a written report.
  - 1. No questions.
- iii. Dean Kelly submitted a written report.
  - 1. No questions.

d. Student Government – No report.

- e. University Staff Council – No report.
  - f. UFC Chair’s Report (Davis Oldham): I encourage anyone who is able to come meet the candidates for our CIO, VP of Student Affairs, and other positions to do so.
    - i. No questions
  - g. UFC Vice Chair’s Report (Melina Patterson): My department has decided that Caitie will be our UFC representative next year. So that means we need someone to serve as UFC Chair next year.
    - i. Davis Oldham: We will be electing officers at the next UFC meeting so I’m anticipating a lot of people reaching out and saying that they want to serve as UFC chair. I will be serving as Past Chair next year so I’ll be happy to help the new chair transition into the role.
    - ii. No questions.
  - h. Faculty Senate of Virginia (Patricia Orozo): No update from the Faculty Senate of Virginia, but the National Council on the Faculty Senates will have their meeting May 29-30, and it's going to be hosted by the Francis Marion University.
    - i. Questions:
      - 1. Davis Oldham: Is the bill about faculty and staff roles on BOVs still looking likely to be vetoed?
      - 2. President Paino: I have not heard any updates. I’m meeting with our lobbyists later this week and will ask.
4. University Committee Minutes: Does anybody have any comments on the committee minutes?
- a. **Motion to approve all university committee minutes.**
    - i. Unanimously approved.
5. Old Business
- a. Davis Oldham: Last time there was a lot of discussion about whether the “bridge” idea for P&T should be temporary or permanent. A group of representatives from UFC had a good online discussion. It seemed like the best path forward was to split these ideas into two separate motions. So now we have a motion to create a “bridge” for next year and a separate motion about future flexibility.
  - b. Revised version of the bridge motion for 2025-26 P&T process:
    - i. Discussion:
      - 1. Jonathan Levin: The motion doesn’t say anything about the role of the Dean. I wondered if that was purposeful or an oversight. If somebody elects to use the P&T committee from the college under which they were hired, does that mean the file will move up to the

dean of that college? Or does it move up to the dean of the college that the individual is currently in?

2. Caitie Finlayson: I think that it implies the dean of the college associated with the committee.
3. Tim O'Donnell: I agree.
4. Mindy Erchull: I also agree. They're being evaluated under the current Handbook using their previous college and so the decision would go to the dean associated with that college.
5. Miriam Liss: UFAC also reviewed this and agrees. It doesn't make any sense to involve a different dean that hasn't been part of the decision making process in the previous college. UFAC supports this motion.
6. Kim Kinsley: I agree. And in the motion it says, "within in the college under which they were hired" so I don't think there's another reasonable way that you could interpret that.
7. Caitie Finlayson: Could we add "and dean" after the "P&T committee"?
- 8. Move to approve the motion as amended:**
  - a. Unanimously approved.
9. Keith Mellinger: The motion says "allow faculty applying." Does that mean that the assumption is that they have a choice?
10. Davis Oldham: Yes, they have a choice and I assume that they will indicate their choice when they turn in their letter of intent to apply for Promotion & Tenure. They will notify the dean of the committee who they choose to review their file.
11. Mindy Erchull: Does that need to be clear as part of this motion?
12. Tim O'Donnell: The declaration date is in the Handbook.
13. Mindy Erchull: But the Handbook doesn't say to indicate a preference for the committee/dean.
14. Tim O'Donnell: You could add that to the motion or the Provost's Office could send out a memorandum to all faculty in the next few weeks that reminds them of the data and that they need to select the committee/dean that will review their file.
15. Caitie Finlayson: Could we add that language underneath the calendar on the Provost's website?
16. Provost O'Donnell: Yes.

c. Motion for future flexibility to select a previous P&T process:

i. Discussion:

1. Janine Davis: I'm not sure why this is limited to 3 years. Why isn't it limited to just the previous handbook?
2. Davis Oldham: My memory from the discussion that we had back in March was that 3 years was a time period that someone suggested.
3. April Wynn: I think 3 years and 5 years were both considered. I think the idea was that allowing people to make a choice to return

to a Handbook 15 years from now, that might be too long a timeline. But there should be a reasonable short-term flexibility.

