

MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
February 4, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Schiavelli at 3:35 p.m. in Rogers 100. Ninety-four members were present.

The minutes of the last faculty meeting of December 3, 1985 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Tom Finn (1,2), Berhanu Abegaz (3)

1. Departments will appoint freshmen and transfer student advisers for next year. The Dean's Office will arrange the training sessions for this Spring. Please be cooperative if requested to advise.

2. The Funds for Excellence proposal, concerning the center for Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies and the Writing Resources center, goes to Richmond next week, ready or not.

3. The Board of Visitors has recently issued a statement concerning its policies on investment in companies operating in South Africa. Several faculty who find the Board's position self-contradictory have drafted a resolution which will be presented at a future faculty meeting. A petition on this issue will also be circulated.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS:

President Verkuil made an extended presentation concerning current expectations for state support of higher education, the present and future position of the College, and the significance of the Long-Range Planning Commission Report.

1. Our effort to convince the State Council that a peer group concept for faculty salaries is appropriate has been largely successful; moreover, private institutions are included in our peer group, which is desirable since this highlights our relative depression. Nevertheless, the State Council has recommended a uniform 10% increase for all institutions in the next salary round. We have however maintained contact with Robb administration officials (who continue to serve in the new administration), and the Governor's budget incorporates the peer group principle. This will lead, if the recommendations pass the General assembly, to a 13% average increment for William and Mary in the first year of the biennium.

2. The Senate has passed a bill establishing an equipment bonding authority for the purpose of financing equipment acquisition and replacement. If passed by the General Assembly research equipment and, especially, computer equipment will not need to be funded out of the regular operating budget.

3. In the state budget we are scheduled for a reduction of twenty-five staff positions. Not that many people would actually be lost however, and we are working for the restoration of these positions. Capital funds for the restoration of Ewell Hall are in the budget, as well as a small appropriation for a minor construction project at the Law School, and \$750,000 for maintenance. Funds for a new gymnasium, freeing Blow Gym for academic use, are not yet in the budget.

4. Andrew Fogarty, a well respected administrator, is the new Vice President for Administration and Finance. One of his major roles will be to organize and follow up on our presentations in Richmond. He will also be very active in budget planning. Provost Healy feels that budget matters have taken up too much of his time.

5. The new Provost will have increased responsibility for academic planning, but will still participate in the budget process, e.g., in the division between academic and other allocations. His main responsibility will be in the development of new programs and initiatives, with a view to realizing the full potential of the university. Eventually other reorganizations will occur as well.

6. He has found that it is not easy to communicate here. There are five different faculties, each with nine meetings per year. He cannot address each faculty on a regular individual basis. There are also forty-five committees. Perhaps the method of appointing committees needs to be reviewed. The internal governance structure as a whole is too complex, inhibiting communication, and needs to be reexamined.

7. The Report of the Long-Range Planning Commission was submitted to the President on October 15, 1985, pursuant to the mandate from President Graves a year and a half earlier. This report has been made available on a confidential basis. The basic intention is to raise the funds detailed in the report by the 300th anniversary of the College, in 1993. The document had been reviewed by some thirty-nine faculty members in Arts and Sciences, the Dean, the Planning and Priorities Committee, the Board of Visitors, and by other groups, prior to its issuance.

8. The Faculty Affairs Committee, in its memorandum of January 22, has however indicated certain concerns which it has in connection with the report. Regarding these concerns he responds as follows:

- a. Concerning the charges that the report contains skewed priorities, and that Arts and Sciences are systematically underrepresented in terms of proposed allocations -

Point 1. This is not a priority setting document. The commission found the mere assessment of needs to be a substantial task. Their letter of transmittal says explicitly that priorities among competing needs are not being established in this document. Moreover, he is unaware of any needs that haven't been addressed. The chance to state perceived needs was granted to virtually everyone. Over \$250 million in needs are contained in the report. Priorities among these are a matter for decision by the President, the Board and the administration generally.

Point 2. This is not a campaign document, just a list of needs and categories. There are capital projects in the report, intended to be funded mainly by the state. The document is not concerned only with private funding.

- b. Concerning the importance of the undergraduate program and the philosophy of liberal education, and the danger of becoming a "mediocre" university -

He takes these concerns seriously. He would like to be able to say that he agrees with the first and disagrees with the second, but the issues are more complex. Several transparencies (Appendix) will be shown to emphasize the relevant considerations. The first three address the first concern.

First Transparency: 1986-87 Overall Budget Comparisons - The conclusion to be drawn from these data are that as a state institution we cannot (because of the funding formulas) be merely an undergraduate institution and still be what we wish to be. If we seek to be like Amherst, Swarthmore or Williams we will end up like Mary Washington. By being a "university" we obtain more resources per student than do schools like James Madison or Radford. We must do some graduate and professional work to have such status.

