

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**January 28, 2009**  
**Red Room**

The meeting came to order at 4:00 pm after a half-hour reception and informal discussion in the Red Room

**Reports**

Provost Mikhalevsky reported on two items. The first was a reminder that as more faculty use digital resources in their courses, they need to be cognizant of copyright and fair-use provisions for digital resources. She will be sending something out to the University with a reminder on this, with some resources for faculty to review on proper use of digital resources.

Dr. Mikhalevsky discussed the Strategic Planning process, outlining the three frameworks within which they are working (SCHEV, SACS, President's goals). She lauded the work being done by the faculty working on this document. The Steering Committee is striving to make this as inclusive a process as possible, but there is very little time. Feedback is sought at all levels, and individuals can contact the Provost or any committee members with input.

The Steering Committee met on Jan. 9<sup>th</sup>, and again on Jan. 23<sup>rd</sup>. The next meeting will be on Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>. They will start posting more materials on the planning website ([strategicplanning.umwblogs.org](http://strategicplanning.umwblogs.org)), and are working on a draft regarding the process, which will likely be posted during the first week of February for comment. The Steering Committee is working on staffing the subcommittees, and will be meeting with President Hample on Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>. The Steering Committee is working with a very aggressive planning timeline, with an initial draft to be prepared for the BOV in June. They Committee will be meeting and working with various constituencies and posting drafts of the plan over the course of the semester, with a full draft ready for comment in May. After receiving feedback from the BOV, the draft will be made available in August, with final revisions prepared for the November BOV meeting for approval.

The University's Strategic Plan is to explicitly contribute to and promote the SCHEV strategic plan- there is a link to the SCHEV plan on the strategic planning website. Provost Mikhalevsky encourages everyone to read it.

UMW is 3 years behind the timeline for SACS review. Ideally, we would have a completed strategic plan at this stage, allowing us to review how we are meeting benchmarks for our SACS review. Given that we are not on that timeline, Dr. Mikhalevsky recommends that we work with 2-3 year benchmarks, allowing for some comparison and reflection for the SACS review. This means that the Strategic Plan, to be approved in November 2009, will have benchmarks scheduled for 18 months to 3 years to follow.

President Hample outlined, on Nov. 17<sup>th</sup>, the directions she would like to take the University. The Steering Committee is looking at those goals, and is trying to understand, with the help of the President, which of those the institution will be able to go forward on, and how they will fit within the Strategic Plan. Finally, the Steering Committee is looking at what our vision is for ourselves, and what are the primary strategic goals that we are trying to meet.

Alan Griffith (Biology) asked about the role of departments in the process- will they be asked for input. Dr. Mikhalevsky said they will be, and that a plan and schedule is being developed to outline how each department/program will fit within the larger Strategic Plan. Given the short time table, there will be a window for input from departments of about five weeks.

Gary Stanton (Historic Preservation) asked about the role of funding in the construction of the strategic plan. The Provost noted that the lack of a strategic plan often complicates funding decisions- without a plan, it is difficult to direct funding and support.

In response to a question, Dr. Mikhalevsky noted that we have not, as an institution, looked at what it means to be a first rate public university. The decision to become a University was not a collective one, and it is time for a collective decision about our goals, and what it means to achieve those goals as a University.

Charlie Sharpless (Chemistry) asked about departmental input. Provost said that the departments will likely not receive a draft of the plan, but will be asked for input about how the departments see how they fit within the plan and institution.

Eric Gable (Anthropology) asked about access to committee discussions- how much of it is fair game and transparent. Provost said most are open, but there will be some work done that will be handled first by the committee before positions are announced (such as the degree to which the committee will work with the President, and her role in the process). All agendas and minutes will be posted, along with any actions, substantive matters before the committee, and they will be looking for input on all of it.

Marcel Rotter (Modern Foreign Languages) asked about materials and length of the plan. Nina noted that she would recommend a more succinct and clear plan. Departments do not need to include a lot of narrative. Faculty have asked for examples of strategic plans- there are examples from across the state. Nina is hesitant to post them because she does not want anyone to think that is what ours is supposed to be. Short is preferred.

