September 18, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Educational Policy Committee:

Don R. Pippin, Chair
Susan Y. Dorsey
James W. Head
Lewis F. Payne
Terence P. Ross
E. Darracott Vaughan, Jr., M.D.
John O. Wynne
Gordon F. Rainey, Jr., Ex Officio

and

The Remaining Members of the Board:

William G. Crutchfield, Jr. Glynn D. Key
Thomas F. Farrell, II Mark J. Kington
G. Slaughter Fitz-Hugh, Jr. Thomas A. Saunders, III
W. Heywood Fralin Warren M. Thompson
Georgia M. Willis

FROM: Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr.

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Educational Policy Committee Meeting on September 18, 2004

The Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia met, in Open Session, at 9:35 a.m., Saturday, September 18, 2004, in the East Oval Room of the Rotunda; in the absence of the Chair, Mr. Pippin, Terence P. Ross presided as Acting Chair. Ms. Susan Y. Dorsey, James W. Head, Lewis F. Payne, John O. Wynne, and Gordon F. Rainey, Jr., Rector, were present.

The Acting Chair asked Mr. Block, Vice President and Provost, to present the Agenda.

Course Evaluations

Mr. Block asked Mr. Adams, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Professor of Biomedical Engineering, to report on course evaluation. Mr. Adams described the process of course evaluation and said student participation—roughly 65%—generally is good. There is need, though, for standardized questions on the course evaluation form, questions that are used in all schools and departments, and a joint faculty/student committee, appointed by the Provost, has recommended this.

The committee also recommended that course evaluation forms be kept short and that the questions be examined for redundancy. Also, there should be a response rate threshold of 65%—which is to say that courses where the evaluation response rate is below that should not be included in a course selection guide.

Mr. Adams pointed out that information from the course evaluations is available to the Provost and to the schools and departments for use in considerations of promotion, tenure and merit awards. Student Council uses information gleaned from the course evaluations for publication of a course selection guide.

The Provost will incorporate the recommendations of the committee in a three-year pilot program, which will begin this fall.

Mr. Ross commented that a course evaluation system works well at the George Mason University Law School, where he teaches. He suggested, too, that faculty—in descriptions of their courses—should make clear ahead of time exactly what the course work will be.

The January Term

The Provost then asked Mr. Adams to describe the January Term proposal, which will be implemented in January, 2005, initially only for undergraduates. The program will be intensive—a semester’s worth of work in two weeks—and will be conducted in early January during the latter part of the Christmas Break. The range of possibilities among course offerings is wide, and can include intensive courses outside the United States.

Mr. Adams said that ten courses have been approved so far and that he expects that in about three years, there will be 1000 students participating. The program will be administered by the
Summer School Office and the fees will be approximately those charged for Summer School courses.

There was enthusiastic response from the Committee. Mr. Head described a similar program at Middlebury College in which he participated as an undergraduate, before he transferred to the University. Ms. Dorsey, recalling the necessarily restrictive curriculum of her undergraduate days in the School of Architecture, pointed out that the January Term ought to be particularly attractive to Engineering and Architecture undergraduates who otherwise might not have much chance to take courses outside their respective schools.

In reply to a question from Mr. Ross, Mr. Adams said that for the moment, participation in the January Term will be limited to undergraduates but that he could envision participation by graduate students in the future. Mr. Ross also asked if the Committee could have an evaluation of this first January Term at one of its meetings next year.

The School of Medicine Decade Plan

The Provost asked Dr. Garson, Vice President and Dean of the School of Medicine, to report on the Medical School's "Decade Plan," and the strategic planning initiatives associated with it.

Dr. Garson outlined a number of points that make up the Plan. His goal for the School, he said, is to put it among the top 20 in the country by 2012 - the "top 20," means the twenty best medical schools in the nation as rated by US News & World Report. Mr. Wynne asked if the USNWR ratings were valid. Dr. Garson replied that he would use a different system of rating, but that USNWR's method is the one generally accepted in this country. He went on to say that his concern is to have outstanding people and outstanding programs, and that he wants to have ten of these in the Medical School; he said he believes that the School has a 50% chance of achieving this goal.

A lively discussion ensued. Dr. Garson stressed the virtues of collaboration between the Medical School, the Medical Center, the School of Nursing and other schools and departments across the University. The recruitment of excellent students and department chairs is important, and he described some recent successes in this regard: Dr. Cato Laurencin as Chair of Orthopaedics and Dr. Bankole Johnson as Chair of Psychiatry - two recent appointments - and Dr. Geoffrey Weiss as Chair of Hematology/Oncology and Dr. Michael Drake as Chair of Radiology - two appointments announced in the last few days; and excellent success in recruiting minority students this year. The retention of faculty is always a problem, he said, and the fact that
teaching is valued – that is, valued by students – must be emphasized. Dr. Garson also described more efficient ways of using research space.

Mr. Ross asked Dr. Garson to keep the Committee apprised of progress on these initiatives.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Provost asked Ms. Marcia Childress, Associate Professor of Medical Education and Chair of the Faculty Senate, to report on the activities of the Senate.

Ms. Childress’s report focused on the Senate’s annual retreat, held on September 10th. The theme, she said, was “Enriching Faculty Life at UVa – Interdisciplinary Collaboration.” The discussion explored collaborations of five kinds: interdisciplinary collaborative teaching; mentoring of and by faculty; faculty advancement; cultivating a more vibrant community of emeritus and retired faculty; and assuring and benefiting from diversity in the ranks of the faculty and across the institution.

Ms. Childress told the Committee that she is impressed both with the quality of the faculty – individually and in the aggregate – and with the commitment of the faculty to the University. Faculty from across the Grounds, she said, undertake institutional service and invest themselves substantially in it. Faculty “are a tremendous resource as the University seeks to move into the top tier of institutions nationally, public and private. They care deeply about UVa and are ready to work long and hard in partnership with this committee, the full Board, and the administration to make UVa a better place in which to work and to call our academic home.”

Executive Session

After approving the following motion, the Committee went into Executive Session at 11:25 a.m.:

That the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters pertaining to the appointment, assignment, reappointment, promotion, performance, compensation, discipline, separation and resignation of specific employees of the University of Virginia; as provided for in Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1) of the Code of Virginia.
The Committee resumed in Open Session at 12:25 p.m. and after adopting the following resolution certifying that its Executive Session discussions had been conducted in accord with the conditions set forth by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, on further motion adjourned:

That we vote on and record our certification that, to the best of each Board member’s knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements and which were identified in the motion(s) authorizing the closed session, were heard, discussed or considered in closed session.

AGG:lah
These minutes have been posted to the University of Virginia’s Board of Visitors website.
http://www.virginia.edu/bov/educationalminutes.html