

Faculty Assembly Meeting
27 March 2007

Present: Allred, Armstrong, Beers, Brown, Canuel, Cate-Arries, Cooke, Fuchs, Evans, Kennedy, Kulick, Lee, Leslie, Linneman, Macdonald, Meese, Meyers, Sheriff, Smith, White

Absent: Diaz

Others in Attendance: Provost Feiss, Dean Strikwerda, Will Hausman

The meeting was called to order at 15:35 by Katherine Kulick.

1. Approval of the minutes of the February 2007 Meeting.

Kennedy presented a motion for approval of the minutes for the February 27, 2007 meeting. Beers seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote pending minor edits.

2. Provost's Report.

The Governor has amended the state budget to allow institutions to increase tuition above 6% if the additional funds are used for need-based, financial aid for in-state undergraduate students. This is positive announcement because it will give William & Mary increased flexibility.

Undergraduate Admissions: Letters of acceptance have gone out to in-state students. Out-of-state and transfer students will be notified in near future.

BOV will be here in about 3 weeks. The budget will be discussed at this meeting.

The Faculty Retirement and Return to Work Policy has been returned to the Provost from the Attorney General's office. This constitutes approval from the Governor. The Provost is ready to implement this new policy pending input from the Faculty Assembly.

3. FA Committee Reports

Liaison Committee (Meese): Committee had no business to report to the Assembly.

Academic Affairs Committee (Diaz): Diaz was absent. He informed the Secretary by e-mail that the Committee had no news to report.

COPAR (White):

Howard Busbee and Brian Hiestand of the W&M Foundation will report to the Assembly at its April meeting.

COPAR has met with the Office of Institutional Research and David Kranbuehl to collate information for an annual report that will provide useful information about the College to the Assembly.

Faculty Affairs (Armstrong):

Armstrong noted that Sections III C, D, H and I have been reviewed by FAFAC. Kulick noted that the Assembly will begin its discussion of these sections at today's meeting. Because the requisite amount of time for review of these sections has not passed, there will not be a vote today.

Discussion of the Handbook was deferred to later in the meeting to hear a report from the Faculty Compensation Board (FCB).

Presentation from Faculty Compensation Board (Will Hausman)

The FCB has been discussing several aspects of faculty compensation including phased retirement, alternate retirement plans, and a tuition benefit for children of faculty. However, the issue of faculty salaries remains at the heart of their discussions. FCB feel that the institution needs to get serious about achieving long-standing goals. Overall, W&M has done good job with recruiting recent hires and retaining them despite low salaries. There is a sense that this will not continue unless the issue of faculty salaries is addressed.

The 1994 Self-Study recommended a goal of faculty salaries reaching the 75th percentile of our peer group. This goal was subsequently endorsed in the "Into the Fourth Century" plan. Recently, President Nichol has affirmed this goal.

FCB questions the seriousness of this goal when the institution has not yet met the 50th percentile. A long process has ensued for trying to make progress on this issue.

For the upcoming fiscal year, the State has recommended 4% increases in faculty salaries. However, the state funds only 40% of this increase; The College funds the remaining 60% primarily through tuition.

W&M's percentile ranking is low relative to other doctoral institutions in state (35th vs. average of 40th). It appears that other campuses have done better relative to their peer groups. However, the State has no interest in providing differential support for faculty salary increases.

Relative to our peer group, all schools except SUNY Albany are listed in US News and World Reports rankings. While W&M performs at the 75th percentile, our faculty are being paid at the 38th percentile.

Hausman recommended that the administration ask SCHEV why they include schools not on US News and World Reports rankings in our peer group. W&M should ask for a fair and reasonable peer group and faculty salaries should be above average within this peer group.

Hausman suggested the following as possible actions:

1. Inquire whether the BOV could develop an institutional peer group. A future goal would be to keep our salaries at the median of this peer group.
2. There used to be Biennial Report to FCB by the Provost. This was last done in 1996. He recommends reinstating periodic report to the Faculty Compensation Board.
3. Private money could be added to state money so that we can attain 50th percentile.

Kulick mentioned that Sam Jones was supposed to be at today's FA meeting but was unable to attend. Instead, Sam Jones provided data for average faculty salary increases over past four years to provide context.

Discussion:

Kennedy: The document that was distributed shows projections for our percentile rank within our peer group (45th in 2008). What figures were used for these projections?

Kulick: It is an estimate because we do not know what increases will be at other institutions.

Meese: Does the BOV have a plan?

Provost: The BOV plan is to get us to 75th percentile by 2010.

Kennedy: Does the BOV's plan reflect 4% salary increases or what we actually get (some funds are used for equity adjustments, promotions, retention, etc)?

Provost: The projections are based on 4%.

Smith: What is the projected relative increase for our peer groups?

Provost: W&M has a disparate peer group with high increases at private schools and lower increases at public institutions. The national average is ~3.6% (Provost is uncertain about this value)

Hausman: How much do tuition increases need to be to raise salaries to meet our goals?

