

MINUTES  
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
2 May, 1995

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer at 3:34 PM and the minutes of the meeting of 4 April, 1995 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Lutzer reminded the Faculty of the importance of meeting the grade reporting deadlines and requested that notices of faculty and student accomplishments be forwarded to the Dean's office for public announcement.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

President Sullivan began with his impressions about the College's current situation, stressing the importance of the adoption of the Strategic Plan, which demanded difficult decisions, critical for the institution's welfare because of the difficult nature of the external environment. Positive aspects are the relative unity of higher education in putting forward its case and the creation of the Business Higher Education Council.

The President thanked Dean Lutzer for his leadership and his judgment, rock-solid integrity, and values. He also expressed confidence in the new dean, Carol Jacklin.

Provost Cell rose and immediately yielded the floor to Professor Miles Chappell, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, in order that the latter might read the following tribute to Dean David J. Lutzer:

"This tribute is in the tradition of the Dean himself who is a man of few words but long memos. The Faculty Affairs Committee, on behalf of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, formally thanks Dean Lutzer for his leadership as our Dean since 1987. Throughout the years, as many will know personally and from working on committees, such as the Dean's Advisory Council and Faculty Affairs, Dave Lutzer has shown the greatest concern for the well being of the curriculum, the students, and the faculty. Our long memo in Dave's honor was reflected in the Jefferson award. Today we point out with few words a small but telling parallel with this institution's sometimes illustrious past. About 1990, David J. Lutzer, Clyde Haulman, the EPC. and other colleagues embarked on a major revision of the undergraduate program. The revision, now known as the New Curriculum, was designed

to provide the student with depth in one or more fields and multicultural breadth in others. In this, the revision has something in common with the first major revision by Thomas Jefferson. In fact, there is a rumor that the J. in David J. stands for this well known freshman advisor. This may or may not be true, but for other Jeffersonian qualities we thank you Dave Lutzer with this standing ovation for being our leader in these past years."

The Faculty rose and responded with long and enthusiastic applause.

Provost Cell then thanked the Dean for his help and cooperation and presented him with a gift from the Faculty.

Dean Lutzer: "Thanks. The more I hear about this guy Lutzer, the better I like him."

The Faculty insisted that he open the present, which turned out to be a small replica of the statue of James Blair which stands outside the window of the Dean's former office in James Blair Hall.

Provost Cell announced that updates on the plans for the implementation of the Strategic Plan over the next two years were available on WAMI and that the Budget Committee was at work on decisions regarding the administrative downsizing process which are critical to release funds for academic programs. Regarding the retirement aspects of the Workforce Transition Act, it is important to make a case to retain the positions and the dollars, and no administrative recommendation on faculty retirement would be made until the first step (staff) is settled.

She then discussed drafts of two important policy documents: one a policy on financial conflict of interest and another on outside employment. The federal government requires that the first be in place by 1 July, 1995; it addresses three circumstances:

1. when the College receives a government grant and an individual has a significant personal or familial financial interest in a business which may benefit;
2. when the College gets a contract from a business and an individual has a significant personal or familial financial interest in a business which may benefit;
3. when a staff or faculty member wants to involve students in his or her own business venture or paid employment, in which case it is necessary to ascertain

the educational value of the opportunity and protect the students against exploitation.

The External Paid Employment Policy replaces the old policy and clarifies it in many respects:

1. such employment should not interfere in any way with the faculty member's primary responsibility to the College;
2. there should not be any use of College facilities without financial remuneration, nor use of the name of the College in inappropriate ways;
3. the College is to be properly and completely informed of all such activities;
4. the summer months are excluded for those on 9/10 month contracts;
5. outside employment should be professionally related in the majority of cases;
6. any use of students must be non-exploitive;
7. there must be professionalism in how we use our time -- beware of excessive use of time for external employment. The time guidelines are mainstream now, similar to other Virginia institutions.

(A fire alarm sounded at 4:13 PM, causing the Faculty to evacuate the building until 4:28, at which time they reassembled and the meeting reconvened.)

Professor Tiefel commented that we can expect criticism by the state and that the document could provide a ready-made trap in a hostile climate; we need to be careful about statistics, not in substance, but in appearance; perhaps it would be better to use 'overload' rather than 'outside' to be more defensive.

Provost Cell responded that although she could agree on some points, she considers this policy protective, and it is not being driven by the state.

Professor McGlennon stated that we need to be very careful about policy on external employment; this does not seem to clarify all the issues addressed, for example: is an invitation to do a seminar paper for a small honorarium covered? The proposal seems to lack precision of wording and leave the faculty open to charges of violations. It is necessary to clarify several other important issues, such as profitable

hobbies and whether we would not be allowed to hire students who respond to adds for jobs open to anyone.

Provost Cell answered that the focus is to be on professional activity, but the state Attorney General's office caused some vagueness.

Professor McGlennon then asked whether the adoption of these policies comes under the voting procedures of the Faculty Handbook.

Provost Cell: "The second part."

Professor Rublein suggested that this discussion raises questions about the breadth of application: does it apply to students working in fields unrelated to the courses, etc., or only to situations where the student would be supervised by the same person as both an employee and a student?

Provost Cell replied that the point is to avoid any damage to the students' educational careers.

Professor Gary DeFotis added that it is too easy to find imaginative examples which will paralyze the process.

Professor McGlennon stressed that he wanted the language of the document to be as helpful as possible to clarify these points.

