

## **Summary of FUPC/COPAR activities 2011-12,**

submitted on May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012

**COPAR Members:** Will Hausman, Todd Mooradian, Debbie Bebout, Terry Meyers, Suzanne Raitt, Ron Rapoport, Emmett Duffy, Rick Gressard, Trotter Hardy, Kathleen Bragdon-Brown, J.C. Poutsma, Ned Waxman (FCB chair)

**FUPC members (*ex officio*):** Anna Martin, Carrie Cooper, Dennis Manos, Jim Golden, Sam Jones, Virginia Ambler, Carrie Cooper, Gene Tracy, Sean Pieri, Susan Bosworth

**Students:** Tom Innes, Kaveh Sadeghian

**Co-Chairs:** Todd Averett, Michael Halleran

### **Action Items**

**Leadership of FUPC:** Two years ago, it was decided that the members of COPAR would become the faculty representatives on FUPC, along with the chair of the FCB (Ned Waxman). The Faculty Assembly by-laws state that the president of the Assembly may not chair standing committees except for the executive committee. Because COPAR was not previously part of FUPC, the president of Faculty Assembly was a co-chair of FUPC (with the Provost). It was decided that the chair of COPAR (Todd Averett) would become the co-chair of FUPC with the Provost, effective immediately.

**Baseline PBR's** were evaluated by COPAR and a report was presented to FUPC. This year we chose to evaluate only those PBR's that were above \$30k. There were 12 proposals that were evaluated. The evaluation scheme used was chosen to match the format for the Strategic PBR's. Ratings were: Endorse (fund if possible, high priority), Defer (suggest resubmission next year) and Reject (do not recommend funding). In light of tighter budgets at the College, several proposals considered worthy of funding were deferred. Proposals endorsed were mostly in the area of M&O where base operations in various units needed significant support. A report was submitted on November 1, 2011.

**Baseline Advising PBR:** One of the baseline PBR's considered (984) was a request from the Arts and Sciences Office of Advising to increase the faculty advising stipend for freshman advising from \$35 per student to \$100 per student. The committee felt that this was not necessarily the best solution to the declining faculty participation in the advising program. It was suggested that a review of the program be undertaken to explore the best options for improving advising. Subsequent to this decision, FUPC received a letter from the DAC requesting that we reconsider our decision. Upon further deliberation the committee decided not to re-visit the PBR. Note that an external review of advising began on April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

**Athletic Fee:** A motion was made by Terry Meyers to lower the current athletic fee by \$200 and recover these funds to be used to support the academic mission of the College. A presentation was made by Terry Driscoll; followed by questions and discussion. The motion did not pass.

**Lab Fee Request:** We received a collective request from several of the science departments to institute lab fees for expendable items needed in teaching labs such as glassware, chemicals, failed equipment, etc. The committee voted to endorse this request.

**International Office Fee Request:** The Office of International Students, Scholars, and Programs requested we consider a proposal to require additional fees for international students to be used to cover costs associated with orientation, cultural education, visa services, etc. Examples of many schools with such a fee were given in the proposal and this request was considered necessary and reasonable. The committee voted to endorse the proposal.

**Budget Reports:** We received regular reports from Sam Jones regarding the budget process in the General Assembly and College. The reports were the most direct conduit to the overall budget issues the College faces from the Commonwealth and as such, were quite useful. At the April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012 meeting, Sam Jones presented a proposed budget for the College for the next fiscal year based on the expected state budget scenarios for William and Mary. To allow COPAR members to further discuss the proposed budget, an open meeting was held by the Provost. The committee felt that it would have been beneficial to consider the proposed budgets further in advance to allow time to digest the details and provide useful, timely feedback.

### **To be re-examined for next year:**

- 1) Formalize and document the process for evaluation of the baseline PBR's based on experiences from the evaluation process in the last two years.
- 2) Review how the faculty could be better engaged and included in the process of creating the final budget for the BOV.