University Faculty Council
Annual Report 2009-2010

1. Membership
   Arts and Sciences: Con Beausang (substituting for Michelle Hamm), Ori Belkind
   (substituting for Sheila Carapico, second semester), Jane Berry, Jennifer Cable, Sheila
   Carapico (first semester), Geoff Goddu, Dorothy Holland, Kasongo Kapanga, Ladelle
   McWhorter, Dan Palazzolo, Bill Ross
   Business: Tom Arnold (substituting for Dean Croushore, first semester), Dean Croushore
   (second semester), Pat Fishe, KimMarie McGoldrick
   Leadership Studies: Doug Hicks (chair)
   Law: Chris Cotopia, Jonathan Stubbs
   Continuing Studies: Ellen Walk

2. Distinguished Educator Award Selection Committee Membership
   UFC representative (chair): Dorothy Holland
   Previous winner: Mari Lee Mifsud
   At-large faculty: Mirela Fetea
   At-large faculty Joe Hoyle
   At-large faculty: Al Goethals
   Academic Affairs Council: Kathy Monday
   Alumna: Ruth Byrne
   Student Government Association: Kerissa Richards

3. Subcommittee on Retirement Policy- Tom Arnold, Pat Fishe (chair), Kasongo Kapanga
   This subcommittee’s recommendation from academic year 2008-09 to allow early retirement
   in August or in January, was endorsed by the UFC body and was finalized by the Board of
   Trustees, in consultation with UR General Counsel Shannon Sinclair, Provost Steve Allred,
   and subcommittee chair Fishe. These recommended changes were made University policy.

4. Board of Inquiry on Search Process- KimMarie McGoldrick (chair), Chris Cotopia,
   Jonathan Stubbs
   UFC received two written requests for a review of the process of the spring 2009 faculty
   search to fill an appointment in Philosophy with teaching and administrative responsibilities
   in the Philosophy, Politics, Economics, and Law (PPEL) program. UFC voted to form a
   board of inquiry for this purpose. After completing its work over the course of the year, the
   board of inquiry shared a summary version of its confidential report, in executive session, to
   the UFC in April. The full report, with appendices, was sent to the provost and president.
   Following discussion of this report, the UFC approved this statement in April, 2010:

   Because successful faculty searches require an environment of trust among administration
   and faculty members, the University Faculty Council recommends the following:

   1. All hiring processes should follow the diversity guidelines, set forth in Guidelines for
      Promoting Diversity in Faculty Hiring (adopted by UFC and the University Faculty in
      2007; revised by both bodies in spring 2009). Key components of this process include
      (but are not limited to):
a. Identifying the diversity advocate position at the start of the search and communicating this information to all relevant parties.
b. Providing the diversity advocate with the roles and responsibilities associated with the position and training in support of such duties.
c. Conducting discussions when the search commences that identify recruitment strategies for attracting a diverse applicant pool.

2. That searches which involve multiple constituencies are conducted with special attention to ensuring consistency in expectations and processes across relevant parties. Searches will have face-to-face meetings with all relevant parties (or a significant number of their representatives) at critical junctures of the process which include (but are not limited to):
   a. Establishing roles of the search committee and the faculty of the Department or School
   b. Drafting of the position advertisement and expected duties
   c. Vetting of candidates to bring to campus for interviews
   d. Discussions of whether to continue or shut down a search
   e. Discussions associated with extending an offer
   f. Any and all votes

3. The decision to start or reformulate a search near the end of the academic year (late Spring) should seriously consider the timing's affect on the integrity and completeness of the search and potential candidate pool.

4. All tenure and promotion decisions (for both internal and external candidates) shall be vetted by the Tenure and Promotion Committees of the respective school.

5. The Provost should hold meetings every fall bringing together deans, department chairs, chairs of search committees and diversity advocates (if identified), and other interested faculty to review the processes for conducting searches for hiring people to fill tenure-track and tenured faculty positions.

6. UFC urges the president and provost to take appropriate steps in the event that any policies related to searches and hires are violated.

5. **UFC-sponsored Evaluation of Deans** - Jennifer Cable (chair of Peart review panel), Con Beausang, Ellen Walk; Dean Croushore (chair of Douglass review panel), Del McWhorter, Bill Ross

   Fulfilling its responsibility to sponsor an every-three-years review of each dean and the provost, UFC panels were formed this year to coordinate the review of two deans: Sandra Peart of the Jepson School of Leadership Studies and John Douglass of the Law School. Given the thorough revisions undertaken three years ago to the instrument designed for this purpose, the established instrument was used for both reviews this year (adapted in minor ways in consultation with the relevant dean and the provost). For the first time, the evaluations were administered as online surveys, with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Both panels completed their summary reports and sent all results to the provost in April.
6. **Subcommittee on Faculty Governance**- Jane Berry, Dan Palazzolo (chair), Geoff Goddu

*University Policy Regarding Presidential Search Committees:* This subcommittee continued the work of finding suitable language for University policy regarding the composition of presidential search committees. It forwarded to UFC revised language and the request, which was then approved by UFC as a whole, that the Board of Trustees would approve of general language indicating that it would include on any future presidential search committees faculty members nominated by the UFC, staff members nominated by the University Staff Advisory Council (USAC), and students and alumni. Rector George Wellde sent chair Hicks a letter, dated February 19, 2010, describing commitments by the Board toward these ends. Hicks sent a reply, dated March 12, thanking Rector Wellde and also expressing the expectation of UFC that the Board would honor the policy outlined in the Guide to Faculty Governance that *all* faculty members serving on presidential search committees would be nominated by UFC, barring any compelling University interest unforeseen by the UFC. These letters are included at the end of this report.

