

Faculty Assembly Meeting
December 18, 2007
Minutes Approved – January 22, 2008

Present: Bill Cooke, Liz Canuel, Francie Cate-Arries, Mike DiPaolo, Larry Evans, Alan Fuchs, Carl Hershner, Colleen Kennedy, Lisa Landino, John Lee, Rip McAdams, Alan Meese, Terry Meyers, Todd Mooradian, Dee Royster, Carol Sheriff, Gene Tracy, Tom White, Laurie Wolf

Absent: Katie Bragdon, Heather Macdonald

Others in Attendance: Provost Feiss, Dennis Manos, Carl Strikwerda, Anne Rasmussen

The meeting was called to order at 15:00 by Alan Meese (15 members present, including Alan Fuchs at the early start time)

Motion made and seconded to move old business to front of agenda; passed by FA

1. Section III J.

Changes aimed to get mutual consent for changes in the handbook with PPC and FA.

Counsel suggested changes to avoid the exclusive role of the state Attorney General, to the more general reference of “legal advisors”.

Counsel states that the President should forward the changes--if section ABC or J, then President forwards to the BOV.

Motion made and seconded to forward III J as presented to PPC; passed by FA.

2. Section II.

Sect. A, B and C are versions of the current by-laws of BOV.

Page 1, changes have been reviewed by Rector of BOV.

Page 2, from the by-laws about the President appointing committees—leave as is

Some FA discussion centered on the use of the word “appropriate”; this language was added before “advice”, per the by-laws of the BOV. The point is to go to the appropriate committee; FA discussion concluded to leave “as appropriate” in the faculty handbook draft.

Some discussion about what the FA constitution charge to FA is; handbook will show a hyperlink to Article III of the FA constitution.

Page 3, FAFAC struck “when appropriate” language; who decides what is appropriate got some discussion by FA; link to FA constitution here would address this.

Do we want to give implicit power to Provost to create Committee; not necessary.

Page 4, Section E, Budget Committee is cited here generally, not FUPC in the current version.

Page 5, FAFAC deleted the FA charge listing all duties; discussion focused on the desire to have all duties listed here; same comment for PPC; should there be a hyper-link here as well for PRC? FA discussion concluded to reinstate the language deleted by FAFAC, and leave in the FAFAC new sentence on page 5.

Motion made and seconded to make this language change, with the caveats of hyper-link included.

EOC—membership is to be four tenured faculty members; new language to include alternates; Colleen Kennedy will modify draft for the exact language to be used here (bottom of page 5).

Motion made and seconded to send to PPC, with the changes as discussed; passed FA.

FA is done with handbook until PPC has reviewed the draft; this will go up on webpage after PPC meets; approval by 2/3 of FA members will be needed at a future FA meeting to finalize the handbook revisions.

New Business—

Provost report thanks Colleen Kennedy for her extensive faculty handbook work.

Budget news from the governor's proposed budget—good news on the capital side, most of what we wanted; on the operations budget not so good news. The 6.2% budget cuts are to be made permanent in governor's budget—about \$3 million is gone. Proposed budget gives back \$550,000 in base adequacy funding; faculty salary increase deferred to July 2009; long-term worry is when new facility comes on-line the state proposal provides no new M&O money; state only pays 40% of the M&O money anyway—but we will have to come up with additional money for Business School and Education School buildings in 2009 and 2010. Research money was removed and put back at this stage.

Two questions: why cut and then give back base adequacy? Provost responded that some of this is formula driven maneuvering. It is a way to show new investments in certain favored budget items.

President Nichol's comments: agrees with Provost's view of the current budget; capital side good, \$100 million for W&M it appears; School of Education is in his budget rather than the bond issue—this speeds up process by a couple of years. Still see problems with the operating budget for day to day business. We cannot sustain the budget cuts—higher education is placed in the discretionary realm, unlike some other priorities. Some progress here in our lobbying efforts--this was reflected in the reduction of the earlier budget cuts from 7.5 to 6%. Some of this \$3 million may be restored. Unacceptable to have no faculty salary increases due to our current salary position—more reason to hope the General Assembly will change this aspect of the governor's proposed budget.

