

University Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

November 4, 2025, 4:15-5:15 PM

via [Zoom](#)

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

1. Call to Order 4:16
2. Approval of 10/29 minutes by consensus
3. **Section 7 Language:** We discussed the feedback from UFC on the proposed language for promotion and/or tenure.
 - a. The proposed criteria for teaching are consistent for each level of promotion, which makes that section simple and short compared to the sections for professional development and service. A comment proposed introducing a “developmental build” to the teaching criteria. The committee was reluctant to incorporate additional details to the criteria at this time due to (1) time constraints, (2) the option for departments that want more detailed benchmarks for teaching to incorporate them in their discipline-specific guidelines for promotion, and (3) the priority being to formalize current practice instead of introducing substantial changes (this could be done at a later time instead).
 - b. Another comment advocated for the sentence, “Each college and department at the University has its own set of promotion criteria that will be applied in individual promotion cases,” to be re-instated in Section 7.3. The argument presented in favor of this provision was that having college- and department-level criteria would facilitate accreditation. Argument made against this provision was that the specific department-level guidelines were the better place to accommodate the differences among disciplines than the overall criteria that the P&T committee should use.
 - i. After discussion, the committee voted against re-instating the sentence on a 4-1 vote. The COB member voted in favor.
 - c. The committee also reviewed several other smaller suggested edits.
 - d. The committee then voted to send the Section 7 language to UFC for approval on a 5-0 vote.

4. **Subcommittee Model 2.0:** We also discussed the proposed P&T model and the language in the proposal. Today's discussion was mostly focused on the presentation of information in the proposal, as our previous meetings included extensive discussion on the actual structure of the model.
 - a. One alteration to the model based on feedback received was adding a full-committee screening prior to subcommittee review, which also required minor revisions to the proposed timeline. One concern for the timeline for reviewing applications was that, if the full committee reads a subset of documents, then the initial screening of packages would be about one month. The committee decided that would not be too onerous, assuming that screening could be done asynchronously. Therefore, the timeline proposal involves candidate files being due mid-September, the full-committee screening process being completed by mid-October, and then subcommittee (or full committee review, in cases of concern) would be completed.
 - b. We also discussed how the proposal describes the process UFAC used to gather information related to AACSB accreditation. The proposal describes that process because the possibility that the proposed model would jeopardize COB's AACSB accreditation was the main point of disagreement among UFAC members.
 - i. The proposal stated that UFAC "consulted with" members of legacy COB faculty and a representative from AACSB, which could be taken as implying an endorsement of the resulting model.
 1. The committee agreed to clarify that the proposed model is a product of UFAC, and that stakeholders did not offer endorsement of the proposed model.
 2. A copy of the email correspondence between Melissa and Maria Baltar (Senior Manager, Accreditation, AACSB) is included at the end of the minutes.
 - c. We voted on a motion to pass the revised Subcommittee model and send it to UFC with recommendation to submit to all faculty for a vote. The motion passed (4-1), with the COB rep against.
 - i. We also reviewed the list of faculty eligible to vote (from Deb Schleef) and confirmed that the list assigns departments to their new colleges (eg, Math in COB).
5. **Motion from CAS P&T to revise *Faculty Handbook* §§ 7.2.3.1 and 7.2.4.1:** We tabled this discussion for a future meeting to avoid having multiple competing versions of Section 7 circulating.

6. **New language for Section 2:** A University-wide P&T committee would be a new standing committee, so it would require description in Section 2. UFAC has started a draft by pulling information from the Subcommittee proposal and other sources. We will take this up at a future meeting.
7. Next meeting to be **Dec 3, 2-3 PM**

Correspondence with AACSB

Melissa's email (10/9/25)

Good afternoon! My name is Melissa Wells, and I am chair of our University Faculty Affairs Committee at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA. Our College of Business is AACSB accredited. We underwent academic reorganization last year, which involved moving some additional departments into the previous College of Business. This means that our previous college-level promotion and tenure process will no longer be valid, and we are working on a possible university-wide committee model.

Our business stakeholders are very concerned that a university-wide model will not meet AACSB's expectations for shared governance. This model would be voted on by the faculty and then would have committee members elected by the faculty. We have reviewed the standards and the interpretation guidance, and I am not seeing language that would require a college-level committee or preclude a university-level committee. The most relevant language I see states that there should be "shared governance and active participation by a cross-section of faculty in university and college service" and that "faculty expectations, evaluation, promotion, and reward processes are systematic, transparent, and support the school's mission." I was wondering if you had any additional insights we should consider regarding promotion and tenure and maintaining AACSB accreditation? I am happy to discuss further via email or phone/Zoom.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Maria Baltar's response (10/10/25)

Dear Dr. Wells,

Thank you for reaching out and for providing helpful context regarding your university's reorganization and plans for a new promotion and tenure model.

You are correct that the standards and interpretive guidance do not prescribe a specific structure for promotion and tenure committees (for example, college-level versus university-wide). What AACSB emphasizes is that governance processes—whether at the university level or within business school—should demonstrate shared governance, transparency, and consistently applied.

From an accreditation standpoint, what matters most is that:

- The process is clearly defined, documented, and applied consistently across faculty;
- Faculty have meaningful input into decisions that affect their evaluation, promotion, and reward structures; and
- The model continues to support the distinct mission and strategic priorities of the College of Business within the broader institution.

If the university-wide committee model maintains those principles and provides appropriate representation and engagement from business faculty, it will be consistent with AACSB expectations.

I will be happy to participate in a zoom call if you would like to address any other issues.