Interim Dean of the Faculty (Ms. Rosemary Barra)

Dean Barra gave an update on faculty searches. Departments are in the process of bringing in candidates. There are 12 full time faculty searches going on, and everything is currently on schedule. Plan to start making offers in the next couple of weeks.

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (Mr. John Morello)

In addition to a written report, Dr. Morello talked about the planning for the Information and Technology Convergence Center, presenting floorplans and architectural drawings of the proposed building. This is a new project for UMW, with approval coming in late spring. The hope is that it will be a multi-purpose teaching and learning center that brings together components of the University that are often treated as separate. It is designed to allow for collaboration utilizing the best technology and practices that we can provide.

The floorplan is open, and flexible in its uses of different technologies as they are developed. Dr. Morello showed the proposed location- just to the west of Simpson Library. Early plans were to locate the Convergence Center on the Mercer Hall location (Mercer was to be demolished), but given conservation concerns with the stream, and traffic, it did not prove feasible. Budget for the building is set at \$37 million, with \$10 million projected for furnishings and technology. Funding is only in place through the planning stage. Construction funding, should it be approved, would start in 2010, with final planned completion of July 2013.

Chair, Academic Council, CGPS (Mr. Doug Holcombe)  
No report.

President of the Senate (Ms. Mary Rigsby)

The Budget Advisory Committee has submitted a resolution for Senate consideration. It focuses on the 2010 budget cuts, and was considered under New Business.

President-Elect of the Senate (Ms. Suzanne Sumner)

Suzanne gave a reminder re: the bills outlined in her report, and encouraged faculty to send any opinions or ideas her way. Faculty can also send to Suzanne the names of legislators they nominate to be recognized for their support of higher education.

Student Representative Reports (Mr. Colin Turner and Ms. Sarah Payne for Ms. Quincey Garcia)

Mr. Turner reported on lobbying day in Richmond- this was the first time UMW students have participated. The biggest concerns were funding for furnishings in Lee Hall, and the state increase for out-of-state tuition (concerns that it would impact campus diversity). John Morello noted that there is a furniture budget for Lee Hall, and that any concerns about that funding should be directed to him.

Ms. Payne gave the report for Ms. Quincey Garcia (copy included in Senate packet). There was some backup in resolution of hearings that they are currently working to resolve. Marcel asked the average time between an accusation and hearing. Sarah noted that it varies – typically around four to five weeks. The Honor Council is considering changing the process to expedite hearings through Constitutional Review. Some changes have already been recommended (to allow for a more efficient process), and will be voted on by the student body and the BOV.

## **Standing Committees**

Curriculum Committee  
Distributed before the meeting.

Faculty Affairs Committee  
Distributed before the meeting.

### **Curriculum Advisory Committees**

General Education Committee  
Distributed before the meeting.

### ***Ad hoc* Committees**

The Faculty Advisory Committee for the University of Mary Washington Teaching Center (Mr. Ernest Ackermann)  
Prof. Ackermann reported that the committee is soliciting grant proposals from faculty (for travel grants, collaborative teaching programs, the teaching scholars program). You can find more info at [teachumw.org](http://teachumw.org).

The search committee for a Teaching Center Director is at the end of the application process. A report to the Faculty Senate on the search will follow. The Director will be a faculty position, and they are expected to teach in a specialty supported by the University. The committee will be in touch with appropriate departments when reviewing applications to make sure they will be a fit within that department. The Director's salary will come from the Teaching Center's budget.

UMW University Faculty Governance Study Group (Mr. George Meadows & Ms. Kim Kinsley, CGPS)  
Mr. Meadows reported that the Group sent a model for faculty governance to the FOC this week. They hope to get it to the Senate for the April Senate meeting. The model is for a university-level governance, with each college developing its own governance structure. There still will be a Senate and Council. The model includes a central governing body, called the University Faculty Council, eight standing committees reporting to the Faculty Council, and a Chair's Council, acting in an advisory role to the Faculty Council. The model will be available on the faculty governance blog within a week.

Faculty Senate Website Committee  
No report.

Faculty Handbook Review Committee  
No report.

### **Special Report**

Martin Wilder, VP for Enrollment and Communications, Admissions

The report discussed the admissions process for last year, highlighting issues and concerns. Applications for the freshman class was up 3%. There were some increases in several minority categories. However, we ended up with a smaller class from the previous year, with 917 vs. 978. We had fewer students accept offers of admission, with 28% attending. Applicants applied for an average of 6 schools, competition is increasing, and more financial aid is being made available from other schools.

