Call to Order

Provost June Aprille called the meeting to order at 9:05 PM in the Alice Haynes Room of the Tyler Haynes Commons.

Announcements

Four awards were announced.

1. Outgoing ODK president, Jaime Settle, presented the ODK Outstanding Faculty Member of the Year Award to Ellis West
2. Ethan McWilliams presented the RCSGA Faculty Member of the Year Award to Ellis West
3. Ethan McWilliams presented the Administrator/Staff Member of the Year Award to Dean Steve Bisese.

Consent Agenda

The following consent agenda items were approved without dissent or abstentions. (See the online agenda for details and Web links.)

1. Minutes of the March 16, 2006 meeting.
3. Approval of University Faculty Committee Membership for 2005-2006.

Reports

1. President's Report. President Cooper distributed a summary and reported briefly on the May Board of Trustees meeting. George Wellde has been elected as the new Rector of the University. The endowment now stands at $1.39 billion.

2. Provost's Remarks. Provost Aprille commented on several topics.
   a. Common Ground Update. Major changes in Human Resources will affect organization and processes; to include salary benchmarking, management training, and recruiting methods. Following a national search, Dr. Glyn Hughes has been appointed Director of Common Ground, effective July 15, 2006. Office space will be created within the area now occupied by the Center for Civic Engagement.
   b. Undergraduate Admissions. 5,413 applications have been received for 750 spots. Although applications are down 6.3% overall, this is not true for all groups. International, minority, and Virginia applications are up ten percent. While male applications are down ten percent, female applications are down only four percent. Our acceptance rate is forty-five percent, better than last year. We also have a better yield (31%) this year than last (28%). The female-male split is approximately equal. Forty-one Richmond Scholars will matriculate.
c. Provost Aprille thanked three retiring faculty members for their years of dedicated service to the University: Fred Kozub (38 years), Bob Nelson (30 years), and Elizabeth Scott (25 years). She also recognized several faculty for twenty-five years of service: Gary Greenfield, Lewis Tremaine, and Myra Daleng from Arts and Sciences; Neil Ashworth, John Earl, and Bob Schmidt from the Business School; and Martha Edmonds, Gregory Foreman, Rosalind Reilly, Elizabeth Scott, and Michael Wriston from the School of Continuing Studies.

**End-of-Year Committee Reports.** All committee reports are linked from the meeting agenda on the Provost's Web site.

**Old Business**

1. **Credit Committee Report.** (See the agenda for link to the committee proposal.) David Leary, speaking as committee chair, moved the committee report and its recommendations and prefaced the discussion with a few remarks. He noted that committee members came to the task with preconceptions but open minds. The committee operated on a unanimous agreement model that each proposal was the best that they could do. The working principle was what would be best for our students at this point in time.

The Provost moderated the ensuing debate with strict attention to parliamentary rules.

Ellis West moved that recommendation 5 be amended to replace the phrase “with the proviso that quarter units may be earned only on a Pass/Fail basis” with the phrase “and that all departments or schools review their courses to see if there are any that should be offered only on a Pass/Fail basis.” Ellis argued that departments should be given this flexibility. David Leary noted that the committee preferred only full and half-unit courses but recognized that there are some worthwhile experiences that warrants neither a half-unit nor a grade. The amendment failed by hand vote: 53 ayes and 74 nays.

Ellis West made a motion to remove recommendation 1 that decouples seat time and academic credit. Ellis argued that adopting a principle as a policy sets a dangerous precedent. Furthermore, it is unnecessary since recommendations 2 and 4 state the requirements for work. David Leary argued that it is important to state this explicitly since a number of faculty members equate seat time with credits. The amendment failed by hand vote with 29 ayes and 97 nays.

Dan Palazzolo moved that recommendation 11 be amended by rewording the phrase “the maximum number of units that a student should be allowed to take per semester should be 5” to “students should be strongly advised to take no more than 5 units per semester.” Dan argued that there are students who are not fragmented by extra-curricular activities and would like to take more courses. David Leary noted that the current proposal is nearly the equivalent of the current system allowing a maximum of 18 credits since 5 x 3.5 credits = 17.5 credits and strong students would be able to request Dean’s approval as they do now. The amendment passed by hand vote with 68 ayes and 63 nays.