Provost Cell pointed out that the new policy is less intrusive in that it does not ask how much you are earning.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### Nominations Committee

Professor Alan Ward placed in nomination the following:

for two positions on the Board of Faculty Compensation:

Norman Fashing (Biology)  
John McGlennon (Government)  
Carl Vermeulen (Biology)  
Teresa Longo (Modern Languages)

for one position on the Committee on Degrees:

Mark Fowler (Philosophy)  
Beatrice Guenther (Modern Languages)

for one member from Area III on the Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure:

John Delos (Physics)  
Richard Kiefer (Chemistry)

for two positions on the Committee on Procedural Review:

Carla Buck (Modern Languages)  
Susan Donaldson (English)  
Satoshi Ito (Sociology)  
Marlene Jack (Art and Art History)

for the Chair of the Educational Policy Committee:

Jesse Bohl (Philosophy)

Dean Lutzer called for nominations from the floor; there being none, he called for a motion that the nominations be closed; it was so moved and seconded and the motion passed by a voice vote. Ballots were then collected.

#### Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Miles Chappell began by commending the Committee members for their service during the 1994-95 year. Issues discussed during the four meetings of April fell under three headings:

1. Administrative Organization: the Committee discussed the filling of university-wide committee memberships, made a recommendation to the Provost that the report of the ad hoc Summer School Committee be given serious consideration, advised the Dean on budget cuts, discussed concerns about governance and the divisionism of new and established, i.e. older, faculty members, drafting a governance letter which was recently sent, discussed draft #8 of the sexual harassment policy, which is currently being reviewed by the Attorney General.

2. Curriculum: having reviewed the self-scheduled examination proposal from the students, the Committee felt that the honor system issues warranted review and comment by the Task Force on Judicial Systems and requested the same.

3. Faculty Personnel issues: the Faculty Affairs Committee, in a letter to President Sullivan, reiterated the importance of his 1993 commitment to improving faculty salaries; the Committee also discussed further the progress of the revisions for the Faculty Handbook, to be distributed at the beginning of the Fall Semester; finally, the drafts of the policy statements on financial conflict and external activities were discussed at length and in detail and expressed concerns about the definition of the workweek and the restrictions on employing students.

## Educational Policy Committee

Professor Tracy expressed "thanks to Dave for making the year interesting and educational for me." He then discussed the continuing process of estimating the resources needed and available for the new curriculum. The exemption criteria for GER's must also be clarified before the new curriculum is put into effect. The Committee report also includes items on further discussion of the computing resources for that requirement, an update on pilot projects, the conversion of the Applied Science Program to a Department, and changes in the continuance and probation requirements.

He then moved the changes in the continuance and probation requirements proposed in the Committee report. The motion passed by a voice vote.

Next, he moved the motion introduced in the April meeting regarding additional information to be included on transcripts, and the motion also passed by a voice vote.

Dean Scholnick then introduced the document on changing Applied Science to a department; the motion was being made by two committees.

Professor Deborah Green objected that this change should not be made without a consideration of the differences in structure of interdisciplinary programs vs. departments; the language of the motion seems to favor departmental status and suggest a need to get promoted to such a status.

Professor Manos responded that Applied Science was chartered to become a department eventually.

Professor Morton Eckhause asked whether this motion requires SCHEV's approval.

Dean Lutzer answered affirmatively and added that it may also require a new department code at the state level.

The next question posed was whether or not we should accept the precedent and idea of having a graduate-only department.

Dean Scholnick replied that students need to have a Bachelor's mastery of one discipline before going on to this level of work in applied science.

Professor Tracy added that the Applied Science situation is uniquely appropriate to be graduate only.

Professor John Finn favored the proposal because of the program's success and the strong opportunities for good benefits for our undergraduates, but agreed with Professor Green's fears.

Professor Thomas Finn expressed concern based on his experience that: "Things around here become precedents for the flimsiest of reasons," and then asked what the cost of the change would be.

Professor Manos: "No additional cost over current levels of expenditure."

Professor Thomas Finn then quoted from the document containing the proposal under debate: "This vote should not be taken as an endorsement of priority in faculty hiring."

Dean Lutzer commented that Applied Science has great attraction in Richmond through budget initiatives and agreed that a vote in favor of this resolution ought not be interpreted as a statement of faculty priority for applied science.

Professor Thomas Finn: "Subjunctives make me nervous."

Professor Kreps asked about the projected size of the program over five years.

Professor Manos replied that it would grow to about 100 students in five years; now there are about 61.

Professor Clemens affirmed that he was still worried about the policy precedents being set. Are we saying that all programs should become departments eventually?

Professor Kreps pointed out that it matters what the related and contributing departments think -- in this case they agree; in other cases they will not. This vote does not set a precedent.

Dean Scholnick added that it makes sense to all concerned on a practical level.

Professor Morton Eckhause pointed out that this has been looked at thoroughly by two committees; it is not just a self-evaluation by the program itself.

Professor Deborah Green objected that there still seems to be an assumption that it's better to be a department than a program.

Professor Rapoport added: "Doesn't this move away from the trend of having the programs help to strengthen the contributing departments?"

Professor Vold's response was that the document has language to affirm the continuation of close ties.

The proposal passed by a voice vote.

Professor Alan Ward rose to express concern about the faculty governance document: we don't know a lot of information about the service issue, except that there are a lot of committees, recently much increased. The Nominating Committee needs a tabulation of faculty service loads and the new Dean should consider this in merit evaluations. That does not, however, solve the problem of too many committees.

Dean Lutzer called upon tenured faculty to shoulder the majority of governance duties and called this the price of protecting some from over loads.

Dean Lutzer then announced the election results:

Board of Faculty Compensation:	McGlennon and Longo
Committee on Degrees:	Fowler
Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure:	Kiefer
Procedural Review Committee:	Donaldson and Ito
Chair of the Educational Policy Committee:	Bohl

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James R. Baron

Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences