

MINUTES  
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
October 7, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Selby at 3:35 p.m. in Rogers 100. Eighty-eight members were present.

CORRECTION TO MINUTES:

Averring that he had never used the term "athletic admit" (minutes of the faculty meeting of May 6, 1986, page 3, fifth full paragraph down, line 3), but had referred only to students with "special gifts", Mr. Holmes asked that this misquotation be corrected. The secretary accepted the correction, and defended himself by saying that he never claimed to be reproducing verbatim comments in the minutes, but hoped to capture the spirit of remarks made.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Mr. Selby introduced Reginald Clark, Assistant to the President for Community Relations, and Maggie Margiotta, Liaison to the Faculty from the Student Association, who would be present at this and future meetings.

2. Dale Robinson referred to the information recently sent to faculty and staff concerning a new employee benefit package, the comprehensive wellness program of CommonHealth of Virginia. The state was picking up the tab for most of this, and it would be of nominal cost to participants. Mary Louise Mageean, a representative of Continental Health Promotion and the CommonHealth Coordinator for the campus, was introduced to explain the package. A summary sheet (newsletter), HealthBeat, was distributed to those present. Ms. Mageean said that the program would take two years to implement, after which individual state agencies would assume responsibility for it. William and Mary has been selected as the first installation site in this area of Virginia. There were two possible levels of participation: (1) the Awareness Program, which included a subscription to the HealthBeat newsletter, and (2) the Comprehensive Program, of main concern here. The latter included the features of the Awareness Program plus a seminar program and an intervention program. The intervention program comprises the assessment program (with meetings beginning the week of October 13, and including a health risk appraisal and a medical screening) and various programs dealing with exercise, nutrition and weight control, and stress management. Individual invitations to assessment program meetings were being sent out; the cost would be \$3 per individual and \$5 per family. One had to attend one of these meetings in order to participate. Questions could be addressed to Ms. Mageean at EXT-4214, in Thiemes. Mr. Robinson noted that the health risk appraisal and medical screening alone was the equivalent of a typical physical examination.

3. Mr. Welsh, speaking on behalf of Mr. Wiseman, Campus Coordinator for the United Way Campaign, appealed to those assembled to help meet the College-wide goal of \$23,000. One could request that one's contribution be directed into specific programs, and word had it that such requests were honored.

4. Mr. Selby asked Ludwell Johnson to come forward and receive a national silver medal award for distinguished teaching, one of the Professor of the Year Awards from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The nomination had been sent in by former Dean Schiavelli. An enthusiastic round of applause followed the presentation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES:

Nominations and Elections: Anne Netick, Chair

A ballot (Appendix I) containing the names of candidates for a one-year position on the Board of Student Affairs was distributed and reviewed. In addition to the committee's nominees, Dennis Coates and Stephen Field, the name of Virginia Kerns was received and seconded from the floor. A tie between Mr. Field and Ms. Kerns was reported later in the meeting, necessitating a run-off, which was won by Ms. Kerns.

Retention, Promotion and Tenure: Philip Funigiello (for John McGlennon, Chair)

The previously distributed report of the committee (Appendix II) was referred to. There were no questions.

Faculty Affairs: David Finifter (for Gary Kreps, Chair)

Several meetings of the committee have been held since the Spring, and eight items will be reviewed today.

1. The committee was consulted by the Provost on the selection of an interim Dean, and is appreciative of this. The committee is pleased with the appointment of John Selby and thanks him for being willing to serve.

2. In consultation last Spring with the Dean and the Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion and Tenure, the committee has developed a set of procedures for making faculty appointments with tenure outside of established departmental structures. The committee is in the process of working with the Procedural Review Committee to arrive at mutually acceptable procedures.

3. In a meeting with President Verkuil last Spring the committee discussed the possibility of a check-off box on William and Mary Fund brochures for designating contributions to Arts and Sciences specifically. At the President's suggestion, further consideration of this was delayed pending the arrival of a new Vice-President for Development. The committee intends now to arrange a meeting with Mr. Allenby and, hopefully, the President, and will eventually report back to the faculty.

4. The committee has learned that the College's faculty housing program is being evaluated by Charles Lombardo, Director of Operations, Business Affairs. The financial condition of the program and possible use of some housing units as administrative offices have received attention. The FAC has directed certain questions to Mr. Lombardo and to the Faculty Housing Committee concerning the relationship of needs, facilities, costs and alternative uses. However, the FAC believes that the underlying policy on faculty housing, which should presumably guide decisions on the above questions, should be made in consultation with the Faculty Housing Committee, the appropriate representative of the faculty in these matters. It has asked this committee to keep the FAC apprised of ongoing deliberations.

5. In response to the continuing concern about the salary structure at William and Mary, President Verkuil asked the committee to produce statistical information demonstrating where the faculty of Arts and Sciences falls (by discipline or department if possible) in terms of national averages of other arts and sciences programs, with the most relevant comparison being average compensation (and not merely salary) by rank. The FAC has determined that the information necessary for comparisons by discipline or department is unavailable. In cooperation with the Office of Institutional Research it is now trying to develop data leading to salary and

compensation comparisons across schools, focusing on universities which are officially, or can be considered unofficially, our peers. A question of major concern is whether the salary gap between Arts and Sciences, Business, and Law at William and Mary - one which has grown recently - is typical of our peer institutions. Assuming the necessary data can be retrieved, the FAC will report back to the faculty as quickly as possible.