4. Janine Davis: So do you mean this only applies three years from now?
5. April Wynn: This is permanent and it provides assurances to people when we hire them that we won't completely change the ethos of the P&T criteria and process on them. They can go back to a previous Handbook within the last 3 years from the time they submit their file.
6. Christy Irish: Have there been changes in the last three years? I'm just wondering why specify 3 years or 5 years. Why not just say the previous Handbook?
7. Miriam Liss: I see a potential problem if we go to a university tenure promotion committee. Then in three years, someone says I want to go back to the old procedure, which is a college P&T committee that doesn't exist anymore. We can't "get back" a committee structure that no longer exists. I don't think you can ask to regenerate a committee structure. You could ask to use former criteria.
8. Mindy Erchull: I agree with Miriam. The idea seems to be that standards should be known far enough in advance so that people can realistically work on them and not be surprised when they submit their file. But that is different from the P&T structure under which review happens, and I think these two issues are conflated in this motion.  
My other question is that given that we don't know what's happening with appendices, the motion needs to say, "including appendices", because the appendices are much easier to revise because they don't go through UFC. So the appendices could be changed every year and UFC might not even know of the changes. So we need to clarify that as well.
9. Davis Oldham: I think there's two possible scenarios to describe here. One is moving departments between colleges and the ramifications that has. But then there's also a kind of an ethos in terms of what we value as an institution.
10. Christy Irish: Does anyone have phrasing? We use "criteria" in the COE appendix.
11. Mindy Erchull: I think we could add "under the criteria detailed in the Faculty Handbook." And then in the second paragraph where it says "using any faculty handbook", change this to "using the criteria detailed in any faculty handbook that was published...."
12. Christy Irish: Criteria not process?
13. Melina Patterson: Process is related to committee structure.
14. Christy Irish: Right, so do we want to put that in the phrasing and spell out that this is about the criteria and not the process or structure?

15. Mindy Erchull: I think we may be getting too detailed.
  16. Christy Irish: Where are these previous Handbooks housed? Do we have these?
  17. Davis Oldham: Yes, they're on the Provost's website.
  18. Provost O'Donnell: I don't think you need to consider this motion at this time. This is a huge change to the way that we've done things and it probably has unintended consequences. It's something that might benefit from further reflection, especially since there's work to be done over the next year related to the promotional tenure process. I think solidifying Section 7 with universal standards that would apply irrespective of college is important. This motion is built in a way that attempts to protect faculty that come into a system. But presumably because we're talking about what I understand to be disciplinary standards contained either in the appendices as currently constituted or as something that might be housed within a college, those are disadvantages. Decisions about disciplinary or college standards would be something that faculty would always be a part of. And then finally, I think that this is something that we've need council to review and we haven't had that conversation. And so it's probably premature to take action on this.
  19. Next there was a procedural discussion on how to proceed whether it's withdrawing the motion, tabling the motion, voting it down, or referring it to committee.
  20. Melina Paterson: Perhaps part of what we need to do is refer it to the 3 college-level P&T committees so that they can meet and figure out what the university-level procedures should be.
  21. Miriam Liss: Perhaps it should go back to UFAC since they are tasked with making recommendations about P&T criteria and process.
  22. Melina Patterson: I recommend that UFAC have a conversation with everyone in the room rather than having separate meetings with different groups.
  23. Mindy Erchull: I move to refer this to UFAC with a recommendation that as part of their work on this, they meet with all P&T committees collectively.
    - a. Passed by majority vote
- d. Status update on college-level discussions about updating appendices:
- i. Davis Oldham: Could someone from each college give a short update on their work looking into the appendices and making updates?
  - ii. Janine Davis: Our college, including representatives from the new college, is actively involved in revising the rules of order.
  - iii. Davis Oldham: What types of things have you found that need changes?
  - iv. Janine Davis: The internal committee structure needs to be adjusted, as well as the composition of committees and who they report to. We've also

found that we have a lot of rules of order that are possibly not necessary and simplification is probably the best approach for us.