Can we do increase for faculty and not staff? It would be hard for W&M to do this on our own. Our current strategy is to minimize these cuts—a full-court press is underway here. We have to increase our revenues—it is likely inevitable to hit tuitions going forward.

The budget cuts were late in cycle this year, and since not to the base, we had more flexibility to adjust. Now, if these cuts are to base, our work is going to be harder in the next cycle. The highest priority will be to the core missions of the college—education programs and research—not new initiatives, or peripherals. There will need to be widespread discussions across campus on how best to handle these.

Question about delays in faculty salary raises—how to advertise a delay for two years to new hires, etc. This will be handled at the Dean's level, with some advice from FA and/or Provost. This may be done through merit money. We need to make big strides here, not tiny steps—so we have big challenge to find additional salary money. The BOV is well aware of the needs here.

Richmond is well-aware that these cuts will impact tuition increases. Also, these challenges will test the restructuring process now underway.

FA expressed thanks to Provost and President for their efforts on our behalf. We offer help from the FA going forward. President would like to come to future FA meetings to continue dialogue on a number of topics.

New topic: the President's expressed vision of W&M as the best liberal arts research university, but it is hard to talk about new aspirations given the budget constraints.

We have to continue with our aspirations. No road map currently exists, no platform currently exists for this. We all need to talk about what this means—what do we want to be?

Initially the President spoke about W&M as both great and public—this still applies. The public piece of this is about access, efforts of mutuality in our work to meet needs of our state and region. What about great? We need to compete for faculty, students, and programs with the strongest institutions in the academy.

Great for W&M means? Aspiring to be the best liberal arts research university is a way to define this. A&S has done some work on this notion. Liberal arts is distinctive as opposed to the hard sciences. Spread research across all disciplines in A&S. Increasingly use research to teach our students. Several implications, if we project this notion into the future:

- first component: faculty-student research initiative at the UG level especially in A&S, but not to exclude graduate and professional areas;
- deliver results at conferences; indicators from the outside that we have been doing this (Howard Hughes Institute in the sciences);
- marriage of the research mission with our tradition of excellent classroom instruction;

--second component: heavy civic engagement, new learning experiences outside the college through the curriculum process (high Peace Corps participation, for example); more international activities than many larger schools;

--third component: much more internationalized than the past—we are not as far along here as in the other two components.

No ready metrics for this; we are still trying to define our aspirations; President wants to have ongoing discussions on these matters.

Open discussion: Favorable reaction; risk of fleeing from teaching vs. increased research; there are perhaps different models for doing this—faculty hiring is tied to the way this is defined.

W&M has fought against a view of “avoiding teaching” in the faculty recruiting process.

President asserts that we cannot do this without more resources. We ought to publicize better what we do in this regard. This does not eliminate other outlets of research.

Who is our competition? The other great publics are much larger, many more students. We are more like elite privates. Overarching educational experience is the focus.

Are there contradictions in the terms “research university” and “liberal arts education”?

Tensions are well documented regarding these two, and we deal with these all along.

Implications for course load—four courses at four credits might be a model. Not just one model, e.g., the Career Acceleration Modules in the Business School—very intensive six week course modules. We need to be open-minded in thinking about how we deliver course content.

Does this imply more doctoral programs? Some selected expansion here might occur; probably ramp up what we already have first, before any new ones. We made the choice to focus on UG education years ago, along with selected graduate and professional programs. No large-scale intentions to move away from this model. President believes we have the right general focus/framework. How do graduate and professional programs participate in this vision? We ought to look for graduate/professional applications in the core UG experience—collaboration across our campuses.

The challenge is to have mutual benefit for both graduate/professional and the UG educational experience. No immediate suggestions came forward to advance this. It will likely be tied to the merit process, and stage of career issues. Transportation and compensation are some issues that have come up—re: main and VIMS campuses, for example.

Some concerns: If no significant faculty size growth, then class size may need to increase, and this makes individual student involvement in research more difficult.

Meeting adjourned, at 17:15.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom White