

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate  
Wednesday 28 February 2007, 4:00pm  
100 Jepson Science Centre**

The Senate met late in order to allow President William Frawley the opportunity to speak to Senators and other interested faculty about recent developments at the University. President Frawley spoke for just under an hour on the purchase of the two houses on William Street, the possible opening of a coffeehouse and store in downtown Fredericksburg, tenure and promotion on the Stafford campus and numerous other issues before retiring from the room to the applause of the Senate.

Stephen Fuller (FSP) called the meeting to order at 5:03pm. The minutes of the 31 January meeting were approved.

**Academic Affairs Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Curriculum Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Campus Academic Resources Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Faculty Development and Grants Committee**

No questions were asked about this report.

**Environmental Awareness Committee**

It was noted that the FSEM designation should be FSEM 100, not FSEM 1000.

**President of the Senate – Oral Report**

Prof. Fuller said that the 3% raise spoken of in the report had been augmented to 4% for the whole pool. Melina Patterson (GEOG) asked whether this cost of living raise would be transformed into merit pay. Prof. Fuller answered that this was the amount given to the university and that it would not be an across-the-board raise.

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

Dean Barra arose to answer questions from the faculty. None were asked.

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

There were no questions asked of Prof. Morello.

### **Old Business**

Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) asked about the real meaning of the words “advisory committee”. She wondered how the current proposal would affect the name of the committee. Dean Barra said that she remembered the discussion centering around whether it would be a standing or an advisory committee and that it was possible to be a standing committee with the word “advisory” in the title. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) suggested that one of the five CPAs on campus might be an excellent member for such a committee. The motion was voted on and passed by general acclamation.

### **New Business**

Prof. Fuller said that some members of the Senate had wondered whether it was possible to share Senate meeting minutes in advance of the distribution of the agenda. Marie McAllister (At-Large) said that in her department it was the Senator who was responsible for this. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) suggested a podcast but this was generally viewed as too 21<sup>st</sup>-century to be practical for everyone. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) suggested that unapproved minutes might prove problematic. Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) said that she generally got a summary to her colleagues within a day or two after the meeting. Eric Gable (SOC) said that he would be in favour of having open minutes, as long as it was clear that these were unofficial. Mary Rigsby (ENLS) reminded the Senate that a discussion of committee minutes had resulted in the general opinion that unapproved committee minutes weren't a good idea, and that it followed that unapproved Senate minutes were also problematic. David Long (MUSIC) said that the responsibility for communication fell to the representative for a given department. It was agreed that Prof. Long's viewpoint represented the majority.

With respect to the motion from the Academic Affairs Committee, Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether the library proficiency exam was as problematic as the others, and whether this would create further problems later on. Kyle Ott, the student representative, said that the library proficiency exam, like the other IT exams, were generally viewed by students as ineffective and rife with the potential for honor code violations. Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked whether the registration hold would go away if the requirement were eliminated: the answer was yes. Kristin Marsh (At-Large) said that her experiences with students echoed Mr. Ott's opinion, but worried that the two proposals were to be voted on separately. Mr. Ott explained why there were two separate proposals. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) felt the second proposal required much debate and that it was therefore better that the two proposals were separate. Dean Barra said that the motion had come to the committee with two different implementation dates, and that this related to SCHEV requirements. Prof. Morello said that the SCHEV requirement included core competencies but that there was no particular method required to approach these topics: while the competencies were useful at the time of their original implementation, they needed to be further integrated into the overall curriculum.

The first motion passed unanimously, the second motion having been tabled by the committee.

With respect to the motion from the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Marie McAllister (At-Large) said that the Modern Language Association has an official policy that outside evaluators should be paid, and that publications and offices should be sufficient without outside letters. Ernest Ackermann (COMPSCI) said that such letters were extremely helpful to the committee.

David Long (MUSIC) spoke against the motion: he felt that in his own experiences on the committee, letters had been unnecessary. He felt the motion was a result of the imbalance in disciplines on the committee. Melina Patterson (GEOG) said that it was less an issue of the composition of the committee but more of the discipline itself and the ability of applicants to compile a dossier with appropriate documentation. She also felt three letters was an arbitrary number. Andrew Dolby (BIOL) felt the use of the word “recognition” was vague. Gary Stanton (HISPRES) said that it only applied to the rank of full professor and that full professors ought to have standing in their field. Prof. Gable supported the motion in light of the President’s comments on creating a greater understanding of the university’s place in academe. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) wondered about the role of the chair: he felt that the chair should be able to make the case within a discipline. Charles Sharpless (CHEM) wondered what would happen if it were the chair who were up for professorship: the answer was that it was up to the dean. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) mentioned that there were many interdisciplinary departments and that this might prove problematic. Charles Whipkey (ENVS-GEOL) echoed these sentiments and said that the letter requirement could discriminate against professors who specialized more in teaching than in research. Dean Barra said that the essence of full professorship was recognition in the discipline and thus research, but that President Frawley felt that professional activity, however that might be defined, was essential to promotion to full professorship. Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) asked the committee how they arrived at the number three. Suzanne Sumner, representing the committee, said that three letters made it much easier to get a sense of the candidate’s recognition. Prof. Ackermann said that the committee was generally disposed toward recommending promotion and that letters made this much easier. Mary Rigsby (ENLS) said that the motion had carefully considered the composition of the committee; she spoke in favor of the motion.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) proposed a friendly amendment: that the motion demand three letters, not “three or more”. When it was determined that this was not a friendly amendment, she proposed it as an alternative. The amendment was seconded. Prof. Gable spoke against this new amendment, saying that the Senate had not been given adequate time to consider this. Mr. Ott said that most students wouldn’t know the qualifications for full professor but would be inclined to believe that anyone who couldn’t get three letters probably wasn’t making a significant contribution to the profession. Some confusion arose as to whether letters from chairs or candidates would be capped. Mary Rigsby (ENLS) said that getting letters was the industry standard and that a file that didn’t have letters would be viewed somewhat curiously. The amendment was voted down.

The motion was voted upon and passed by general acclamation.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:51pm.