- v. Christy Irish: We're also looking at P&T criteria specifically. We are essentially one department now. We are gaining two more departments. Their criteria would look different than ours. We were waiting for today's discussion to determine whether we're generalizing our criteria or whether we're writing separate criteria for each department.
  - vi. Jonathan Levin: In CAS, Davis invited folks review a document and make suggestions. I and a few others did that. There's not a whole lot that's consequential because in our situation we're just losing some departments. However, there is a lot of responsibility vested in the CAS Faculty Council and it's unclear if that still exists after the reorganization.
  - vii. Davis Oldham: Obviously it would also have a role in P&T in terms of revising standards. The primary role has been related to the Curriculum Committee. We did remove the requirement for the CAS Faculty Council to review CAS Curriculum Committee approvals before sending them to the University Curriculum Committee. This is because the curriculum proposals tend to be so strong by the time they get to this review, that there's no benefit to CAS Curriculum Committee reviewing them before the University Curriculum Committee, so we streamlined process to support a more manageable timeline. So we've already cleaned that up. Thus far, the recommendation has been to keep the CAS Faculty Council in place. One open question is the makeup. Right now, there are 9 CAS members on the CAS Faculty Council, but with department-level representation, there could be 15-16 in the new system. So we need to decide if that makes sense and whether that group will be duplicating departmental level conversations or UFC conversations. We don't want multiple meetings and layers making the process more complicated. And finally, there is one small section of the P&T process that didn't get changed about using Canvas, so we need to fix that.
  - viii. Sayan Sarkar: Faculty from the four departments: Econ, Computer Science, Math, and Business met last week. There is agreement that something needs to be created at the department level but there is no agreement on a university vs college-level structure.
  - ix. Karen Anewalt: Have people from COB met to discuss the other content in the Appendices related to committees?
  - x. Sayan Sarkar: There is a New College Transition Task Force Group, which is the 4 department chairs and 4 additional tenured faculty from the different departments. They've met to create bylaws for the new college. There will be two college-level committees. One is curriculum and assurance of learning. The second is research and faculty development.
  - xi. Kim Kinsley: I also want to add that related to P&T, we'd like to look at other ideas beyond just a college-level structure and a university-level structure.
- e. Add important P&T processes to Section 7 to make them legally binding:

- i. Davis Oldham: There was a time where Section 7 had requirements for the expectations for tenure. And now 7.3 describes the criteria across the university.
- ii. Tim O'Donnell: When we developed this 3 college structure, we took the criteria for P&T out of section 7 and moved those to the appendix for CAS. Then the COB and COE took those guidelines and modified them for their own purposes. So we no longer have a set of university-wide standards that govern the entire process. My suggestion is that this be a conversation that we take up next year. UFAC has already started that conversation this year and I believe is willing to continue that discussion next year. I think an important starting point is that Section 7 be shored up and then whether college-wide or department-wide standards articulating disciplinary standards are developed in the future, that would be a follow on conversation. First, we need to restore Section 7 to have universal standards.
- iii. Melina Patterson: One of the things that UFC Exec talked to Tim about is that instead of having appendices, we could have policies that live on the Provost's webpage. That helps to disentangle the disciplinary guidance from the university Faculty Handbook, which is approved by the BOV. With this type of change, the policies that guide us for P&T aren't under the purview of the BOV.
- iv. Janine Davis: That makes sense, but I want us to name the place where we will house these. If it's the Provost's website, that's fine, but that should be in the motion.
- v. Miriam Liss: Are we talking about department specific policies? Or generalized division policies?
- vi. Melina Patterson: University policies belong in a university Handbook.
- vii. Miriam Liss: Right, so that's Section 7 and Tim says we should beef that up a bit with university standards. And then you're saying department-specific criteria or policies or standards, would be on the Provost's website.
- viii. Provost O'Donnell: When there are additional standards, they are typically aggregated either at the college or university level and they're there for all to see. We can certainly do that, if that's the approach that's taken. These additional standards tend to be more discipline-based than college-based. I think what we've been trying to do is to shoehorn standards into a college structure and I think that's the conversation for next year. What are the university standards? What are the discipline specific standards that a department would apply? And where do we house all that and how does the Provost's Office support that infrastructure to make sure it all goes smoothly?
- ix. Miriam Liss: I think that these are really important conversations and I don't think decisions have to be made right now. I think the language in section 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, that's a new language even though it's not highlighted in red.
- x. Davis Oldham: Yes, sorry that should be highlighted.