Second Transparency: Peer Group Comparisons 1986-87 - Our peer group contains much more prestigious (and Ph.D. granting) institutions than do those of James Madison or Radford. This drives up faculty salaries here as well.

Third Transparency: FTE Student and Faculty Formulae - Graduate and professional students enhance our FTE Faculty count. Also, Arts and Sciences is benefiting slightly more than the other three schools from existing enrollments.

Concerning the danger of our becoming a "mediocre" university - This is more in the control of those assembled here than in the President's. Yet it is his responsibility as well. It is agreed that unless very big quality gains are made at the graduate level we should not deprive the undergraduate program for the sake of the graduate. In fact, we have been extremely cautious in starting new graduate programs. There are now six doctoral schools in Virginia, some of them in large population centers and therefore politically powerful. We might liken ourselves to Switzerland - remaining neutral because we can't afford to fight! But we must be willing to take occasional initiatives, attempting to capitalize on our assets, such as our desirable location and environment. We must be careful concerning quality, but we must also push forward at the doctoral level. Hopefully, the campaign will help us move forward at many levels, including the doctoral.

Fourth Transparency: Eminent Scholars Endowments as a Fund-Raising Strategy - Only for this special category does the state provide matching funds as a matter of policy. The arithmetic is such that the naming of an Eminent Scholar not only enhances that person's salary, it frees up money for other purposes. Indeed, from this perspective, we shouldn't be unhappy to see everyone made an Eminent Scholar!

Fifth Transparency: Eminent Scholars Program 1985-86 - UVA has obtained the lion's share of state matching funds for Eminent Scholars, but several others have also taken quick advantage of this program and done better than we. We should be higher than we are. Next year we will qualify over \$340,000 in Eminent Scholar endowments, and 63% of this will be in Arts & Sciences, which certainly isn't doing badly.

9. The problem of gift allocation is always present. Of course, we accept any appropriate gifts. It seems likely that the Eminent Scholar ratio just noted will be sustained. The President must mediate among the Deans. In fact, he wants to see every school get something (with reference

to Education). Everyone else has a special interest, but the President has only the general interest in mind. It is believed that Business and Law graduates who succeed will also feel some loyalty to Arts and Sciences; there is in any case not present here the kind of imbalance in internal power that exists in Charlottesville.

10. For our success, it is necessary that the faculty have trust and confidence in the administration. The President must rely on sounding boards. The judgment of the Planning and Priorities Committee will be obtained before proceeding with major undertakings. There will also be periodic reports. Much remains to be done before the campaign begins.

Mr. Sutlive, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, expressed his appreciation for the presentation and for the earlier opportunity the FAC had had to discuss its concerns with the President. He wished now to mention some background to the points in the FAC's memorandum. The committee had not seen the covering letter which disavowed any attempt to set priorities, but it did understand the document to be a "wish list". Although he is a member of a department now pursuing a Ph.D. program, and in favor of it, he also feels strongly about the importance of the undergraduate program. There may be some unevenness in the beneficial effects of graduate work in different departments in Arts and Sciences. He believed the appendices of the report, on pages 80-84, do exhibit disproportionate quotas for the different schools. Therefore, he wished to support the earlier resolution (of November 22, to the President) that the report be sent to the Planning and Priorities Committee.

Mr. Meyers asked, what exactly is its status and how will the Long Range Planning Commission Report be used? President Verkuil answered, it was a list of needs, which would be pared down slightly and eventually submitted to a campaign consultant for further advice. Mr. Meyers asked, how would faculty opinion be reflected in a final document? President Verkuil answered, via the Planning and Priorities Committee, and perhaps also the Student Financial Aid Committee. Mr. Kreps asked, at what point would our priorities be known? Perhaps within two years, responded President Verkuil, when a final list of private giving needs would have been generated. The campaign would culminate in 1993, and we don't want to anticipate too much.

Mr. Scholnick noted that the Committee on Graduate Studies had met on January 29 and had passed the following resolution: The Committee on Graduate Studies strongly recommends that the academic program receive the highest priority in the College's long-range planning.

Ludwell Johnson observed that the report included a peculiar disparity in the amounts mentioned in support of athletics on the one hand and libraries on the other. President Verkuil responded that it was advisable to allow interested parties to endow athletic scholarships if they wished, but that this would include non-revenue as well as revenue sports. Mr. Watson asked, will what contributors wish to give money for end up setting priorities? The President replied that we would try to encourage giving that is both satisfying to the donor and consistent with our list of needs. Moreover, we have the ability to effect proper internal balances ourselves. Mr. Funigiello asked, how would the approach to donors be couched? President Verkuil said that, consistent with a commitment to a sensible athletic program, academic needs would drive the campaign. The

guiding committee would be composed of people who care about academics.

