

Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
March 12, 1991

Part the First

The meeting was called to order by Dean David Lutzer at 3:30pm in Rogers 100.

Minutes of the February 5, 1991 meeting were approved without correction.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Dean

1. Reminded the audience that only members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may vote at the meeting.
2. Congratulated an anonymous member of the Faculty for locating the quorum debate of May 1978 in the College Archives. In that meeting the quorum had been set at 80, and the Dean had asked and received the approval of the President for this recent change.
3. Remarked on the similarity of budget resolutions emerging from two different committees of the Faculty. Both resolutions would be debated in the meeting.

The Dean postponed three other announcements of his own, but invited Mr. Haulman's.

Mr. Haulman described the progress of the ad hoc Curriculum Review Committee. The CRC has appointed 9 subcommittees which are already busy at work. A general announcement of the makeup and charges of these subcommittees will appear soon.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

The Provost, Mr. Schiavelli, gave a pie-charted comparison of the university budgets for the fiscal years '89-'90 and '91-'92. Significantly, as the overall university budget will suffer a \$500,000 loss between these two fiscal years, the instructional line item will actually increase by \$1.5 million. The Physical Plant will be shorted for the next year or so. Administration and Academic Support will also incur substantial cuts, but these will be partially offset by increased contributions from the university endowment. In the short term, the Endowment Association may need to take loans against endowment to fulfill these new commitments.

Mr. Nezlek asked if any faculty layoffs are planned. No, said the Provost. To Mr. Nezlek's follow-up question, the Provost said that the 80% salaried year-long research leave program remains, though the internal bookkeeping used to arrange for replacements has been changed somewhat.

Prompted by questions from Mr. Kreps, the Provost

a) Translated the phrase "loans against endowment". It means "borrow money" said the Provost.

b) Explained that he had described only the Educational and General budget. Details of private fund expenditures (beyond the endowment maneuver described earlier) and the Auxiliary Enterprise

budget were not under consideration here.

c) Admitted that the administration is not happy about the state of the physical plant budget. Nasty (i.e. expensive) maintenance items are just around the corner. He did say that custodial staff (and library staff as well) are exempt from any cuts in classified personnel.

Ms. Marshall, the university librarian, discovered to her pleasure that her budget for '91-'92 would be \$6 million, not the \$3.8 million she had expected. The \$6 million is the budget for libraries, not just Swem Library said the Provost. Ms. Watkinson asked whether the 10% cut in hourly wages mentioned by the Provost would come on top of the 20% cut of the current year. Yes said the Provost.

What about the size and number of faculty summer research grants asked Mr. Scholnick. Those should be stable, said the Provost: 49 grants at \$5000 each.

Where does intercollegiate athletics fit in this budget asked Mr. Funigiello. The Provost explained that athletics, like other auxiliary enterprises, pays "taxes" to account for use of university facilities, and only through these taxes does the E&G budget gain benefit from auxiliary enterprises. And how much tax does athletics pay, asked Mr. Selby. Around \$100,000 said the Provost. How about raising the general fees and taxing the auxiliary enterprises still more, said Mr. Johnston. Not so fast, said the Provost. These taxes have to pass an audit muster, they cannot be raised by whim of the administration.

Mr. Tiefel complained that all of these budget decisions were coming down from on high. Doesn't the faculty have any say in all of this? Mr. McGlennon, chair-elect of the Faculty Assembly, commented that the University Planning Advisory Committee had been involved in much of the early budget discussion, and had made many suggestions that were accepted by the administration. UPAC has tried to encourage faculty comment throughout the budget process. The Provost continued with the statement that a late (about #4) version of the draft budget had been seen by department chairs in Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Nezlek asked whether William and Mary Hall was a good revenue source for the College. Not quite, said the Provost. The rock-concert business is very competitive, so we don't make much that way, though Conference Services is doing better than it has in the past.

Mr. McCord asked how a potential 6% cut in the E&G budget would be handled. The Provost said the administration planned (classified) layoffs in the event that this budget were cut. We all hope that the Virginia economy will pick up, or that the Governor will release some of his "rainy day" cash if things get very tight. And does the administration intend to fund the PE department split positions asked Ms. Jackson. We don't know about that yet said the Provost. The Arts and Sciences Faculty needs to make a decision about the PE requirement.

Mr. Crapol thought that the Faculty should all be involved in these budget discussions at a very early stage. Last year, the

library budget suffered a disastrous sudden cut in its budget, and the Faculty had no say in this decision. And the library budget restoration described in the pie-chart does not recover that lost money.

