

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate  
Wednesday 04 April 2007, 4:00pm  
Red Room, Woodard Campus Centre**

Stephen Fuller (FSP) called the meeting to order at 4:02pm. The minutes of the 28 February meeting were approved. A student, Shin Fujiyama, addressed the Senate on the efforts by students to deliver aid to the village of El Progreso in Honduras and encouraged the Senate to participate in his organisation's fundraising efforts.

**Curriculum Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Faculty Organization Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Race and Gender Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Writing Intensive Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Speaking Intensive Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**President of the Senate - Oral Report**

Prof. Fuller said that the Faculty Senate of Virginia would be meeting in the Red Room on Sat 21 April and invited members of the Senate to attend this meeting.

**Report of the Interim Dean of the Faculty**

Dean Barra spoke on faculty searches: seven of nine tenure-track positions have been filled, including three joint positions with CGPS.

The modular units are in place and are being landscaped. Admissions and Financial Aid will move into the modular unit by 01 May. The bookstore will move into the other modular unit after graduation. The police will be moving into Brent Hall after graduation, as well. Lee Hall will be open for graduation so that the bathroom facilities can be used during the ceremony. The bell tower will be rung for the first time on 11 May. During graduation, news media will be in Chandler Hall parking lot, along with additional bathroom facilities.

At the last chairs' meeting, Dean Barra introduced the online system for doing searches for faculty positions starting next fall. The URL for the site is [careers.umw.edu](http://careers.umw.edu). Dean Barra urged members of the Senate to ask their chairs about the new site.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked about the number of first picks we received and why people might have turned us down. Dean Barra answered that she had not been keeping track of such things this year.

### **Report of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Prof. Morello amended his written report to include the provisions to the Faculty Handbook passed by the Senate this year; he presented these provisions to the Board of Visitors. He also rewrote the organization chart to include changes made. Once the BOV has approved these changes, he will put the new text on the web and arranged for printed copies. He also encouraged faculty to participate in Student Research and Creativity Day on Fri 20 April.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked about URES and whether it was to be a freshman-only course. Prof. Morello answered that it would sometimes be advisable to have more advanced students participating in such a course.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked about incoming students: he said their literature did not give a date for registration for classes. Prof. Morello said that there would be no summer preview this year and that students would have the opportunity to register via the portal during the summer. These registration windows would be longer for students in the upcoming summer: a couple of days rather than only an hour. They would also have a window to alter their schedule before 31 July.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked about advising and foreign language tests. Prof. Morello answered that the foreign language test would be available via the portal: students would take a first test during the summer and a second test (to exempt students) after they arrived on campus in August. Students would have opportunities to interact with their advisers during the summer electronically and before classes begin in person.

Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked about the portal. Prof. Morello said that there are several different versions of the portal and that a new one is under development and testing: it is expected to go live on 15 May. New students will receive the "Eagle Essentials" book: this will give them the opportunity to log into and use the portal.

### **Report of the Student Representative**

Kyle Ott distributed a packet about service learning and encouraged faculty to take advantage of the meeting on Tue 08 May to learn more about service learning.

## Old Business

The Senate resumed the discussion on the Promotion and Tenure motion addressing the activity a faculty member may have had before coming to UMW. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) moved to bring the motion off the table in order to end discussion. A procedural discussion as to exactly how the motion was to be dealt with took place. This motion was seconded and approved by general acclaim.

## New Business

The Senate took up the Faculty Affairs motion on the evaluation process. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) suggested that there be structure to this discussion: that the Senate vote to 1) recommit the motions to FAC to keep them alive, then 2) go into Committee of the Whole mode to discuss the motions. Prof. Fuller said that we could simply discuss the motion. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) said that simply discussing the motions would treat the motions in a piecemeal manner. David Long (MUSIC) said that if we went to a Committee of the Whole mode, we are essentially replacing the motion before us. It was generally agreed to enter Committee of the Whole mode.

Eric Gable (SOCANTH) said that his department supports both motions in their general form but felt there was a potential problem in the plethora of details.

Robert Rycroft (ECON) said that there was some confusion between the FAAR running from 15 May and the “FAAP” running from 31 August. The representative from FAC said that activities performed between the submission of the FAAR and the writing of the FAAP would be included in the FAAP.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that there was reference to “average performance” in a number of places: since the newly-flexible distribution system allowed faculty to devote more time to research, this might raise the idea of what constitutes average performance, especially in some departments. He also wondered why the FAAP should be referred to by the chair in the APR: the APR is about performance, not meeting targets. Gary Stanton (HISPRES) said that by going to a percentage system, unforeseen complications may change what a given faculty member may feel can happen.

Thomas Fallace (EDUC) said that professional and service activities often arose unexpectedly or after the fact, and that this made it difficult to anticipate what might happen. He felt that the current system worked well and that most problems were the result of people not following through on the original system rather than a problem with the system.

Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) echoed Prof. Davidson’s worry that standards might change over time: she felt the new standards were too unspecific and problems would arise with respect to people’s general inability to make these sorts of very complex decisions well in advance.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that his department agreed with the desire for flexibility but found the actual percentages potentially problematic. His department wanted more clarity and definition in what the different levels meant; however, they had many more problems with the idea that only a certain percentage of faculty could receive a given merit level. They also felt that the FAAP placed an undue burden on the faculty member and especially his or her chair. They also felt that motivation by objective places a burden on faculty right out of the gate and thus limited academic freedom to a certain extent.

Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) said that experts on organizational behaviour within his department referred to the proposed system as "management by objectives," which only works when people are objective and disinterested, i.e., never. He said that his department was generally opposed to the motion.

Eric Gable (SOCANTH) said that his department liked flexibility but felt that the motions should be transposed because everyone was worried about whether the new system would be worse than the old. He felt that the second motion addressed the issue of what merit might be much more clearly than some of the other commenters felt. The issue of merit should be addressed before the consequences of merit.

Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) said that her department felt the committee had done great work in a short time period, but that there were issues that required further discussion. She raised the question of how a person who low-balled their expectations and exceeded them would be dealt with in comparison to a person who was ambitious but did not achieve all their goals. She suggested that other schools' flexible plans be examined in order to determine how best UMW might address these issues.

Grant Woodwell from FAC arose to address some of these questions. He said that other institutions had been contacted and that UMW was at this time the only inflexible institutions. President Frawley is eager to have a flexible system, as this will augment the University's ability to attract and retain new faculty. He felt that there was no overall mentoring system for new faculty and that the FAAP system would enable more planning. Prof. Erchull said her department wanted to know whether a faculty member would be evaluated against a standard or against the planning document: it seemed evident to them that only one of the standard or the plan would be needed. Prof. Woodwell answered that the standard was the key feature: the point was to bring more, not less, objectivity to the FAAR.

Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) echoed other Senators' appreciation for greater flexibility and concern about the planning document. She felt it might be more effective to tie the percentages to the FAAR rather than the FAAP. Prof. Fuller answered that he found that other schools enable their faculty to change their planning document up until the last moment: while this does render the planning document irrelevant, it does encourage faculty to think ahead about their activities.

Karen Anewalt (CMPSCI) said that her department had a concern with the chair's "approving" the FAAP. She wondered what might happen if a faculty member and his or her chair disagreed on how the faculty member wished to distribute his or her activity.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) wanted to know what schools Prof. Woodwell had looked at. Prof. Woodwell answered that a partial list included Randolph-Macon, Richmond, VA Tech, Radford, James Madison, William and Mary, Bryn Mawr, GA Southern, UVA, Indiana U, among others. Prof. McAllister followed up with some concerns: would the FAAP ever be used to justify course releases, and since course assignments happen more than a semester before the FAAP is submitted, this made it difficult to plan one's activities.

Kristin Marsh (At-Large) said that the FAAP felt like surveillance: did we not trust one another to be professional and plan our activities without a document? She agreed with Prof. Gable that the second resolution was really the primary one. She also felt that the implementation of the rules, rather than the rules themselves, was the primary problem.

Melina Patterson (GEOG) said that the anxiety was that people would feel they were being punished by these standards, and that this punishment would take a *financial* form. She thought the first motion was talking about teaching load rather than standardization; while she supported the motion, she felt strongly that the institution should address teaching load directly.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) felt that there were too many things being changed in the motions and that these changes were better dealt with one at a time.

David Hunt (THEA) said that one person in his department referred to the motion as an “instrument of evil,” but that nevertheless, his department approved of the first motion with reservation. They were unanimously opposed to the second motion.

Stephen Griffin (A&AH) talked about his experiences in graduate school in the late 1960s. At that time, his university instituted a grading system that was too complicated and was quickly discarded.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) reiterated his department’s support for flexibility and the second motion. He agreed that there could be a real conflict between chair and faculty member with respect to the FAAP, but was even more gravely concerned about how the FAAP opens up the potential for micromanagement. He also felt that the issue of teaching load should be addressed more directly.

Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) said her department kept returning to the question of precisely how teaching is to be evaluated. There simply are no standards as to how teaching is evaluated. Her department also felt that there was some confusion in the proposed standards as to exactly what constitutes the difference between 2 and 3, and that 1 was more clearly a punitive rating. Since only 5% of faculty could receive a 3, and 95% couldn’t get a 2, this meant that some faculty would be punished.

Karen Anewalt (CMPSCI) wanted clarification on whether a given year’s merit was really cumulative: whether a 1 might indicate failure to improve over a previous year rather than an objective look at the current year. She also wondered why the maximum percentage for service was lower than that for research.

Prof. Woodwell arose to answer questions. He said that on the whole, opportunities for service are somewhat lower than opportunities for professional development. He also addressed the logic behind the 1.