7. **Ad Hoc Group on Restructuring Faculty Governance**- Dean Croushore, Doug Hicks, Dan Palazzolo (chair), Jonathan Stubbs, Ellen Walk

The Ad Hoc Group on Restructuring Faculty Governance worked on two fronts this year to assess the faculty’s interest in developing a proposal to replace the current governance structure with a representative body, akin to a faculty Senate found at other universities. First, it participated in a survey of faculty opinions on a few aspects of governance. The subcommittee spent part of the fall developing a questionnaire for surveying the faculty. Upon hearing that the University had employed Modern Think to conduct a more general survey of job satisfaction with the University, the group decided to incorporate its questions into that survey. Dan Palazzolo was appointed the faculty representative on the steering committee, which will continue its work into the summer and next academic year, working with Modern Think. Though the survey did not specifically ask about faculty interest in a representative body, the survey provided general information about levels of satisfaction with governance that could serve as a benchmark from which to gauge chances in satisfaction over time. The preliminary results suggest, “Faculty experience of shared governance warrants continued attention. While faculty report having input at the School level and regarding educational issues, they want a greater voice on matters of institutional relevance.” (Modern Think, Key Findings, online survey 2/15/10-03/01/10). The UFC may request more refined analysis and comparisons of the results. Second, each member spoke directly with faculty from each of the schools to determine if there is sufficient interest in a representative body. The results were decidedly mixed: some members of the faculty were interested in exploring a proposal, others were opposed, and some were neutral. In the process, UFC learned that while there may not be a need to replace the current structure, there is an interest in looking at ways to improve aspects of governance to increase the extent and quality of faculty participation on key issues. Thus, the group proposed and the UFC approved of a UFC-led initiative, in consultation with representatives of the administration, for improving the University’s current governance structure and giving more responsibility to the faculty.
8. **UFC Review Board on Dependent Care** - Jane Berry (chair), Sydney Watts, Thad Williamson

The Childcare Benefits Options report, approved by UFC in spring 2009, was presented to USAC, which endorsed its recommendations, and to the University Faculty in September 2009, at which time the Faculty as a whole also endorsed the recommendations. The report calls for two immediately implementable ways to address childcare needs of staff and faculty and for a continued long-term commitment to make an on-campus childcare facility a reality. The report also calls for support of eldercare needs of staff and faculty in the long term, but this is a secondary goal to childcare needs, at present. UFC formed a follow-up committee, chaired by Jane Berry, with Sydney Watts and Thad Williamson. This group met twice with Hossein Sadid, Vice-President of Business and Finance, about ways to implement the plan. VP Sadid expressed that the University places a high priority on finding short- and long-term solutions to dependent care, consistent with The Richmond Promise, as one way of becoming an employer of choice. The issue will thus be a part of the campus master planning process to begin in the summer or next academic year. In the spring, Carl Sorensen and Laura Dietrick of HR, along with VP Sadid, reported to this UFC group that the University is readying a short-term plan with a local daycare provider to offer employees the option of sick-day and school-vacation care.

9. **HR Benefits Advisory Committee** - Members from UFC: Chris Cotropia, Kasongo Kapanga

UFC invited Carl Sorensen to address UFC in November to discuss employee benefits, including concerns about the open enrollment process and changes to the benefits plans. He and Laura Dietrick met with a group of six UFC members to further discuss the process of determining benefits for employees. These HR leaders pledged to work with the HR Benefits Advisory Committee to continue exploring innovative ways to deliver quality healthcare and other benefits to faculty and staff members. The Benefits Advisory Committee met three times in the spring to work on related issues.

10. **Provost Advisory Group** - KimMarie McGoldrick, Del McWhorter, Doug Hicks, Jonathan Stubbs, Ellen Walk

This group did not convene during the academic year.

11. **Proposed Cell Tower on Campus**

VP of Information Technology Kathy Monday and colleagues attended the April 1, 2010, UFC meeting to make a presentation on a cell tower proposed to be built on campus by Verizon on space leased by the University for a 15-year lease, with right to renew by Verizon for an additional 5 years. After deliberation, UFC passed two motions: 1) “The UFC endorses improving our communications methods to optimize campus safety for our students.” 2) “The UFC opposes the 199-foot monopole tower with the five-carrier array as presented at the April 1, 2010, meeting. The UFC also recommends taking the presentation to the faculty at a regularly-scheduled university faculty meeting with the expectation that the contract with Verizon would not be signed until there is a full faculty discussion.”