6. The committee has been discussing the present annual faculty evaluation system at William and Mary, motivated by at least two questions: (1) given the reported very high correlation of individual evaluations from year to year, is such frequent evaluation necessary or efficient, and (2) what are the effects on faculty (particularly senior) morale of annual evaluation? Mr. Sutlive (outgoing chair of FAC) and Mr. Kreps (incoming chair) visited the State Employment Office in Richmond to learn more about faculty evaluation options. They found that, assuming Board of Visitors approval, the College has considerable flexibility in performing formal evaluations of faculty. The state director of personnel advised them, however, that no changes should be made without consensus among the faculty that such changes are genuine improvements. For example, one alternative evaluation option, a so-called "step" system, has not generally been found to be a panacea where tried.

The committee concludes that the present evaluation system in Arts and Sciences has both strengths and weaknesses. The strengths include the identification and reward of meritorious performance, along with some recognition of varying market conditions. These factors are widening differences in salaries among individuals and disciplines. The weakness include the absence of built-in steps (promotion and tenure) in determining salary levels, difficulties in determining market conditions from one year to the next, and time-consuming, painful and too frequent evaluations. For the sake of improvement, the above matters at least will need to be addressed. The Personnel Policy Committee appears to be the appropriate forum for considering them. The FAC sees no way of avoiding annual evaluations. It may be possible in the future to link tenure and promotion decisions with explicit steps in the salary structure, but such changes should not be attempted without considerable study of how they would be phased in. In any case, continual reflection on these matters is important for maintaining an evaluation system that is understood and legitimated by the faculty.

7. The committee has discussed the faculty senate initiative with Provost Schiavelli. The latter will address the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the November meeting to apprise it of preliminary planning toward such a university-wide body. The present vision of a faculty senate is vague; however, explorations in this area will address two issues: (1) President Verkuil's desire to have a group to act as a focal point of communication for all university issues, and (2) the need to take a careful look at the present committee structure.

8. The committee has discussed the processes and goals associated with Master Plan efforts with Provost Schiavelli. The FAC believes that faculty input in all stages of Master Plan analysis and implementation is essential, and intends to continue to monitor the process.

Mr. Tiefel asked why there was no written report in view of the many important topics just reviewed? Mr. Finifter replied that there was a tradition of oral reports from the FAC, and that the minutes of the meeting would contain a summary of what he had just said. Mr. Tiefel said he thought the FAC should inform the faculty ahead of time of what it was examining, and then suggested that a straw vote be taken on his request for written rather than oral reports. In response to this Mr. Willis, a new member of the FAC, noted that this committee reported at every Arts and Sciences meeting, thus keeping the faculty informed on a continuing basis, and that it had a great deal to do. A written report at each meeting was impractical, and the committee

should not be burdened with this. No further discussion on the matter developed.

Mr. Funigiello said he was concerned by the reference to expansion of the administration into faculty housing space. Space for graduate students was already very scarce, yet was, for example, critical to the expansion of the Ph.D. program in History. Mr. Selby observed that space in the faculty housing program was all that was mentioned in the FAC report. Mr. Funigiello replied that graduate student space needs should still be the first priority.

As its final item of business, the FAC nominated four people from Area I (William Barnes, Joanne Funigiello, James Baron and Marlene Jack) for two positions on the Nominations and Elections Committee, and two people from Area II (David Dessler and Virginia Kerns) for another position on this committee. There were no nominations from the floor. Ballots were distributed and collected, and later in the meeting the winners were reported to be Joanne Funigiello, Marlene Jack and David Dessler.

Honors and Experimental Programs and Interdisciplinary Studies (joint report):  
Cam Walker, Chair

The September 15 memorandum from the Dean's office (Appendix III) concerning the Center for Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies was referred to. Approval of the resolution, underlined in the memorandum, is needed, but first make corrections as follows: first paragraph, fifth line, "three" should be "four" students; same paragraph, sixth line, after "Dean of Student Affairs" insert "for 1986-87 and three annually thereafter". The changes are needed to avoid bumping a student. The Chair moved adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Tom Finn, who indicated his willingness to respond to questions after offering a review of the program's finances. The \$246,000 grant was for two years, 1986 and 1987. The 1986 allocation of \$167,000 would be used largely for the Center for Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies (CHIS). Development of the Writing Resources Center (WRC) would begin later this year. Some \$95,000 is allocated for renovating the space assigned in Tucker, and some \$120,000 is allocated for faculty compensation in the form of curriculum study and development grants. The balance, ca \$30,000, is allocated for equipping the centers, for unanticipated developments, and for items like evaluation expenses, consultation fees, and software.

No questions were asked. The motion was put to a vote and passed decisively, with no nays heard.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary C. DeFotis  
Secretary to the Faculty

- Appendix I: Ballot, from the Committee on Nominations and Elections
- Appendix II: Report to the Faculty: Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion and Tenure
- Appendix III: Memorandum from the Dean's Office: The Center for Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies