

Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Wednesday 01 November 2006, 4:00 pm
Red Room, Woodard Campus Center

Stephen Fuller (FSP) called the meeting to order at 4:03pm. After a few minor changes, the minutes of the 04 October meeting were approved.

Visit from Legislators

Senator John H. Chichester, the president *pro tempore* of the Virginia Senate, and Delegate William J. Howell, the Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, came to visit the Senate.

Senator Chichester spoke first. He said he preferred listening to rather than talking to Faculty Senates. He takes a great deal of interest in higher education, having chaired the relevant committee in the Senate for some time now. He spoke about the mechanism for funding higher education and how Appendix M was no longer useful after the mid-1990s. He and his colleagues came up with the Base Adequacy Report and saw significant imbalances among the way institutions were funded. These imbalances were adjusted and Senator Chichester is very pleased that Virginia institutions of higher education are more or less fully funded now. The key issue is the 67%(state)/33%(non-general fund) ratio: full funding might require institutions to actually cut tuition. UMW has received a 32% increase in funding from the state this year.

Delegate Howell then addressed the Senate. He also stated that he looked forward to the opportunity to hear the questions and concerns of members. His concern was that colleges and universities be released from burdensome state bureaucracy.

The representatives then took questions from the Senate.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked about the textbook law passed last spring, specifically whether our guests thought there was pressure for there to be further moves in this direction, e.g. a per-class cap on the amount of textbooks that could be assigned. Delegate Howell said that there was an overall concern about affordability, especially from constituents, but that last year's law was probably about as far as things would go. Senator Chichester echoed Delegate Howell's concerns. Delegate Howell added that it was important for faculty to get involved in such issues. Prof. Davidson followed up by asking whether the problem lay with the textbook manufacturers rather than faculty. Delegate Howell agreed that this was probably the case, but that they had little control over the textbook manufacturers.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked a philosophical question: back in the Wilder administration, there was an attitude that colleges & universities should participate in public education in the communities in which they served. But the pendulum appeared to swing back toward being more accountable to students. What was the General Assembly's view of this? Senator Chichester answered that community development was the key phrase. Universities should be more involved in raising the educational levels of their communities, especially with respect to the local school systems. Delegate Howell added that this sort of school-sponsoring was a wonderful idea but not within the purview of the General Assembly: he felt that universities were likely to want to do these sorts of things on their own.

Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) thanked the representatives for their efforts in increasing Base Adequacy Funding. She asked Senator Chichester about the Spellings Commission Report and what impact that report had on the General Assembly, specifically the idea of building on the successes of the No Child Left Behind Act. Senator Chichester responded that many of the issues the report raised had already been addressed by the General Assembly and by Virginia schools in general. He felt that Virginia schools should prepare secondary school students for entry into university and/or the workforce and that we were already doing most of these things.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked about salaries. Documentation shows UMW to be in the low teens among peer institutions but the numbers were in fact unclear and were based on constant enrollment sizes. Senator Chichester replied that the goal for faculty salaries was the 60th percentile of the peer group, and that next spring, the General Assembly intended to try to address this. He admitted that things were still underway but that it was intended that UMW would be in the high-40s by the following year. The data lay with SCHEV and not with the General Assembly. Delegate Howell urged Prof. McAllister to contact SCHEV. Rick Hurley rose to address the issue. He said that SCHEV was in the process of reviewing peer groups, and that there were other data points beside number of faculty used to create the formula, and that this formula should be recalculated in the spring.

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) spoke of the problem of recruiting and retaining faculty, which has become increasingly difficult, largely due to financial considerations. She wondered about the progress of a resolution in the General Assembly to address these concerns. Senator Chichester said that he was not familiar with this resolution. Delegate Howell asked whether it was just about UMW or about Virginia universities in general. Prof. Rigsby said that it was a general issue. Senator Chichester asked whether this was in all disciplines. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that a big issue was housing costs and that he hoped the General Assembly would address this. He suggested that it might be best if UMW were included in the group of schools that received a cost of living allowance because of the high costs of living in Northern Virginia. It was generally agreed that the resolution in question had been tabled. Senator Chichester wondered whether SCHEV might be the best venue for such a study to take place. Prof. Fuller said that this was already the case and that funding was the issue. Senator Chichester said that he would investigate the matter. Prof. Fuller said that K-12 schools received extra money this year in order to compensate for high housing costs and wondered whether this might lead the General Assembly to admit that this is a problem in the Fredericksburg area. Delegate Howell answered that this might be a slippery slope and that other state employees would then demand similar increases. Senator Chichester said that UMW was really competing with out-of-state institutions.

Nabil al-Tikriti (HIST) asked about the future reverberations of the proposed Proposal One and its effects on faculty retention. Delegate Howell answered that legislation had been passed allowing companies and institutions to offer domestic partnership benefits. He also claimed that the amendment would not impact wills and powers of attorney between unmarried couples of any sexual orientation. A law had been passed two years ago that allowed for such issues and the proposed amendment would not change this.