Respectfully submitted by
Douglas A. Hicks, UFC Chair 2009-2010
April 30, 2010
February 19, 2010

Dr. Douglas A. Hicks
Associate Professor of Leadership Studies and Religion
and Chair, University Faculty Council
University of Richmond

Dear Doug:

I write in response to your e-mail of February 3, 2010 to Ann Lloyd Breeden, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, following my letter to you of November 24, 2009 and your e-mail response on November 30, 2009. I appreciate your continued interest in ensuring that the Board benefits from the advice of appropriate representative bodies in the formation of any future search Presidential committee.

As I indicated, and as Ann Lloyd reiterated in your recent phone conversation, while the Executive Committee is committed to inclusivity, it does not believe the University Bylaws are the appropriate place to codify such a commitment. Bylaws are, by their nature, very general guidelines and are not meant to give explicit guidance for particular situations in which latitude may be needed to respond to a current context. That said, it is my hope that this letter will provide helpful clarity. This letter reflects the February 11, 2010 discussion and decision of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and as you know, once an issue is decided by action of the Executive Committee, the decision becomes University policy.

I will address the faculty and staff issue explicitly, since I know that is your greatest concern. The Executive Committee agreed to the following: In forming the search committee for the President, the Board will consult with the recognized representative body for faculty and the recognized representative body for staff. At this time, those bodies are the University Faculty Council (UFC) and the University Staff Advisory Council (USAC). The Board will invite nominations from these recognized representative bodies (i.e., UFC and USAC, or the respective successor of each) and commits to accepting representation from a list of nominees provided by the bodies. At this time, however, we cannot predict the overall size of the committee. The Board reserves the right to determine the final size and composition of the committee, including supplementing the nominees with additional faculty and staff, should it wish to do so.
I understand the UFC’s concern with the way in which the previous search committee was originally constituted, and I agree that it would have been best to have consulted UFC before making the original faculty appointments to the committee. I have conveyed the intent of collaboration going forward; agreement about the importance of the role of faculty and staff (as well as alumni and students) in the Presidential selection process; and the value of the advice of the recognized representative bodies to inform selection of faculty and staff representatives. In addition, you and I agree that the selection of the University President is one of the Board’s most important duties—arguably its single most important duty—and that ultimate responsibility for the appointment of the President lies with the Board alone. Taken together, Doug, these considerations recommend a course like that outlined above: a clear commitment to a consultative process that preserves latitude for the Board to address any unforeseen circumstances.

Again, thank you for the time and careful thought you have given to this issue.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

George W. Wellde, Jr.
Rector

cc: Shawn Morrison, President USAC
March 12, 2010

Mr. George W. Wellde, Jr.
Rector, Board of Trustees
C/o Ms. Ann Lloyd Breeden
Secretary, Board of Trustees
University of Richmond

Dear Rector Wellde:

On behalf of the University Faculty Council (UFC), and in consultation with my colleagues in leadership of the University Staff Advisory Council (USAC), I want to thank you for your letter of February 19, 2010, regarding the formation of any future search committee for University President. In particular, we appreciate that the Board of Trustees Executive Committee has made it University policy that the Board shall consult with UFC and USAC and will accept representation from our respective lists of nominees. We are grateful for your careful work on this matter, and we certainly believe that this consultation and collaboration will be fruitful for all parts of the University.

We also understand that the ultimate responsibility for selecting the President is the responsibility of the Board alone. It is in this context that we understand your caveat that "[t]he Board reserves the right to determine the final size and composition of the committee, including supplementing the nominees with additional faculty and staff, should it wish to do so" [italics added]. As you know, the University Guide to Faculty Governance states, at III.A.2, that "[t]he University Faculty Council shall also nominate all faculty members to be appointed to screening and search committees for President and all Vice Presidents" [italics added]. At its meeting on February 25, the UFC considered the possibility that the Board might conceivably appoint a faculty member whom the UFC did not nominate, an action that would run counter to the University Faculty’s ruling Governance document. After some discussion, we concluded that, while we understand that the Board has ultimate authority on the hiring of a President, we would expect the Board to act outside of the normal University Faculty process on the nomination and appointment of faculty members, as codified in the Governance document, only in the case of a compelling University interest that the UFC failed to take into account in its nomination process. We understand this to be a high bar.
Again, many thanks to you and your colleagues on the Executive Committee for your deliberations last month and for establishing a policy for consultation and nomination. We look forward to continuing to collaborate with you on various issues for the University.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. Hicks
UFC Chair
Professor of Leadership Studies and Religion

Cc: Ann Lloyd Breeden, Secretary, Board of Trustees
    Steve Allred, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
    Erik Craft, Secretary of the University Faculty
    Shawn Morrison, Chair, USAC
    Del McWhorter, Secretary, UFC