

University Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

October 8, 2025, 2-3* PM

via [Zoom](#)

Committee members attending: Brad Lamphere, Melissa Wells, Nicole Crowder, Smita Jain Oxford, Ian Finlayson

1. Call to Order 2:01
2. Approval of 10/1 minutes occurred via email.
3. Review of proposed University-level criteria for Section 7
 - a. In the past, different sections of the Handbook and different academic units have had distinct criteria and/or different ways of describing those criteria. Our current effort aims to make the criteria more consistent and applicable across the University's academic units. To support that aim, the new language uses broad language to describe the criteria and supports them with a non-exhaustive list of examples that would meet those criteria.
 - b. Teaching section had similar criteria for promotion across the ranks (e.g., for Assist --> Assoc and Assoc --> Full). The committee's consensus was that they should be similar, given that teaching well is our primary task.
 - c. Professional activity had distinct language related to conference activity for Lect -> Senior Lect versus the other promotions. The committee changed that to make them consistent. It also revised the examples of professional activity to be clearer. Promotion from Assoc --> Full carries an expectation of professional recognition beyond campus, so the criteria reflect that higher standard for that step.
 - d. Service expectations had been listed as a nearly exhaustive list. The committee changed it to a list of examples that represent options. The committee's consensus was that promotion from Assoc--> Full should require a higher service level. For example, the criteria for that step indicate that mere membership in committees is not sufficient. Promotion at that level requires a "substantial contribution" to committees and/or "effective leadership" of them.
 - e. Next step is for UFAC to review the proposed language prior to sending it to the faculty via whole-faculty email for comment and then on to UFC. The goal is to send to faculty by 10/10 for review/discussion prior to the 10/22 UFC meeting.
4. Review of Subcommittee Model 2.0

- a. The committee reviewed several "Considerations" raised in feedback from UFC and others. The most substantive Considerations were a desire for a thorough review of files and for the committee to have the expertise needed to do a competent review. The challenge for UFAC is how to satisfy those needs while also keeping the workload for the P&T committee to a reasonable level.
- b. Concerns that the P&T decision should come from a thorough and representative review
 - i. The committee discussed a modification in which the whole P&T committee read the chair's letter and rationale, and the external letters (for promotion to Full). That would spread the responsibility for the P&T decision more broadly without increasing workload too much.
 - ii. Committee members will impact P&T decisions across the University. The consensus view is that all seats, including seats dedicated to a particular unit, should be elected by the faculty.
- c. Concerns that the committee will lack expertise in terms of the subject area or of the University's standards.
 - i. The proposal uses "disciplinary expertise" as a broader measure of familiarity with the applicant's field than "departmental expertise", while keeping the committee to a reasonable size. For example, an applicant from Chemistry would not be guaranteed to have a chemist on P&T, but would have a representative from the School of Science.
 - ii. To broaden the expertise on P&T, the committee recommends that at-large seats be elected "with preference for" departments that are not represented by unit-dedicated seats. That language would give UFOC some flexibility when there's a shortage of volunteers.
 - iii. Feedback also indicated that many believe that Full Professors' expertise is desirable for P&T. The committee discussed several options for ensuring that the committee has Full Professors.
 - 1. One option would be to require to the at-large positions to be Full
 - 2. Another would be to require a certain percentage to be Full, but that may be difficult to coordinate over time.
 - iv. Legacy COB proposed including language that would explicitly allow the colleges to form their own P&T committees. They argued that a college-level committee would more easily satisfy their accreditation standards.
 - 1. College-level P&T would mean the committee has more representation from departments closely related to the applicants'.

2. The committee could not agree on whether the other AACSB schools that have University-level P&T represented fair comparisons for UMW.
 - a. The argument against using them is that schools with unionized faculty are not a fair comparison to UMW.
 3. The committee could not agree on whether the proposed P&T model met the AACSB's recommendations for shared governance.
 4. Dr. Tabak has scheduled several meetings over the next week to discuss these concerns.
5. Adjournment 3:20
6. Upcoming meeting 10/29, 2-3 PM (definite)