Senator Chichester and Delegate Howell retired from the room to the general applause of the Senate and urged members of the Senate to contact them with further questions.

Academic Affairs Committee

Andrew Dolby (BIOL) said that the Biology Dept. had reservations about the motion to repeal the rule about repeating prerequisite courses. Prof. Fuller said that this would be addressed under New Business. No further questions were asked.

Budget Committee

David Hunt (THEA) spoke of their meeting. He said that proposals were being solicited for capital improvement projects and suggested that such proposals be submitted by the end of January 2007. It was suggested that the committee provide details of the funding formula. Prof. Hunt said that the documents about last year's budget were available already.

Campus Academic Resources Committee

Robert Rycroft (ECON) wondered whether the Committee could be asked to provide more details on proposals.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked about "2/3 of requested amount," and whether that meant that CARC will only fund 2/3 of the request. It was suggested that requests be inflated. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that the person requesting money needs to come up with one-third from another source.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Grant Woodwell arose to give an oral report because their meeting with the Board of Visitors was too recent to allow for minutes to be included in the agenda packet. He said the agenda had five topics of interest:

- 1) The changing relationship between the two campuses: what was the Board of Visitors thinking about these changes? The Rector answered that they acknowledged the changing relationship between the two campuses and that they were content to watch this unfold. President Frawley said that we are one university and that communication was essential.
- 2) Extending tenure to the Stafford campus: Dean Barra said that a committee had already recommended that this be done. Whether this will be retroactive or apply only to new positions was as yet unclear. President Frawley reassured the Committee that there was no likelihood that tenure would be eliminated on the Fredericksburg campus.
- 3) Inviting the President to the summer retreat: Rector Poole seemed open to the idea but said we also needed to include representation from the Stafford campus.
- 4) The discrepancy between SCHEV-reported salary levels and what was seen in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*: SCHEV put into place some years ago a particular formula, and this formula may be outmoded. President Frawley said that this issue is being very actively investigated, and that part of the process of having SCHEV reformulate our peer group would involve bringing them up to date on our developments.

- 5) Transportation: a bus has been purchased to transport students back and forth to DC, but the bus is unreliable and expensive. It was asked that this situation be improved by replacing the bus and agreed that this would be investigated.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked whether this was the bus that had been discussed for years. Prof. Woodwell said that it was. Prof. Fuller said that vans had been downgraded from fifteen to ten passengers and that we needed to replace our aging transportation fleet.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked about tenure for the Stafford campus and wondered why the timetable for implementation was uncertain. Prof. Woodwell said that he knew it was an issue and that President Frawley had given many scenarios for how this might be done. Dean Barra said that the PAC Committee had recommended long ago that tenure be looked at for the Stafford campus. This was passed by the Board of Visitors but was not given a timetable due to the upcoming change in administration. She does not believe that there is discussion currently taking place on this issue. Prof. Watkins asked whether anything had been published to this effect: Dean Barra answered that this documentation was available.

Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) asked about the changing relationships between campuses. She said that her department was concerned not so much with the concept of merging functions as with the effect on the focus on undergraduate education on the Fredericksburg campus. She said that her department would like more complete information on the topic. Prof. Woodwell replied that this was indeed why the agenda item was front and centre in the meeting. It is clear that the Board of Visitors is willing to go forward with the experiment and see what happens. This was the intent behind the \$400k offered by President Frawley for proposals to integrate the two campuses. He believed that it was more of an opportunity for experimentation than something imposed upon the faculty. Dean Barra added that there was no intention to reduce the focus on undergraduate education but that there was potential for looking at certain areas where it would make sense to have a masters' program.

Gary Stanton (HISPRES) asked whether SCHEV will now review our peer institution status and the effect of further graduate education on salary scales. He said that this would have a more direct effect on the faculty salary issue. Prof. Woodwell said that this was not discussed at the meeting, but that it was clear that we were moving into a new category. Prof. Watkins wondered whether the large number of adjunct faculty at the Stafford campus might actually impact UMW faculty salaries negatively. Prof. Woodwell said that his own experiences had led him to believe that encouraging further contact was the best idea.

Faculty Organization Committee

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked the committee to talk about the best solution for budget committee membership. Prof. Jakubecy replied that an appointed committee would have more even representation.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked what makes the Budget Advisory Committee different from other committees. Prof. Jakubecy replied that there are other appointed committees and that this one was being formed from the ground up and appointment was the best solution to these issues. She asked the Senate what the general feeling was on elected v. appointed.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) said that the committee was advisory to the administration and that it would be problematic if certain types of departments were absent from the committee.