- xi. Miriam Liss: I don't know that this is the final answer of what is going to be added to Section 7. I think this is the beginning of a longer conversation involving UFAC and the three P&T committees. And the bridge motion is giving us the year to have those conversation. UFAC was wondering who wrote this update to Section 7. I don't think we have issues with it, just maybe it shouldn't be decided today so there's more time for discussion.
- xii. Davis Oldham: I drafted it, but it's just a cut and paste from the existing appendices. So I hope that we wouldn't have any objections to these criteria because we already have these in the appendices. I appreciate the desire to have more conversation on it. My thought was that the sooner we can have a Handbook the represents only the pieces that are approved by the BOV, the better. That's not to say that the other documents couldn't exist elsewhere. There are risks to having the documents. But there's also risks to not having them. Tim's said today that we don't need to rush to do this, but it is something that needs to happen.
- xiii. Mindy Erchull: My concern with passing this today is that it references things that don't exist, like department-level policy documents. If we have this in the Faculty Handbook and it goes into effect in August, then every department has to have a policy document in place and I don't think that's realistic.
- xiv. Davis Oldham: Yes, that was the challenge with these sections. I put in what I considered the absolute bare minimum that people agreed on. I think there's more stuff that we could add to Section 7 that could make it even better. I'll also say that I don't think departments will be required to have additional criteria or standards. I think my own department may be happy with just what is currently in Appendix I.
- xv. Caitie Finlayson: This has to change because it's referencing things that aren't going to exist. For me, saying "academic unit" is vague enough that it could mean either department or school. There are a few places where it still says college instead and those should be changed.
- xvi. Christy Irish: If we are thinking about waiting to do some of this, is there a reason that we would have to do one or both of these now?
- xvii. Mindy Erchull: I think that the order is complicated because if we vote to remove the appendices, we can't have references to the appendices in section 7. If we don't remove the appendices yet, then we do need to decide what to do. These motions are separate, but they're stacked.
- xviii. April Wynn: I'm trying to get clarity. The Handbook is what goes in front of the BOV and it does not have much in there now. Are we opening ourselves to have a more difficult time enforcing an appendix or a policy or whatever form the additional criteria take? To me then that would maybe lead us to a sense of urgency to make some changes now, knowing this is going to be a bigger conversation later. If the appendices become policies, they're not part of the handbook. Which way are we opening ourselves up to a bigger risk or issue? Are we opening ourselves up to issues by not having any clarity in here, in which case something is better

than what we have now. Or do we only open ourselves up if appendices become policy?

- xix. Melissa Wells: The other concern the Handbook Committee has is that the appendices are referenced 153 times in the Handbook. So we are concerned about deleting the appendices without consulting the 153 other references to appendices in the Handbook to understand the impact. Any changes to Section 1-7 need to be approved today to be passed by the BOV to be included in next year's Faculty Handbook. And we feel that it would be better to wait to have some time to look through those changes.
- xx. Davis Oldham: Most of those references are in the table of contents.
- xxi. April Wynn: Couldn't these changes be made in an editorial context by just swapping in the word "Policy" for "Appendix"?
- xxii. Davis Oldham: Yes, with one exception in Section 1.12.3.
- xxiii. April Wynn: And for that, we could vote on a motion that says we approved that non-substantive change as part of this as a wordsmithing thing.
- xxiv. Christy Irish: I'm just curious what the rush would be. If we're going to have to do a lot of this next year anyway, we might just wait and make sure we're doing it all right.
- xxv. Provost O'Donnell: So what's the felt need here about what needs to happen over the next week so the committee will present something to the board? I don't see anything in these two motions that must be done now for us to operate next year. If I'm wrong about that, please point that out. But these are both issues that could benefit from some additional consideration. What we will do with the composition of the next handbook is, as we always have, take any changes to the appendices as they come in through mid-June and publish by July 1, as we always have. The bridge motion, addresses any concerns about the promotion to tenure process, and you've resolved the overwhelming concerns about where we're at in this moment in time.
- xxvi. Caitie: But wouldn't our faculty handbook be out of compliance? For example, in 7.5 where it says each college has its own set of procedures.
- xxvii. Provost O'Donnell: As I understand it, the bridge motion would be inserted at the beginning of each appendix to recognize the difference in the distinction there. The colleges themselves exist. There are additional departments that are members of two of those colleges, but the names aren't going to change until that proposal is put through SCHEV. That'll take another six to nine months. So the question is, functionally, what business cannot be done if you don't make any additional edits today?
- xxviii. April Wynn: I feel like bridge motion is very specific for promotion and tenure. But not all of the appendices are about promotion and tenure. So I don't know that it would go in front of things about how to organize a committee structure. The bridge motion doesn't cover all of the stuff. And then I'm worried that then we have parts that are out of compliance or out of date that that bridge motion doesn't cover because it was P&T specific.