Admissions utilizes the Admitted Student Questionnaire to see how UMW is perceived. UMW was rated higher in some areas, including personal attention. UMW was rated lower in several areas, including quality of academic programs and majors, and academic reputation. One area worth considering, according to Wilder, is the development of an Honors or Leadership Program- a number of students commented on their decision to attend other schools to participate in similar programs.

Our primary competitors include JMU, UVA, VTech, George Mason, Christopher Newport, and Virginia Commonwealth, with the last three as recent entries on this list.

Honors Admissions offers increased, but our yield for admission dropped. The incoming class was more diverse (16% identifying as diverse), with some gains in various categories. Projections of high school graduates in the years to come are a concern, with drops in most categories, including out of state admissions.

There are a number of challenges UMW faces, from quality of programs, how we are serving incoming students, and what can be done to compete with schools that offer more financial aid.

While it is too early to say much about the current admissions process, Wilder did note that as of this week, we are running slightly ahead of last year's application count. However, we are still close to a thousand applications behind the final count for last year. The economy is playing a large role in the process, and it is not clear how families, concerned with education costs, will factor in.

Anand Rao (English, Linguistics, and Communication) asked about application fees and waivers. Wilder noted that the fee is \$50, and the fee is waived for students with financial hardships, and students coming from targeted populations (including students from diverse backgrounds, honors students, and those attending some programs).

Suzanne Sumner asked about the Rappahannock Scholars Program. UMW has partnered with a group starting in 9<sup>th</sup> grade, and they are told that if they meet certain goals, such as a minimum GPA, they are guaranteed acceptance into UMW. This was the first year of students entering the freshman class.

David Long (Music) asked about past trends. Wilder noted that the total number of applicants has stayed roughly the same, but that the yield rate has gone down.

## **Old Business**

### **Motion from the Academic Affairs Committee to permit departments to offer minors.**

The revised motion was distributed in the Senate packet. Holly Schiffrin (PSYC) reported that the Psychology Department is concerned that there may later be pressure for departments to offer minors, though they recognize that the current wording is fine. Marcel Rotter (Modern Foreign Language) also noted that MFL is concerned about departments being required to offer minors, and is only in support of the motion with that being listed.

Andrew Dolby (Biology) commented that the offering of minors may help address some of the issues that Marty Wilder discussed, and students interest in expanded academic programs.

David Long (Music) noted that the offering of minors will likely mean the effective end of double majors.

The motion passed with just one vote against.

## **New Business**

Mary interrupted the agenda to allow Charlie Sharpless (Chemistry) to introduce a resolution from the Budget Advisory Committee on FY10 budget cuts. It is the committee's position that it would be bad policy to respond to budget cuts by considering layoffs of faculty and staff.

The resolution was seconded by Gary Stanton (Historic Preservation). Stanton asked whether it is appropriate for the Faculty Senate to pass a resolution concerning more than CAS. Charlie circulated an alternate resolution that removed the reference of the Academic Council of CGPS.

Alan Griffith (Biology) asked if the consequence of this resolution would be to recommend salary cuts to prevent layoffs. Charlie noted that all options may have to be considered, but that the resolution, of course, does not take a position on what actions should be adopted.

Eric Gable (Anthropology) expressed concern about passing a resolution that speaks on behalf of both campuses. Charlie noted that the committee, composed of representatives from both campuses, felt strongly that the faculty and staff speak with one voice.

Shawn Humphrey (Economics) expressed concern about supporting this resolution in that it does not spell out what alternatives should be explored, which means that it may lead to tuition increases for out of state students. He suggested that it appears to be acting out of self-interest – 'don't fire me'. Mary Beth Matthews (Classics) argued in favor of the

resolution, noting that the resolution would not tie the hands of the President in exploring all options, but that it expresses our concern that firing faculty and staff would be a bad idea.

Resolution passed.

**Motion to explore changing requirements for election of Senators**

Held until the next meeting.

**Motion to survey faculty satisfaction with administration (still in committee)**

Held until the next meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:48pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Anand Rao  
English, Linguistics, and Communication