Dean Barra said that there was no limit of 5% receiving 3s, and that approximately 20% of faculty received a 3 last year.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether it was the inflexibility or the 50% teaching that provided a disincentive for new faculty. Prof. Woodwell said that it was the inflexibility.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that his department liked the flexibility but disliked the FAAP: he also thought it questionable that a realistic distinction could be made between, e.g., 50% and 55% in a given field. He also said that while it was collegial for a chair to request information about a faculty member’s activity plan, it was potentially punitive to require a written plan from everyone.

Randall Helmstutler (MATH) said his department was generally in favor of both motions, but that many of his colleagues were opposed to the FAAP, arguing instead that a faculty member’s allocation of percentages should take place in the FAAR.

Andrew Dolby (BIOL) said his department was very supportive of the second motion and generally supportive of the first with the exception of the FAAP.

Prof. Marsh said she was surprised at the idea that service opportunities were not easy to find. She felt that the ranges of percentages should be removed.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) said that weighting the percentages was simple: the problem arose when it came to getting the score that was to be multiplied by the percentages.

Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) said that the proposed rubric went beyond “corporate” into “militaristic”. He felt that the idea of the chair sitting down with the faculty member was inherently unbalanced – for that matter, so was the idea of the dean sitting down with the chair. He felt that the assumption of equality at the bargaining table was unwarranted.

Prof. Gable suggested people use the wiki as a way of generating discussion. He felt that the proposed rubric wasn’t corporate at all, but rather a way of creating transparency. He suggested that the FAC look at ways to address the concerns of Senators.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked Prof. Woodwell what the downsides of having the FAAR determine the percentages might be. Prof. Woodwell answered that he didn’t feel that there was a downside: reasonable people ought to be able to set their percentages for the year by looking at their achievements. He felt the only potential downside was that eliminating the FAAP requirement might impede a chair from knowing what his or her faculty were doing in a particular year.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked whether the issue of faculty expressing their goals might be over too short a period of time.

Charles Whipkey (ENVS-GEOL) felt the 4/4 teaching load was still the major sticking point: how was a person who wanted to have research count 50% to be compensated by somehow having a lower teaching load? Prof. Woodwell said that there were a large number of faculty who weren’t teaching a 4/4 load.

Prof. Marsh reiterated that a course reduction was not a free ride and did not reduce a faculty member’s overall work load.

David Long (MUSIC) said that the proposed plan was identical to one proposed over a decade ago, and which was rejected for many of the concerns brought up by Senators in the current discussion. He felt that the FAAP was a good idea and encouraged faculty to plan their activities.

Thomas Fallace (EDUC) felt the current system was a good thing: the service requirement had broadened his own horizons.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) wanted everyone to know that he loved service.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) wondered whether there was any evidence that people had been downgraded in teaching because of a course reduction. Prof. Woodwell said that this evidence was persuasive but admitted that it was largely anecdotal and based on peer review.

Marcel Rotter (MDFL) said his department wanted to know what the relationship between the new system and tenure or promotion might be. Prof. Woodwell said that expectations had risen over the years for promotion to full professor in the absence of structural change.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) wanted to know whether the FAAP would be part of the record for the tenure file. Prof. Woodwell said that this had not been discussed.

Prof. Gable wanted real evidence, rather than anecdotal evidence, for the contention that a course release led to a lower teaching evaluation. He felt that the FAC needed to be provided with more hard data.

The Senate left Committee of the Whole mode.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) made a motion to recommit the motion to the FAC along with the feedback by the Senate. This motion was seconded and passed by general acclaim.

The Senate then took up the second motion.

Melina Patterson (GEOG) said that it was important to communicate that we need base salaries that address standard of living issues.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) supported the motion but wanted to know whether the motion had been addressed by the administration. Prof. Woodwell said that any motion approved by the Senate also had to be approved by the BOV.

Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) said that her department supported the motion.

Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) echoed this opinion.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that recommitting the motion to the committee had less to do with the motion than with some of the specific language on the meaning of a 1.

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) said that there were two different descriptions of a 1. Others disagreed. The language is dependent upon the changes proposed in the first motion.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) suggested that the existing language be left in the second motion: the Senate could go back and change the specific language later. The definitions in the new part could be excluded. Prof. Woodwell felt it was best to create a debate on the salary issue and considered this a friendly amendment. Dean Barra said that none of this would make it to the BOV this month, and that the summer retreat agenda is set by the BOV, so neither motion would make it to the BOV until the fall, at any rate.

Prof. Marsh suggested there was no reason to have language defining the meaning of Level 1 and 2, as it already existed. Prof. Fuller answered that the motion erased the old language.

Prof. Gable said that he felt it was nearly impossible to get anything other than a 2 under the new language, but that the old language undermined the goals of FAC to get rid of the lack of transparency in the old way merit was decided.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) said that since the motion seemed very last-minute and was not going to make it to the BOV anyway, that perhaps it was best to allow further debate on the motion. He made a motion to recommit the motion to the FAC. This was approved by general acclamation.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04pm, before the Senate had time to address the third motion on faculty support for an MLK holiday.