

Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Wednesday 04 October 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 06 September meeting were approved.

Academic Affairs Committee

The minutes of the committee were approved. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked Liane Houghtalin what discussion the committee had on the Freshman Seminar requirement. Prof. Houghtalin replied that this issue had never been addressed in the committee. Stephen Fuller (FSP) put the probation question aside to be addressed later.

Campus Academic Resources Committee

No comments were made on the report.

Curriculum Committee

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked John Morello whether the First-Year Seminar requirement would be discussed in the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Morello replied that this would most likely go through the General Education Committee first and that it had not yet been finally determined whether the First-Year Seminar was indeed to be a requirement.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Jason Davidson (PSCI) asked Prof. Fuller when he said he would defer President Frawley's idea of inviting legislators to campus. Prof. Fuller said that Sen. Chichester had been approached about this issue previously, and that President Frawley had asked Prof. Fuller to defer this until a later date. Prof. Fuller wanted to have the Senate discuss what it might wish to ask Sen. Chichester and other representatives.

Faculty Organization Committee

Jason Davidson (PSCI) asked whether anyone from FOC was present – nobody was – and then asked why the system for choosing members to the budget advisory committee was a better system than an election in the long term. David Long (MUSIC) asked Prof. Davidson whether he would prefer an election. Prof. Davidson answered that it was logical for other committees and wondered whether there was anything specific about the BAC that led to its being by appointment rather than by election. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) brought up the issue of division by area and asked Prof. Fuller to invite representatives from FOC to answer these questions.

Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee

No questions were asked.

Global Awareness Committee

No questions were asked.

Race and Gender Committee

No questions were asked.

Writing Intensive Committee

No questions were asked.

Environmental Awareness Committee

No questions were asked.

Speaking Intensive Committee

Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked about students' names appearing on reports. Prof. Fuller said that perhaps other committees ought to be informed that they shouldn't put students' names on materials.

President of the Senate – Oral Report

Stephen Fuller (BIOL) gave a summary of the Board of Visitors meeting. Ron Singleton talked about design services that his group has that are available for departmental brochures and webpages. David Bareth talked about the Gari Melcher home and the new pavilion there that enabled meetings and workshops at that site. John Wiltenmouth talked about projects: in Seacobeck, \$5M was spent on renovating the floors and kitchens and this represented a real upgrade. The new Stafford campus building is 90% finished and on schedule. The Convocation Center schematic is complete but is over budget so some reworking of the design will have to be done. The bell tower will be completed in January. Improvements in Dodd will be done in the spring. The parking deck is in use. Belmont will get a new roof and Monroe Hall will be renovated again. Work on the HVAC in the Melcher house will start in the spring. The GW mold problem in the basement is going to be addressed. Mona Albertine brought up a new set of bylaws, which were passed on the condition that the Board of Visitors committee structure be realigned to come in to concord with the President's new administrative structure.

Prof. Fuller has a letter from the President welcoming the new members of the Board of Visitors.

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) talked about the Faculty Senate of Virginia. She gave general information about this august body and its website. SCHEV may have the opportunity to compare benefits among faculty and best practices for the recruitment and retention of quality faculty. Prof. Rigsby asked whether the faculty of UMW might be interested in setting the bar high by having all faculty members donate \$5 to the FSV and said that she would bring a motion to this effect at the November meeting. Stephen Fuller (BIOL) said that the Virginia 21 student group was very effective in promoting student rights and that the FSV might prove equally effective in aiding the interest of faculty among the Legislature in Richmond. Prof. Rigsby said that the next FSV meeting was on 11 November and that any questions should be directed to her.

Report of the Interim Dean of the Faculty

Dean Barra spoke about her memo included in the agenda packet. She said that she had spoken to the dept chairs about this initiative to have every freshman in the 2007-08 academic year take

a seminar and that this fulfill a requirement. She said that the First-Year Seminar committee was sending a proposal to the Writing Intensive committee that First-Year Seminar courses count as WI courses, and that this would go through General Education and Curriculum. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked how this would impact enrollment targets for departments - would the 15-student First-Year Seminar courses change this? Dean Barra said that this was as yet unclear. Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether there would be extra sessions so that students had a choice of what to take. Dean Barra replied that the First-Year Seminar courses would be in both fall and spring semesters and that all departments and faculty were encouraged to participate. Stephen Fuller (FSP) asked whether this might replace Writing Workshop. Dean Barra said that since the General Education and ATC requirements were being reviewed and that the possibility of First-Year Seminar becoming a General Education requirement would be part of this discussion. The new catalogue will be only a one-year catalogue so that a new two-year catalogue would be printed afterward with the new General Education requirements. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked whether, in the process of shifting to new requirements, the First-Year Seminar would replace other courses on the books. Dean Barra said that this was as yet unclear but that courses would be shifted in order to accommodate the need for General Education courses.

