

UMW Faculty Senate
Wednesday 05 September 2007, 16h00
Red Room, Woodard Campus Centre

Steve Fuller (President) called the meeting to order at 16:02. Steve Watkins (ELS) was unanimously elected as parliamentarian.

Reports

Report of the Acting Provost/VP for Strategy and Policy

Prof. Mikhalevsky gave an overview of her office's planned activities. Her primary goal is to build the office of the provost and to establish it in such a way as to meet the needs of the university and the faculty. Her specific goals include improving faculty salaries – a challenge on a number of fronts – as well as the roles and responsibilities of the department chair and the teaching loads for faculty. She wishes to improve academic and administrative structures and services across the university, i.e. across both campuses. She views the formation and development of the University Council as a key aspect of achieving these goals and intends to implement this council, whose primary purpose is to facilitate communication across the university and to advise the executive officers. She intends to ask a smaller group to develop a plan for university-wide faculty governance. In general, she intends to facilitate communication among and between faculty. The first step for this was to open up the all-faculty list server: she suggested opening this up to the Faculty Senate president so that faculty could have an easier time sending messages to this list.

Report of the Interim Dean of the Faculty

Dean Barra asked whether any Senators had questions for her. None had.

Report of the Associate VP for Academic Affairs

John Morello said that the orientation schedule for this year has been revised and encouraged those who had opinions on orientation this year to send comments to his office. He also said that Friday 08 September is the deadline for new URES applications. Gary Stanton (HPRES) asked Prof. Morello how the online Preview went this past summer. Prof. Morello said that in general, students were able to register and 96% of these had at least 12 credits. The biggest problem was that there were 88 students who generated no schedule and were forced to wait for schedule adjustment in order to register. Most of these were able to do so. Prerequisite problems stemming from unreported AP credit arose, in many cases because students failed to register Social Security numbers on their AP exams.

Report of the President of the Senate

Prof. Fuller spoke of the large portfolio he had received over the summer. He said that he would be updating the Senate once he had had time to prepare such a report.

Report of the Student Representative

No report was given.

Standing Committees

No reports were given.

Ad Hoc Committees

The Senate brought the motion to adopt a new General Education Curriculum to the floor. A round of hearty applause was requested and received for the hard work of the committee. Prof. Fuller asked for points of observation.

Eric Gable (SOCANTH) asked how much flexibility existed in changing the language of the rationales. Prof. Hudgins said that once it left his committee, it was in a larger circulation and thus changes might be made.

Margaret Mi (BUSAD) said that the BLS curriculum had six credits of PE: would this change if the proposal were adopted? Prof. Morello said that there was no such requirement: the issue dealt with transfer credit. She also asked about tracking the new requirements: how does the Registrar's office count whether and how the requirements were filled? Provost Mikhalevsky said that they would be coded in Banner, just like they were now.

Kristen Marsh (At-Large) asked a procedural question: was there a way to talk about what the potential changes might be before putting it in the hands of the Curriculum Committee? The general answer was that related motions could be raised during the New Business section.

Melina Patterson (GEOG) wanted to know how the procedure worked, specifically. Prof. Fuller said that the Curriculum Committee could receive comments, but that ultimately the responsibility lay with the committee: everyone on the faculty had the ability to contact the committee. She suggested that it be made clear that faculty could contact the committee: Prof. Morello said that he would put a page on the wiki for such comments.

Thomas Sheridan (AH&PE) said that his department was concerned about the elimination of the PE requirement, and that their question on the rationale to eliminate the requirement was not answered to their satisfaction. Prof. Hudgins said that one rationale was the reduction of the overall number of hours in the Gen Ed curriculum; also, the Athletics, Health and Physical Education department did not submit feedback to the original proposals. Dean Barra added that each department had been tasked to give feedback on the whole plan, not just the issues that concerned that department specifically. Prof. Sheridan asked for clarification: he still did not feel there was a definitive rationale for the elimination of the requirement. Tim O'Donnell responded that departmental feedback was largely split, and that there was no consensus to retain the requirement. Elizabeth Lewis said that this specific issue took up a number of meetings, but that the committee came to the consensus that the requirement should be eliminated, not only for the above reasons, but also for the reason that the General Education curriculum was specifically academic in nature. Prof. Morello emphasized that this was not intended to downplay the importance of student health and wellness. It was suggested that this issue be brought up with the Curriculum Committee.

Prof. Marsh, after reiterating her appreciation for the committee's work, wanted to know how the committee arrived at its final plan, and where and how the core values emphasized in the proposed curriculum were arrived at. Steve Hannah responded that the committee began by examining all the documents submitted since the previous October, and wrote a draft statement. This draft statement was then modified by the information and opinions submitted on the wiki. Prof. Marsh said that she did not remember being asked, as a member of the university community, what the core values were. Prof. Hudgins responded that there was a statement of these values buried somewhere in the proposal. Prof. Morello said that this statement had been distributed to the faculty, twice. Prof. Marsh admitted that she could have raised this question before, but that what she had perceived as her instrumental

questions were in fact essential to things outside the curriculum: specifically, the issue of diversity, which she did not feel was reflected in the proposed curriculum.

Prof. Watkins returned to the PE requirement: at any point, did anyone from that department come to the committee to make the case in favor of the retention of the PE requirement? Dean Barra said that no major concern about the PE requirement was raised, but that the case had been made that the eight credits of PE that students could take for credit should be retained.

Prof. Mi asked about the implementation of the eventual product: she was again concerned about tracking whether requirements had been fulfilled. She spoke of her department's heavy load of advisees and wondered what help she as an adviser would receive. Prof. Morello said that Banner would flag courses as to whether they would fill a given requirement for a given student: this would be updated as a new curriculum was adopted.

Mary Rigsby (ELS) said that anyone with additional comments should have another window of opportunity, and emphasized that people should be informed of this.

Susan Fernshebner (HIST) wondered whether it might be possible for the Curriculum Committee to hold an open meeting. Prof. Fuller said this would be up to the committee.

Jason Davidson (PSCI) suggested that the Curriculum Committee look carefully at the old comments as well as the new: people should not have to reënter their comments at each phase of the process.

Gary Stanton (HPRES) wondered whether the order of business in the November Senate meeting would take comments on the recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee before looking at the motion from the Curriculum Committee. Prof. Fuller said that considering implementation before the proposal was illogical and said that the Curriculum Committee issues would come to the floor before contemplating the implementation of the proposal.

It was then agreed to send the proposed changes on to the relevant committees.

Old Business

It was made known that the student proposal on the MLK holiday had been withdrawn.

New Business

Prof. Marsh proposed a motion to amend the Gen Ed proposal and send this to the Curriculum Committee: briefly, that the Human Inquiry requirement be amended to include the race and gender requirements. Prof. Fuller said that this would best be passed on to the Curriculum Committee, and reiterated that everyone make their comments and ideas available to the Curriculum Committee.

Announcements

Prof. Fuller urged members to look at the list of finalists for the advisory committee for the presidential search. He then adjourned the meeting at 17:06.