- xxix. Provost O'Donnell: Right. So focus in on those parts. We did hear a report from each college that says that they're in the process of making changes and that they will likely have something prepared by fall as they normally have.
- xxx. Davis Oldham: The good news is that sections F, G and H are not referenced anywhere within the handbook.
- xxxi. Janine Davis: I understand the argument about the content being out of date. Since it seems as if it's not within this body's purview to change the language of the Appendices, could we send to the 3 colleges a request to put the bridge motion right to the top of their promotion and tenure appendix? And also ask that they produce an appendix that names the current departments that will be part of their college next year at the very minimum, by July 1st or whatever date the Provost identifies?
- xxxii. Provost O'Donnell: Because the appendices are not part of the normal approval process, they can technically be edited at any point in time. So a college might decide their organizational structure for the rest of the year in August or September. But they can be updated at the discretion of the college.
- xxxiii. Janine Davis: So is it the case then that the college could decide that they would prefer to remove that appendix by this date because it is not a part of the handbook? It sounds as if any of the colleges could say "the change to our appendix is that it says our policy documents are housed in X place".
- xxxiv. Provost O'Donnell: Yes. Although I think we might want some uniformity with one central repository for most documents and we can talk about where that is.
- xxxv. April Wynn: Can we create that repository regardless of what we're going to call them, appendices or policies or something else? Because that's a great step. Then we have a place to deposit changes, particularly since they can be made at any point.
- xxxvi. Provost O'Donnell: Yes.
- xxxvii. Christy Irish: Can we also ask whomever to make the necessary typographical changes? To do things like fix the table of contents where it says rules of order for the College of Business to update that to not be wrong?
- xxxviii. Melissa Wells: We are still doing final edits. We're waiting to finalize the content after the BOV approval. Then we're going to go back through and all of those kinds of things will be fixed in the final version.
- xxxix. Davis Oldham: I think the issue is until SCHEV says something different we can't change the names of departments or colleges.
- xl. Provost O'Donnell: That is correct. And the only thing we forwarded to them is the proposal for the School of Science and School of Art.
- xli. Davis Oldham: So we have to keep the current names for now.
- xlii. April Wynn: Do we have a timeline on that?
- xliii. Provost O'Donnell: No.