Gary Stanton (HPRES) asked about the numbers. Dean Morello said that we would need 64 completely filled sections to accommodate the freshman class. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked Dean Barra whether President Frawley intends to have a more formal, comprehensive proposal for the General Education revisions/reductions. Dean Barra replied that the President's inaugural speech outlined his goals in broad terms. The first General Education meeting would be on 18 October and Dean Barra asked the President to participate in future meetings and articulate his vision, but that this would not occur on 18 October due to other commitments. Bulent Atalay (PHYS) asked about the writing workshop not having enough sections. Dean Barra replied that students with high SAT scores did not have to take the writing workshop. Dean Morello replied that some students took it in the fall or spring, but that this had nothing to do with SAT scores and everything to do with the number of sections required. Prof. Atalay asked whether this might not be doable with respect to the First-Year Seminar requirements. Dean Barra said that it was too early in the process as yet, but that First-Year Seminar courses would be divided between the semesters. Melina Patterson (GEOG) asked whether the First-Year Seminar committee might consider having First-Year Seminar courses count for departments or majors. Dean Barra said no, because it was a general course, and that we were in an intermediate situation. Prof. Patterson suggested that the First-Year Seminar committee think boldly, but Dean Barra said that this was impossible because there was so much variance among First-Year Seminar courses and they only met general guidelines. Andrew Dolby (BIOL) asked whether any data were cited to support that First-Year Seminar courses enhance student success. Dean Barra replied that the committee spent a whole year looking at other institutions' experiences and first-year students' experiences in order to develop the First-Year Seminar program. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked whether it would be possible to see a summary of this research. Dean Barra said that this had already been done and that the motion for First-Year Seminar courses had already been approved by the committees and the Senate, and that this information had been available last year. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that approving the general idea of First-Year Seminar courses was different from approving the specific courses, and that First-Year Seminar courses would impede his dept from offering upper-level courses and thus lower the overall upperclassman experience. Dean Barra said that the committee was already aware of these issues and was addressing them.

Charles Sharpless (CHEM) asked whether the administration had given consideration to team teaching of First-Year Seminar courses. Dean Barra said that this would be counterproductive. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said the Senate approved what he thought was a pilot project and that approving 64 courses was a different story. He felt that seeing data from the current crop of First-Year Seminar courses would greatly aid the Senate in its deliberations. Dean Barra said that the Senate approved the entire project, not a pilot project - viz. the Curriculum Committee's report on the issue. She said that we have plans to evaluate the First-Year Seminar but that it was premature at this point to have any results. She also said that it was not her original intent to rush the process, and that she was expressing the President's wishes in this matter. Melina Patterson (GEOG) said that faculty could not do the expanded First-Year Seminar without missing other goals, and that this thus represented a fundamental change in the process. Dean Barra said that it was the President's desire to see all first-year students take a First-Year Seminar course, and that the expanded project was still working its way through the committee structure, and that at each of these steps, the Senate would be informed. The discussion is premature because the process has not yet gone through the committees. She is very much aware of these implications. Prof. Patterson said that linking it to General Education reforms would be helpful. Bulent Atalay (PHYS) spoke of other successful models: at Duke, each group of 30 students had a focus group of five or six faculty members.

Dean Barra spoke about major programs and strategic plans, all to be submitted by 01 November. This is essential because all open and new positions must be justified in light of the strategic plan. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked who does the approving. Dean Barra said it requires her to look at it first, then the VP for Strategy and Planning. Prof. Watkins asked whether there was a guiding set of principles for standards and goals that would work in the approval process. Dean Barra said that these principles would come from the strategic plans submitted by departments, but that these strategic plans would not necessarily be permanent or irrevocable. Gary Stanton (HPRS) asked for a clarification: whether smaller, multidiscipline departments were to justify the program as a whole or to justify each subdivision. Dean Barra replied that they were to justify the program as a whole. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked whether depts. and programs would have the opportunity to change their strategic plans. Dean Barra replied in the affirmative. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that since positions revert to Academic Affairs, this implied a campus-wide competition for positions, and wondered what principles might determine the winner of the competition. Dean Barra answered that this was as yet unclear. Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether each position needed to be justified in the strategic plan. Dean Barra replied that it was about the plan more than the individual. Stephen Griffin (A&AH) asked whether this competition would be shared with the Stafford campus. Dean Barra replied that there were three categories of positions: new joint positions for which funding has already been provided; open positions where a slot already exists; new positions that will be determined based on the need expressed in the strategic plans. The 15:1 program is being rethought and no longer exists in its old form, because the determinations for those positions were made based on old formulae and new positions must be based on the strategic plan. She does not know how many new positions will be available. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) asked whether new joint positions would reside on this campus or the Stafford campus. Dean Barra said that the home would be where major teaching responsibilities took place. There are up to seven new joint positions. Alejandro Cervantes-Carson (SOC-ANTH) asked how many 15:1 positions were still open. Dean Barra answered that the question was moot because the 15:1 structure no longer exists. Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) asked whether the Fredericksburg campus would be competing with the Stafford campus for non-joint positions. Dean Barra said that vacant positions revert back to the VP of that area. Stephen Watkins

(ENLS) asked whether the administration had in mind expansions or reductions of existing majors and programs, or whether competition would make us all better. Dean Barra said that the President would like to expand the faculty even beyond what had been planned for the 15:1 but that no specifics had been provided and would not be until after he saw what the faculty wanted. He is interested in unique programs that could be hallmarks for MWC. Wendy Atwell Casey asked whether the President was suspending judgement until after the strategic plans were submitted. Dean Barra replied in the affirmative.

Dean Barra talked about the General Education requirements. The President wants to know "What is our product?" He believes there are too many General Education requirements and that they need to be streamlined, but that it is up to the faculty to decide exactly how to do this. He also believes there needs to be an expansion of undergraduate research and independent study. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) wondered whether it would be reasonable to say that we want independent studies but that our current structure impedes this. Dean Barra replied that this was an appropriate use for the strategic plan.

Dean Barra then spoke about the joint CAS-CGPS programs and that there would be a competition for proposals, but that each proposal needed to be joint proposals. These proposals could, but do not need to, include proposals for the joint appointments.

She then spoke about background checks and requested that the Senate ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to review the UMW background check policy. Stephen Fuller (FSP) replied that he would ask FAC to do this.

Report of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dean Morello reminded the Senate of the TLTR forum scheduled for Friday 06 October at 15:30 in Trinkle 210 and urged faculty to attend. The subject of the forum is developing information technology skills and how this might apply to the information technology requirement. The result of this forum may induce the Executive Committee to issue a statement regarding future IT requirements here at UMW.

He also spoke about the undergraduate research initiative, a priority of the President. He said that an advisory committee had met on this issue but that a report would be delayed until concrete recommendations had been made. Melina Patterson (GEOG) asked whether this was an opportunity or a requirement. Dean Morello replied that it was an opportunity.

Student Representative

No report was made.

Ad Hoc Budget Committee

David Hunt (THEA) gave a brief discussion of the new committee and what they had learned. The Senate thanked the members of the committee for their service.

Old Business

Prof. Fuller asked for questions we might wish to ask the visiting legislators. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked about how reported salaries differed from actual salaries. Jason Davidson (PSCI) suggested the Senate ask about what future legislation might be made with respect to the textbook question. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) asked about the general question of

resources for higher education. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) was interested in the Spellings Commission report and how the Leg might interpret this. She also said that we might wish to thank Senator Chichester for the increased budget. Prof. Fuller said that he would bring up these issues.

With respect to the promotion and suspension policy, Liane Houghtalin from the Academic Affairs Committee arose to answer questions.

Prof. Fuller made a motion to accept the changes. The motion passed.

New Business

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) made a motion to have committees submit approved minutes to the Senate. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) asked whether we would know the difference between summaries and approved minutes. Charles Sharpless (CHEM) asked about the difference btw unapproved minutes and a report. Prof. Watkins said that a report was from the chair. Andrew Dolby (BIOL) asked whether this meant a list of actions that were voted on. Prof. Watkins said yes. Gary Stanton (HPRS) said that a report would tell us what they'd done but that it would not set anything in motion until final minutes had been submitted. Prof. Watkins said that he did not know whether this was true. David Long (MUSIC) said that if minutes were accepted then any actions a committee took were thus approved by the Senate.

Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) seconded Prof. Watkins' motion.

Dean Morello said that the central question was how confident the Senate could be that what the Senate got from a committee was what actually happened, and not whether this took the form of a report or of minutes. Mindy Erchull (PSYCH) asked whether there were any real substantive changes ever made to minutes. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) replied that it was usually an issue where the content of someone's discourse had been misrepresented.

Mary Rigsby (ENLS) said that the Senate might be better off simply asking committees to be clear in their reports. Prof. Fuller agreed, as did many other members of the Senate. Prof. Watkins then withdrew his motion.

Prof. Watkins then asked about Lee Hall ballroom and whether the faculty might consider convening as a committee of the whole in order to consider a vote on a resolution that the school reconsider its plans for the room. He made a motion to this effect. This motion was seconded and approved.

Prof. Watkins then made the motion. "The Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the Administration retain Lee Hall Ballroom in its present form." Gary Stanton (HISPRES) wondered whether the changes were not in fact temporary. Dean Morello said that the change was not temporary and that the interior features were to be retained: the room is to be divided into a large and small meeting room. He felt the project was so far along that it was unclear whether the Senate could do anything. Gary Stanton (HISPRES) said that Dean Morello's remarks indicated that the changes were reversible. The motion was approved, 11 to 8. Prof. Fuller agreed to draft a letter. The Senate moved out of a committee of the whole.

Stephen Fuller (FSP) asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made and seconded. Prof. Fuller adjourned the meeting at 5:55 pm.