Meese: Approximately 1% increase for in-state tuition would meet our goal.

Smith: What is the BOV's plan for meeting this goal?

Hausman: We would need ~9% increases for next two years. 5-6% for 2010.

Meese: We should be careful about looking at the average. Instead, we should be looking at median. Last years 5% increases were actually closer to 3 to 3.5%.

Kulick: The State has provided differential increases in the past but not in recent years. The State believes it is making good progress across the board using averages. However, progress cannot be done with across the board averages.

Meese: When will BOV decide how much to add to state appropriation for salary increases?

Provost: At the April meeting. Information will be brought to finance committee following meeting.

Meese: Should we do something to communicate our goals?

Provost: Sam Jones, Anna Martin and Provost will present figures to President. President will convey his wishes to finance committee.

Smith: Why would BOV not authorize the percentage needed to meet their goal?

Provost: So far, on target for 60th percentile by 2010.

Meese: Other goals have been added along the way without meeting this faculty salary goal.

Kulick: According to recent faculty survey, salary remains an issue across institution.

Hausman: Need an honest goal that we can reach. 60th percentile of our peer group is reasonable.

Cooke: Top three institutions in VA are similar. What do these figures mean? Do they consider factors such as cost of living? Alternatively, we should consider how much increase in faculty salaries we would see per absolute dollar committed to this effort. Salary differential does not seem to be as big as it used to be. BOV plan should be circulated. We need to know how much money it will take to move us from 60th to 75th percentile. It may be better to say how many dollars short we are, rather than to discuss percentiles.

Hausman: It is a good idea to see how much money is needed. This will give us benchmarks. Let's set fair, reasonable goal and meet goal.

Kulick referred remaining discussion to the Executive Committee.

The meeting returned to discussion of revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty Affairs (Armstrong):

Discussion Section III. D

Page 1.

Meyers: 1b. Benefits. Should "general" be included?

Provost: Could be cases where we need flexibility.

Kennedy: Noted removal of language, "Whenever possible, should replace with full-time replacement." This has not been current practice.

Macdonald: Suggests we reinstate this phrase.

Page 2. No revisions.

Page 3.

Sheriff: Paid Disability Leave. Can a faculty member accumulate more than 120 days?

Kulick: Will be clarified.

Meyers: Non-Academic Leaves. Any programs?

Kulick: Everyone is in department or school

Page 4.

Kulick: George Greenia expressed concern about relationships for which non-academic leaves is pertinent.

Meese: Can you take leave to take care of in-law if spouse is not employee?

Kennedy: In present handbook (p.63), there is paragraph that defines family members. This came out of the state code. We removed definition of family deliberately because it was restrictive. The change was intended to provide greater flexibility.

Meese: What would guide decision?

Provost: Have to trust that institution is compassionate about what constitutes a family crisis. Have to do so on a case-by-case basis. Consider precedents.

Meyers: Concern for consistency across time. Would it be possible for a summary report to be presented to Assembly or Executive Committee.

Provost: Difficult to do this without divulging confidence. Might be possible to provide broad report to Executive Committee that respected confidentiality.

Kulick: Is broadening of definition of family occurring in other areas such as benefits?

Provost: These categories are well-defined.

Kulick: What about provisions for partner benefits? Traditionally, this has had strict definition.

Provost. The institution has little leeway on this issue.

Kulick: Are there opportunities for funding benefits for faculty with partners who might not be covered?

Provost: Almost impossible to do this because of the high costs.

Page 5.

Employment of Both Parents

Armstrong: For cases with two spouses employed at college, could both parents get 120 days collectively? Both individuals have 120 days but not for same child.

Kennedy: In revision, two parents could each take 120 days for same child.

Armstrong: Passage says that max leave cannot exceed 120 days per contract days.

Kennedy: Do you want to keep proviso that if both parents are faculty, only one can use paid leave for 120 days.

Kennedy: Paid leave is one per child. But can take unpaid leave.

MacDonald: Word "combined" is confusing. Faculty are not clear that they can have 2 kids in four years and have a leave for both children.

Armstrong: Language requires clarification. Suggest something like, "Up to 120 days for each child ..."

Kennedy: Unpaid leave. Sentence was contradictory because unpaid leave has to be negotiated. Took out sentence about unpaid leave.

Provost: Unpaid leave affects benefits, disruption of program, etc.

Kennedy: Did not know intention of wording.

Meese: Passage reads, “unpaid leave is only available if the person is the person who provides care”

Provost: This is the intent.

Meyers: Suggest change wording from “appropriate to “corresponding “ in Section c (ii)

Page 6.

No changes.

Kulick noted that the Faculty Assembly can vote on revisions to section D at its next meeting.

4. Old Business – none to report

5. New Business

Meyers asked about developing a Faculty Assembly resolution to commend Alan Meese and Jim Livingston for their committee’s work. There was unanimous support for doing so at the conclusion of the Committee’s work (Note: Meese did not vote).

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth A. Canuel, Secretary