

CAS Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
February 19, 2020
4:00 pm, HCC 111

In attendance: Patrick Catullo (for Drew Delaney), Jackie Gallagher (secretary), Helen Housley, Miriam Liss, Laura Mentore (Vice President), Sarah Morealli, Gregg Stull.

Visiting: Keith Mellinger.

Unable to attend: Larry Lehman, Angela Pitts (President).

In Angela's absence, Laura chaired the meeting.

- I. Minutes, 11/20/19 and 1/22/20. Approved unanimously.
- II. Dean's Report to UFC (see attachment).
Some discussion about state budget, planning funds for new theatre complex, possible raises.
Discussion about the endowed chair in Physics: this has been in the works for a number of years, will be treated as a supplement to the faculty line.
- III. Old Business
 - a. CAS Faculty Council: structure and future
Suggestion to hold meetings only as needed, electronically or in person. No decision made.
 - b. Discussion of Feedback from/in the All Faculty Meeting, 2/4/20
Brief discussion.
 - c. Piloting a "Super" Gen Ed Committee for 20/21 academic year?
Brief discussion. Mixed reviews from CAS Chair's Meeting, and our constituents. Some would like to see a diagram of what it would look like.
 - d. Curriculum Process Revision? Feedback, Pathway, and Process going forward
No real discussion (no time!). Perhaps we should wait till new electronic system is in use and see how that changes the process, rather than suggest changes beforehand.
- IV. New Business
 - a. Anthropology Program Review by SCHEV
Laura explained that SCHEV considers all degree programs in groups; each has a set minimum number of majors **and** minimum number of graduates, which are calculated by averaging over 5 years for each institution. Each institution's degree programs fall into the same group as all others and have the same minimum numbers, regardless of size of institution. So, for example, Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics and Geography must have 48 FTE majors and 12 graduating seniors; Art History, Computer Science, Modern Foreign Languages, Music and the sciences must have 36 majors and 9 graduates. Programs are reviewed every 5 years, and may be reduced from program status if they do not maintain numbers. This doesn't mean elimination – American Studies became a Special Major instead of being a degree program.

Most recent data can be seen [here](#). Having a low number in one category (e.g. number of graduates) but not the other (number of majors) is like a warning.

“Degree program” does not always equate with “major” – e.g. EESC has a single degree program, which has 4 majors. Sociology and Anthropology are two separate degree programs housed in the same department. ANTH became a degree program/major in 2006.

SCHEV’s policies do not allow for strategic shrinking. UMW might get smaller but SCHEV will still expect us to have the same minimum numbers as the big public schools. As a faculty, we should discuss these metrics – we should be aware of this kind of “control” that SCHEV has over us.

ANTH faculty have written a response to SCHEV, with help from Dean Mellinger and Provost Morello. SCHEV provides guidelines to address by way of justification for maintaining the program. Laura is cautiously optimistic about a successful argument.

- b. Formalized Meeting Times – ran out of time; no discussion!
- c. Making UMW Transfer Friendly – ran out of time; no discussion!
- d. Other: Considerable discussion about the structure of CAS and the university.
This occurred in the middle of the Old Business.
Should we consider restructuring of CAS? Should that include the other colleges?
It is hard for 20 departments to be nimble, to react to impending changes strategically. It is difficult for the Dean to advocate across the board, all the time.
We are lopsided with two small colleges and the very large CAS.

Any changes would have to ensure that there is NOT a new layer of administrators.

Changes might allow a better flow for curriculum changes, would allow easier response to VCCS; would be faculty driven rather than top-down.

What would the positive and negative outcomes be?

Dean Mellinger says that if we had, say, 3 colleges or schools of the same size, with a common structure, it would be easier to get work done: e.g. school of social sciences, curriculum committee would deal with proposals that the group members understood well; a P&T committee would have good comprehension of requirements in the social sciences. University level committees would have 2 members representing each school – so would be smaller, and again more nimble. It might be easier for marketing and advancement – speaking with The Dean is very desirable to donors, but he spends 70-80% of time on operations, doesn’t have time to meet with donors. From a student perspective, most have no idea that their department is in the CAS; having a school might spark some additional pride that would encourage donations.

How to further explore this idea? What might a restructuring really look like? Decided that we need to devote a whole CAS FC meeting to it, to look at how other schools about our size are structured. Dean Mellinger knows that W&M have one CAS, but it has a large number of assistant deans, who probably manage operations on a daily basis!

Adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Our next scheduled meeting is Wednesday March 18.