Kristin Marsh (At-Large) said that that argument was not compelling and wondered again whether it might not be the case that there was nothing inherently different about the Budget Advisory Committee and that the issue was one of filling committees in general. Prof. Jakubecy answered that appointed committees were a solution because of the lack of interest forms, but that the Faculty Organization Committee could appoint people regardless of whether they'd filled out interest forms.

Alejandro Cervantes-Carson (SOC-ANTH) suggested that the Senate wait until the Faculty Organization Committee could provide the full arguments before expressing a preference for elected over appointed committees.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) wondered whether the committee needed to remain a sub-committee of the Senate. Prof. Jakubecy said that the membership would be drawn from the general faculty.

Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee

No questions were asked as no members of the committee were present.

Race and Gender Committee

No questions were asked.

Writing Intensive Committee

Melina Patterson (GEOG) asked whether the “extensive discussion” had led to any additional information and whether there was discussion on whether and how Freshman Seminars related to English 101. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) replied that this was a real issue and that the members of the two relevant committees would meet on Friday 03 November to debate the issue of whether all Freshman Seminars would be designated as Writing Intensive. Gary Stanton (HISPRES) said that his department tried to distinguish between “extensive writing” and “writing intensive” and that they were trying to disabuse students of the notion that the two designations implied a page count.

Prof. Fuller suggested that the Senate was getting away from the report and urged members to table their questions until such a time as a member of the committee could be present to respond to such questions.

General Education Committee

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked whether “no conclusions could be reached” was the most common answer. Prof. Morello said that it was one of a series of responses to the question but that he did not have the numbers in front of him. Some of the concerns were that the phrasing of the questions might lead to misleading answers, which was the reason that the General Education Committee was addressing the issue. He said that the percentages of students saying that they did not get much from courses were higher in General Education courses than in specific courses such as those that meet the individual ATC goals.

President of the Senate – Oral Report

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) spoke of a resolution brought to the Senate by her and emphasized that if the resolution were to pass, the expectation was that each member would inform their colleagues about the Faculty Senate of Virginia.

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether Prof. Rigsby had made efforts to involve the other campus. Prof. Rigsby said no.

Robert Rycroft (ECON) asked why this was a one-time rather than a yearly donation. Prof. Fuller replied that this would enable the FSV to do some needed lobbying.

Nabil al-Tikriti (HIST) said that the FSV seemed invisible to our two distinguished representatives and wondered why it seemed invisible to him as well. Prof. Fuller said that there was a listserv and that it was relatively simple to get involved. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) said there was also a website that provided important updates.

Report of the Interim Dean of the Faculty

Dean Barra spoke about the Trinkle Hall 24-hour study room and the series of thefts on campus in recent months. In Trinkle, the items were taken from locked rooms. The study room was closed temporarily and the plan is to re-key the entire building, but this will take time. The keys on the outside doors have been changed except for the front door. A security guard was hired and is in Trinkle from 2200-0600 every night, as theft of equipment implied a security threat to students.

Departmental strategic plans were due today and most of them had been sent to Dean Barra before this meeting. Her plan is to look at the plans and then evaluate and discuss the plans with Nina Mikhailevsky in the near future.

She also addressed the request from the Department of Environmental Science and Geology to change its name. In the past, such issues had been dealt with by the administration, but Dean Barra had wanted the Senate to be involved in the process and suggested the Senate pass this on to the relevant committee.

She also spoke about merit pay. She said the process was similar to that in the past: the total dollar amount was divided up based on merit levels. She said that merit levels would be 3.5%, 4.5% and 6.5%. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked about the percentage of faculty who were in the different categories. Dean Barra replied that Level 3 was about 20%, v. 39% last year. Level 1 was 15% and the rest were Level 2.

Andrew Dolby (BIOL) asked about security in Jepson. Dean Barra replied that there had been no clear indication that a master key had been involved and that the thefts appeared more opportunistic than systematic.

Report of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Prof. Morello said that all involved representatives had approved the idea of the Undergraduate Research proposal and that it would be coming to departments soon. Marie McAllister (At-Large) wondered how often this would be repeatable. Prof. Morello said a student could only take it twice for credit.

The General Education group will meet again soon and will be publishing results soon. Charles Whipkey (ENVS-GEOL) asked whether it would be clear that a student has done research in a particular field. Prof. Morello said that the course title would have the field in it.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that the General Education review process seemed unclear as to how bound UMW is as an institution with respect to the number of credits students need to graduate. Prof. Morello said that the accreditation agency states that at least 120 credit hours must be required. The agency also stipulates that General Education must be at least 30 credit hours of these. The old accrediting guidelines were much more severe in this respect.

New Business

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) presented her resolution. Marie McAllister (At-Large) seconded it. The motion passed by general acclamation.

The motion on scholarly activity prior to the probationary period was assigned to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Stephen Fuller (FSP) asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made and seconded. Prof. Fuller adjourned the meeting at 5:58pm.

Respectfully submitted
Ian Campbell
Secretary to the Faculty Senate