Mr. Willis said he would like to accept all the foregoing in good faith. But much of the language in the report was banal, cliches and generalities abounded, and there was little explanation of budget details. The document depressed him. He was not concerned that it was a wish list, but would the figures be perceived as representing an existing internal reality? He urged the President to obtain more faculty input. The President responded that he appreciated this message in the spirit intended. The commission worked long and hard on the document. Its recommendations could not be termed absurd. Financial aid, faculty support, research support and computer acquisition were all big items that almost everyone could agree on. Of course, the list of needs would be refined.

Mr. Funigiello asked, hadn't the commission been originally directed to prioritize, and had it not therefore, having failed to do this, discharged itself prematurely? President Verkuil said that perhaps this was true. The commission was exhausted, and the full charge of President Graves had not been fulfilled. Mr. Kreps suggested that priorities had not been addressed because such a process would lay bare self-interest. Moreover, when priorities are set Arts and Sciences operates at a disadvantage, with twenty-two different departments and undergraduate versus graduate claims to reconcile. So the Dean of Arts and Sciences is in a difficult position compared to the Deans of Law or Business, and he needs to enjoy a special relationship with the President and the Provost. President Verkuil responded by saying that he didn't believe that anyone had to lose, that all would benefit and feel good in the end, and that all programs at the College needed sympathetic support.

Mr. Meyers said he believed the report was flawed, and that he was especially bothered by the nebulous stance on faculty input that seemed to be emerging. He therefore introduced a resolution and moved its adoption. The motion was seconded. The resolution reads:

Resolved that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences requests that the Planning and Priorities Committee review the Report of the Long Range Planning Commission and, in consultation with appropriate faculty and College Committees, set in priority the list of desiderata the Report contains, that the Committee work to define a realistic fund-raising goal in accord with academic priorities of the institution, and that the Committee report the result of its labors to the Faculty of each of the Schools for discussion and endorsement.

Discussion of the motion began, with Mr. Thompson wondering how much the intent of the motion differed from the planned procedure. He went on to observe that, in his and most people's eyes, there was no comparison between the condition of certain departments (e.g., Physics and Chemistry) twenty years ago and today. It was incomparably better now. He had seen the faculty tie itself in knots in committee deliberations in the past. The resolution wouldn't lead to any better prioritizing than if this task were left to a smaller group.

Mr. Schiavelli observed that the Planning and Priorities Committee believed that it should be involved in the process. He could assure those assembled that the Chair of that committee (himself) would put this matter

at the top of its agenda. There was not that much difference between this and Mr. Meyers' suggestion.


Mr. Livingston noted that there are only four people from Arts & Sciences on the Planning and Priorities Committee. He did not believe that Arts & Sciences would emerge with anything particularly favorable by working within this committee. Mr. Kranbuehl stressed the importance of the time element, saying he felt nervous dealing with issues of fund-raising and priorities before so many key members of the new administration were on board (e.g., a new Provost, a Vice president for Development). Perhaps we should let some time elapse before proceeding. Mr. Archibald observed that priorities are largely established when money is actually spent; fund-raising priorities are of secondary importance. Mr. Axtell agreed with this, noting moreover that on the Committee on University Advancement Arts & Sciences is well represented. Even members of this committee from the other schools place much importance on the undergraduate program. Also, this committee has already played an important role in establishing priorities, and the voice of Arts & Sciences has been heard.

Mr. Freeman said that he felt the document lacked form. Also, administrators prayed to certain gods not in the Arts & Sciences pantheon, but these were inferior deities. Mr. Delos agreed that the document lacked form. But the commission avoided setting priorities deliberately, and it was good to have a comprehensive wish list. He asked President Verkuil, don't our fund-raisers need more guidance than the report provides, and how would he himself guide priorities? The President responded that the Planning and Priorities Committee was the appropriate venue for deciding priorities, but when the time was ripe, which wasn't now. He didn't believe there was really that much disagreement on priorities. Ms. Walker asked, how many had actually read the Long Range Planning Commission Report? A show of hands suggested that at least a substantial fraction of those present had.

Mr. Edwards said he shared some of Mr. Meyers' concerns. To vote against his motion is to oppose priorities. But to vote in favor of it is to eventually set priorities that the Committee on Planning and Priorities would not be able to reconcile. Therefore he moved to table the pending motion. This was seconded. The motion to table carried easily.

The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary C. DeFotis
Secretary to the Faculty

Appendix: Five transparencies on Budget Comparisons, Peer Group Comparisons, FTE Formulae and the Eminent Scholars Program and Endowments.