- xliv. Kim Kinsley: The motion ahead of or behind this, is to remove appendices from the handbook. Is this a permanent move? In other words, even if they were all perfect, are we still going to remove the appendices from the handbook from now on out?
- xliv. Provost O'Donnell: I have found no handbook that has departmental or college standards about the way that colleges organize themselves to do their business or the way that departments and disciplines look at the tenure promotion process. Those are not parts of university faculty handbooks, and they often refer to a repository for those other approved documents that sit outside of the university handbook.
- xlvi. Christy Irish: What would be the language for UFAC then? Are they charged with the handbook?
- xlvii. Melissa Wells: UFAC is charged with P&T.
- xlviii. Davis Oldham: This is another case where section 7.11 doesn't actually currently use the word appendix. So section 11 wouldn't actually need to be changed. So unless we change section 11, I think you're right. You can make the argument that whatever they're called and wherever they are stored, then the same procedures that we've had in place would still apply in the future.
- xlix. April Wynn: I think we should do what Janine just said.
  - 1. Janine Davis: The motion is for UFC to charge the college bodies to add the bridge motion to the top of their promotion and tenure appendix, and also to change the title and any essential details in their Rules of Order appendix so that it accurately reflects the units that will be within that college by a deadline set by the Provost.
  - li. Provost O'Donnell: I think we should recognize that Section 7.11 is really important. And I think we should recognize that through the fault of no one, we haven't had UFAC perform this function to provide oversight on the P&T process. Because the changes have been made by colleges in the appendices, and they've gone to the back of the handbook as published by the Provost's Office, they haven't always gone through faculty approval, and that's not a space we want to be in. We need to create some process around this by which any changes to promotion and tenure standards should be completed by the end of the fall semester so that UFAC has an opportunity to review them so that they've been published and signed off on. This is an important section. We need to get back to the fidelity and the importance of this.
  - lii. Mindy Erchull: I'm working from the assumption that the motion is not technically on the floor yet. And that was just workshopping what will be on the floor because I've lost a bit of the thread of this conversation and I'm trying to figure out where we are with the original motion. Are we functionally trying to put this on hold to be revisited next year?
  - liii. Davis Oldham: Given the complexity of it, that would be my recommendation.
  - liv. Christy Irish: Can be table it?

- lv. Mindy Erchull: I'm uncomfortable tabling this because it seems important. I would rather we figure out who this gets referred to or defer it to determined time where it comes back to UFC. I think there's a way to that in Robert's Rules, essentially putting it on pause to return to this body.
- lvi. Davis Oldham: I think it has to involve UFAC. I don't know if it's quite task force level, but I think it's going to need to be some conversations with a lot of people in the room, not only UFAC, but I think it's going to need some UFC representatives, various constituents rather than relying on just UFC to have these conversations.
- lvii. Jennifer Walker: I move that we send this issue to UFAC and allow them to decide who comes to the meeting.
- lviii. April Wynn: There's also a way to postpone this for a certain time if we'd rather do that.
- lix. Mindy Erchull: That means it comes back to this body though.
- lx. Caitie Finlayson: Isn't UFAC getting smaller?
- lxi. Davis Oldham: Yes, by one.
- lxii. Caitie Finlayson: And has any one on UFAC served on P&T before?
- lxiii. Davis Oldham: That's why they need to have a conversation with a group people who have – either representatives from UFC who have served on P&T or college faculty council chairs or college UFC representatives.
- lxiv. Kim Kinsley: Are we going to vote on Janine's motion?
- lxv. Davis Oldham: I think it's a second motion after we decide what to do with this one. Let's vote on Jennifer's first.
- lxvi. Motion: To send Section 7 and the need to establish university-wide P&T expectations to UFAC and to let them as a body determine who to meet with to discuss.**
  - 1. Unanimously approved
- lxvii. Motion to charge colleges to add the bridge motion to the top of their appendices and then to change details in the rules of order to make sure that they're consistent with the new structure.**
  - 1. Unanimously approved.

f. Removing the Appendices from the Handbook

- i. Davis Oldham: Do we also need to make a motion to charge UFAC to figure out what to do with the appendices? This is a motion that would change the Appendices F-K to documents on the Provost's website.
- ii. Caitie Finlayson: If we recommend that UFAC looks at this again, given that there wasn't a lot of agreement on UFAC about P&T this year, do we have hope that they would be able to reach a consensus that we couldn't?
- iii. Melissa Wells: Many of our disagreements in UFAC also related to the way that procedures will be changed this year within current voting structures as opposed to how reorganization will actually take effect. So we started to realize that we'll have more productive conversations once we are reorganized and can make decisions in the units that will be affected by said decisions. I'm also asking UFAC to use our final meeting in April to lay out a game plan so we hit the ground running in August

instead of spinning wheels. We believe it's important that we come to some consensus and make some decisions next year. This year there are just many conflating factors in addition to not even knowing how we were being reorganized until very late and that prevented us from meeting some of these requests in a timely fashion.

