

**Faculty Assembly Meeting  
Minutes for February 20, 2018  
3:30-5:00 pm  
Blow Hall Board Room**

*Officers Present:* Cathy Forestell (President), Jack Martin (Vice President), Chris Abelt (Secretary), Eric Chason (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors)

*Other Members Present:* Mark Brush, Lynda Butler, Mark Forsyth, Carl Friedrichs, Ron Hess, Rex Kincaid, Rowan Lockwood, Michael Luchs, Alan Meese, Christy Porter, Ron Schechter and Tom Ward

*Members Absent:* Tim Costelloe, Steve Holliday, Jenny Kahn, Megan Tschannen-Moran, Sophia Serghi

*Others in Attendance:* Todd Stottlemeyer (Rector), Katherine Rowe (28<sup>th</sup> President), Michael Halleran (Provost), Michael Fox (BOV Secretary), Henry Broaddus, Jeremy Martin, Bill Cooke, David Feldman, Margaret Saha and Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian)

**1. Call to order**

Ms. Forestell called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

**2. Approval of the Minutes for January 30, 2018**

The minutes were approved by unanimously.

**3. Introduction of Dr. Katherine Rowe, 28<sup>th</sup> President of the College of William and Mary**

Incoming President Rowe offered a brief introduction and fielded questions. She sees access to education as an important priority. She values interdisciplinarity in research. Her going back to graduate school in media studies was a turning point that reshaped her path to administration. She is excited about the Design and Engineering initiative. She championed a similar Design Thinking initiative at Smith. She does not sense the typical tension between the critical and reflective disciplines and the ‘hands-on’ disciplines at the College. Ms. Lockwood asked about her efforts in diversification at Smith. In the last 3 1/2 years 50% of the faculty hires were of color and 75% of the STEM hires were women. She developed a workshop that hiring committees undertook as preparation. While implicit bias is hard to change, behavior can be changed. The workshops were improved each year based on lessons learned. For diversity in the student body faculty are asked who in their classes are unrepresented and how can you get them to stay. She admitted to being a ‘gov geek’, and was involved in rewriting faculty policy and procedures.

**4. Provost’s Report**

The Provost thanked the faculty members of the President search for their service. He was thrilled and excited by today’s announcement. House and Senate bills in Richmond have been presented. The House bill expands Medicaid freeing up \$421M, such as a bonus for classified staff.

The bills will be reconciled over the next eighteen days. Bills requiring universities to accept transfer credits are still active. Another bill would require Boards to have an open comment period before approving a tuition increase. A budget bill in the Senate puts in motion easing the restriction on the in-state out-of-state ratio. The College's AY2019 budget will only be able to fund few, if any, PBRs. The unanticipated cost of covering financial aid this year figured into the planning. It is the College's policy to fund 100% of the unmet need for in-state students. This policy has resulted in high socio-economic diversity of the student body. Continued high cost of financial aid is ultimately not sustainable.

## **5. Reports from standing committees**

Executive Committee – Cathy Forestell

The posted proposed changes to the Handbook concerning family leave received many comments. The ad hoc committee will compose a revised draft based on this input and will re-post on WMDigest.

Liaison Committee – Jack Martin

The faculty presentation at the last BOV meeting in April will be on the Lemon Project with Jody Allen.

Academic Affairs – Christy Porter

The committee has refined its survey questions on faculty priorities. There are ten categories with 5-8 tactics in each. Faculty will be asked to rank the tactics within each, then rank the categories. It should take 10 minutes. The question was raised whether this survey should be combined with the faculty survey for this spring. Next fall the HR survey may be sent out. Having both the HR survey and the faculty survey come out during the same semester resulted in lower than desirable response rates for the faculty survey. They hope to use the answers in a document for the new President highlighting current policies and future directions. Several expressed concerns that combining the priorities survey with the faculty survey would make it too long. Sending a survey out in April that would be open for a month should be possible.

Faculty Affairs – Cathy Forestell for Megan Tschannen-Moran

The committee is waiting for a decision on the combination question before reexamining the climate questions, perhaps with the assistance of Dania Matos.

COPAR – Rex Kincaid

There is little money for PBRs this year. The committee will meet on February 22.

## 6. Update from the WM2026 committee

Ms. Forestell presented a draft slide presentation report. The committee began its work in November, and has met weekly. It collated information, and interviewed various stakeholders: Dennis Manos, Gene Tracy among others. The faculty forum in December showed that faculty wanted a voice in these plans. Our operating model (small enrollment, 12:1 student to faculty ratio, 79% T/TE faculty) is misaligned with our financial model (tuition driven, 78% of E&G funds). Budget projections predict an \$8M deficit by 2026. This includes new programs such as Engineering and Design. Ms. Butler asked about the increase in administrative costs. Most of these probably arise from support staff (*e.g.*, advancement and IT) rather than adding high-level administrators. We should get this data. The \$8M shortfall is due to new initiatives, salary increases, cost of new facilities and deferred costs and financial aid. Mr. Kincaid asked about the large expectation for student demand (100/yr) in Engineering and Design. That figure is for generating the necessary critical mass for the program. This program is expected to increase the quality of applications which will allow for growth without lowering the quality of the accepted student cohort. Mr. Kincaid wondered whether student would be attracted to a program that was not ABET accredited. Mr. Cooke responded that ABET accreditation is not that important. Mr. Luchs said that the Engineering and Design initiative is not in the classic model of engineering schools. It has a new vision. This program cannot be one that begins on a very small scale and grows incrementally. This initiative is a risk. Mr. Cooke also noted that there will be significant continuing costs for the program. The cost is not just in startup funds. Other solutions for the budget shortfall include modifying the in-state/out-of-state ratio, increasing tuition and fees, and growth. Growth does come with the added costs of adding faculty and providing start up. Mr. Feldman talked about the possibility of adding a summer semester. It offers \$30M-\$50M in revenues with no added infrastructure costs. The Dartmouth model requires rising sophomores to stay that summer and to leave for one-semester later on. There are enough beds for students to stay on campus over the summer. Ms. Lockwood asked about the length of the term. It would be a little shorter. There was a question about expanding the business school. The required GPA for admission has risen to 3.6. Mr. Luchs said it may be time to reexamine this possibility. Mr. Cooke replied that when he co-chaired COPAR this idea came with a large price tag (\$1M in additional cost). Charging a fee may be a possibility. Other sources of revenues are extra-ordinary programs. The St. Andrews program generates \$1.5M. The current and past directors suggest that St. Andrews may be saturated. Establishing a new point program might be a better approach. We could also start an extension school or certificate programs. The next steps would be to have small fora hosted by two members of the ad hoc committee.

## 7. Old Business/New Business

None

## 8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

Prepared by Chris Abelt