Art Charlesworth moved that a new recommendation be added to the committee’s proposal. “Students should be asked how many hours per week they spend for a course, on a specific course-by-course basis, and the results should not be reported until after the course has been completed.” Discussion focused on the general nature of the
recommendation to allow flexibility for implementation. The motion passed by voice vote.

Jim Monks moved that recommendation 10 be amended to reduce the minimum number of units defining full-time status from 3.5 to 3. Jim noted that a student who registers for four units but then drops a unit will lose full-time status which would mean loss of eligibility for financial aid. Others noted that this situation already exists for students taking 12 or 13 credits who drop a course. The amendment failed by voice vote.

Andy Szakmary proposed an amendment to recommendation 9 to reduce the minimum number of units that a student must take at UR (or in an approved study abroad program while enrolled at UR) from 30 to 27. Andy noted that the current number of AP/IB allowed is 30 of 120 credits (25%). His analysis of peer and aspirant schools (distributed electronically) indicates that UR is approximately in the middle for this requirement. Under the proposed rule, the maximum would be 5 of 35 units (14%) which is the fourth most restrictive among surveyed schools. Discussion included the following points: these remain high school courses and should be restricted; AP courses are becoming an important means for minority students to gain acceptance to selective universities; departments can effectively restrict numbers by setting higher standards for minimum AP/IB scores; and admissions experience is that prospective students take AP restrictions into account when choosing a school but they often take more college courses than planned after getting here. A friendly amendment was accepted to set the minimum number to 28 (rather than 27). The amended motion passed by hand vote: 65 ayes and 51 nays.

Bill Myers moved that recommendation 10 be amended by eliminating the sentence, “In addition, we recommend that this 30-unit minimum may be fulfilled with any course that is worth at least a half unit (that is, exclusive of quarter units.)” The motion passed by voice vote without further discussion.

Ellis West moved that recommendation 8 be amended to increase the minimum number of units require for graduation from 35 to 38. Ellis argued that the case has not been made for reducing units to 35; there has not been a survey of student or alumni; the proposal does not mention negative effects; and the 38-unit distinction could be used in marketing. April Hill noted that very few science students take 38 or more units currently; most take 30-32; 35 is pushing it; 38 is nearly impossible. Andy Newcomb also noted that a large number of students currently take fewer than 38 units. The motion failed by voice vote.

Hearing no new amendments or discussion, the Provost called the question. The Credit Committee Recommendations, as amended, passed by voice vote. General applause followed to acknowledge the good work of the Credit Committee.

2. Task Force on the Undergraduate Education (See the agenda for links.)

   a. Steering Committee Report. Provost Aprille noted that the final report of the Steering Committee has been distributed with the meeting agenda. For the record, the report records that the proposed curriculum revisions failed by electronic ballot of the undergraduate faculties which were delegated by University Faculty to deal with this this issue The assembly offered a round of applause for the TFUGE Steering Committee to acknowledge their efforts. The Provost also noted that she had consulted with the General Education Committee about how to
proceed with further review/revision of the undergraduate general education curriculum. She mentioned that our efforts so far may have been hampered by the fact that the faculty were not in the same room at the same time to discuss, amend and vote on the proposal as we just did for the Credit Committee recommendations. Two other schools that she contacted had a mandatory and very successful all-day retreat (at a nice place with good food) to accomplish major curriculum changes. We might benefit from that model.

b. Athletics and Academics Subcommittee Report. An interim report with recommendations was posted with the meeting agenda. A final report will be forthcoming in the fall semester.

**New Business**

1. **Proposals for courses requiring Field of Study Approval.** A proposal for Field-of-Study credit for CHEM 111 (Chemistry Detectives: Solving Real World Puzzles) was approved without dissent. (See the agenda for links to the course description.)

2. **Motion to create a new committee to study general education writing requirement.**

   Ellis West offered the following motion.
   
   “That as soon as possible the University Committee on Committees appoint a special committee that will, after investigating what other universities are doing to improve the writing of their students and what the nation's leading experts on writing pedagogy say is the best way to improve the writing of college students, recommend to the University of Richmond faculty a general education requirement or other measure(s) that in its opinion would best serve to improve the quality of our students' writing; that said committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members, three from the School of Arts & Sciences and one each from the Business School and the Leadership School; and that said committee will issue its report to the faculty before the end of the fall semester, 2006.”

   Joe Essid posed two questions. First, the restriction to tenured faculty eliminates the Director of the Writing Center from serving on the committee. Why not delete that restriction? Ellis responded that that although the Director could serve in an advisory capacity, his intention was to obtain fresh perspective on the committee. Second, why not employ the General Education Committee for this purpose. Ellis replied that they will have enough on their plate with reviewing the TFUGE proposal. The Provost corrected the last comment to note that the General Education Committee will not be taking up major curriculum revision as a body this fall, but that they will be very busy defining a plan for learning outcome assessment as required for SACS Accreditation.

   A motion to revise the phrase “five tenured faculty members” to “tenured faculty members” was made and passed by voice vote. The amended motion passed by voice vote.

   Dan Palazzolo made a motion to further revise the motion to allow non-tenured faculty members to serve on the committee. The amended motion passed by voice vote.
3. University Faculty Council items - Catherine Bagwell. (See the agenda for links.)

   a. Motion for policy on faculty search procedures designed to promote diversity. The motion passed by voice vote without discussion.

   b. Motion to recommend revision to "Selection of Department Chairs" in Guide to Governance.

Ellis West moved following amendment (amended sections in bold type) on behalf of the Provost.

"All department chairs are appointed by the President of the University. In practice, however, and in the spirit of shared governance, the President delegates responsibility to the Provost, Deans and departments, for recommending suitable chair candidates to the President in the manner prescribed below. Department chairs in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Robins School of Business ordinarily are nominated by the regular full-time department faculty acting as a collective and deliberative body and voting ordinarily by secret ballot. The person nominated will have the approval of at least half of the department’s members. The department’s nomination will be in the form of a letter to the Dean of their school that explains the department’s choice of a chair. Although individual members of the department should be informed that they have the right to send a confidential letter of their own to the Dean, such letters should not be required or even solicited by the Dean. If the Dean does not support the department’s nomination, the Dean meets with the department to explain his or her reasons for not supporting the nomination. The department will then reevaluate their nomination and consider the Dean’s objections. Subsequently, the department will communicate their choice of candidate for chair to the Dean. The Dean and the department will remain in consultation until a mutually agreeable candidate has been selected and has agreed to serve as chair. A mutually agreeable candidate is a person who has the support of both the Dean and at least 50% of the regular full-time department faculty. The consensus candidate’s name is forwarded to the Provost and then to the President as a recommendation for appointment. In rare instances when a consensus is not attained in a timely manner after protracted effort, the record of consultations and reasoning on all sides will be communicated to the Provost for resolution and recommendation to the President. Chairs are appointed for a term of a specified number of years and normally are eligible for reappointment for additional terms. Chairs are responsible to the Dean for the normal operations of the department, including scheduling of classes, assignment of instructors, preparation of annual budgets, and recommendation of employment, promotion, tenure and salary increases of faculty members in their departments. Chairs represent their departments to the administration as well as in the Academic Council and the University Senate and are expected to keep their departments informed of actions of both of these bodies."
The motion to amend passed by voice vote. The amended motion passed by voice vote

c. Report on "Email Privacy Policy." As an informational item, Catherine noted that the University Faculty Council endorsed this policy unanimously. So that it would be official university policy, Ellis West moved that the faculty approve this policy. The motion passed by voice vote.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Schmidt, University Faculty Secretary

9/8/06