- iv. Davis Oldham: I also think some of that would also be addressed by expanding that discussion and inviting people to come to your meeting. Because this is a critical issue, I think having more than a 5 person committee wrestling with the issues is appropriate.
- v. Mara Scanlon: Just to clarify, I think there's been agreement that these things should be in the Handbook. And Tim said no one else has these policies in their handbook. So the issue is that maybe we can't remove the appendices yet because of editing and other things that need to be done, but it doesn't seem like anyone is arguing that these policies should still be living in the Handbook as an appendix.
- vi. Davis Oldham: Yes, I think there are some technical issues within the Handbook and we want to make sure that we're not missing anything that is currently referenced or things like that. We can make the change but we're weeks away from the end of the semester. So I'm getting the sense that people want to do this well next year.
- vii. Jennifer Walker: What is the motion on the table right now?
- viii. Christy Irish: This whole thing that we're talking about is a motion.
- ix. Jennifer Walker: I make a motion that this goes to UFAC.
- x. Janine Davis: Can I ask a question? I understand UFAC is looking at the content of the promotion and tenure criteria because we've established that is their purview and we also know that this body has the power to adjust the language of the handbook. We've also established that this is not technically part of the handbook. However, we have published it as one document. And we've also established that the colleges are in charge of their own Appendices. So that's pretty complicated for any one group, especially a five person group, to change. I don't have an easy solution here, but I guess I do see value in a more inclusive group looking at this. I think it makes sense for UFC to take on the idea of putting these documents somewhere and doing something with them. And I don't see a reason to send this to UFAC.
- xi. Christy Irish: So can we do what April was saying to pause this and have it return to UFC in September as unfinished business on the agenda?
- xii. Jennifer Walker: I rescind my motion.
- xiii. Mindy Erchull: I think maybe this is an October task to give college bodies a chance to figure out what they need to do.
- xiv. Christy Irish: That sounds fine.
- xv. Melina Patterson: Now that we know that the UFC has no control over these, but also know that these are not legally binding documents and that nobody else has them, I don't care if we delete them or not, because they don't matter. My understanding of the appendices is that they are policy, but they're not approved by the Board of Visitors, and they can be changed

whenever a college decides that they can be changed. And the UFC never approves the changes and doesn't even know about it half the time.

- xvi. Christy Irish: I don't think anybody's arguing that point with you. I think we're just saying that we know we can't do that right now.
- xvii. Melina Patterson: Yes, and so if they don't matter, I also don't care if they're there.
- xviii. Catie Finlayson: But if Section 7.5 references them and that's in the Handbook.
- xix. Davis Oldham: That's why we're kicking it into the future. We can't do anything with it right now. So October, whoever's on UFC next year will figure this out.
- xx. Melissa Wells: The other complication here that will fall on the UFC is that if there are decisions made between university or college level P&T, that will affect appendices too. So if we move to a university structure, that would move what's in the appendices into Section 7. So that's another reason why having more time would be helpful.
- xxi. Davis Oldham: Are we good waiting until October to revisit?
- xxii. Motion: That we postpone this discussion about removing appendices until the October UFC.**
  - 1. Unanimously approved.

#### 6. New Business – Committee Action Items

- a. University Curriculum Committee – Remove the courses not taught in the past 5 years from the catalog.
    - i. Kevin Caffrey: I've compiled a list of courses that haven't been taught in five years. We try to remove those from the catalog. I sent the list to department chairs who reviewed it and could make a case to keep a course if they are planning to offer it in the future or if it's essential that it's in the catalog. The chairs have approved the courses on this list to be removed. When the courses are removed, they are set to be inactive, so they can be reactivated through CIM. Do note that the 2 French course and 1 German course were missed in the discussion, so those are going to be kept. So we're going to vote on this list with the exception of the 2 French classes and German class.
    - ii. No discussion.
    - iii. Motion to approve the removal of the courses (while keeping the French and German classes).**
      - 1. Unanimously approved.
  - b. We also have some speaking intensive and digital intensive designations to consider.
    - i. No discussion.
    - ii. Motion to approve all speaking and digital intensive designations.**
      - 1. Unanimously approved.
7. Meeting adjourned at 5:22pm.