But the library budget is increased \$80,000 beyond last year's base budget said Mr. McGlennon. The Provost also protested the tone of Mr. Crapol's remarks. The Faculty is involved in these budget decisions. Many of the Arts and Sciences Faculty have had regular access to draft budgets. Yes, but only selected faculty, said Mr. Crapol. We should all have access before radical changes are made in the budget. And as far as restoration of the library budget is concerned, we lost \$350,000, so the administration is still not paying back what it took from the library. The library has been permanently damaged.

Mr. Willis could not understand the issue of faculty involvement in the budget process. The Assembly had been spending vast amounts of time on the topic, and there are numerous faculty committees all having access to detailed drafts of the budget. Fine, said Mr. Johnson, but the people in the trenches don't see any of this. The Provost didn't see how he could be more informative. All chairs of Arts and Sciences departments have been kept regularly informed as the budget process moved along. But why can't we talk about these things at Faculty meetings said Mr. Johnson. And why can't you just talk to the Faculty Affairs Committee and your Dean asked the Provost.

Mr. Kreps said that conversations with elected assembly members or department chairs do not provide the kinds of detail that could be available in an Arts and Sciences Meeting. Here, we can talk about general policy. For example, how can a university of this size support the kind of intercollegiate athletic program that it does.

Mr. James Harris supported Mr. Willis' view. There are numerous meetings of department chairs where the Provost is most forthcoming with information. These people should be carrying the message to their colleagues.

Now the Dean continued with his three extra announcements:

4. The Dean explained that by his authority over the A&S budget he intended to make some slight alterations in the priorities staked out by the Provost in setting the overall university budget.

5. Described the shape of class scheduling for the Fall term as that scheduling was influenced by budget considerations.

6. Thanked those members of the Faculty, who, through their department chairs had expressed opinions on the use of possible additional funding to Arts and Sciences. He invited further comment.

Mr. Langer, SA liaison, asked about the size of the incoming class, especially as the administration had reassigned a freshman dormitory from men to women. We have a target of 1180 to 1200 for the freshman class said the Provost. How many we actually get is anyone's guess.

## Committee Reports

(To accommodate schedules of certain attendees, the Dean shuffled the agenda slightly: First part of the EPC report, then FAC, then EPC again.)

Ms. Ventis reporting for Educational Policy described EPC's internal debate regarding cutoffs for Latin Honors. Without delivering the motion as an EPC proposal, she herself moved to amend the cutoff schedule of the Faculty motion of December 1990 so that 20% rather than 15% of the graduating class would receive honors.

After the motion was seconded, Mr. Nezlek said he thought the deeper cutoffs reflected a sense of insecurity at William and Mary. He preferred the more stringent schedule. Mr. Holmes agreed, and Mr. Funigiello said he thought the Dean's List, operating under tighter guidelines, would be more prestigious than Latin Honors. But the Dean pointed out that his List accounts only for grades in the most recent semester, while Latin Honors cover four years' work. Mr. Oakley also wanted to keep the December schedule. Ms Ventis' motion failed by a 30-37 margin.

Mr. Palmer now moved to exclude the freshman year grades as grade cutoffs were invoked to determine Latin Honors. Ms. Ventis objected to the motion on the grounds that no one had any data about the import of such a change. Why don't we just table this motion said Mr. Nezlek, until we can get data. Ms. Ventis said that as a general matter, the Board wants to hear what we have to say about Latin Honors right now, and then would like the matter to rest for several years. Annual tinkering with the cutoffs will annoy students (and their parents).

Mr. Johnson asked about the use of transfer credit in the arithmetic. Ms. Ventis said the College would take transfer grades as delivered for the purpose of Latin Honor calculations. This seems peculiar said Mr. Johnston: GPA computations omit transfer grades, why would we use them for Latin Honors? And it says on the permanent record card that transfer credits are automatically counted with a grade of C, said Mr. Selby. (This point was clarified later in the meeting.)

We are following the registrar's recommendation said Ms. Ventis. EPC did not discuss this matter in detail. Mr. Palmer withdrew his motion.

Mr. Funigiello thought there was too much discussion going on about Latin Honors with insufficient information. Can't we wait until the April meeting with this he wondered. The Dean repeated Ms. Ventis' earlier remark that the Board of Visitors would like any changes contemplated in the Latin Honors program to be made as soon as possible, and then left in place. Mr. Funigiello said he was satisfied with the status quo. Mr. Johnston offered a qualifying amendment to the effect that only William and Mary grades would be used to determine Latin Honors. But Mr. Coleman said that the sole use of the mechanical C assigned to transfer credits was to verify the C-average required for graduation. Mr. Johnston withdrew his motion since it seemed irrelevant.

The Dean, preparing for the extensive agenda, then invited a

resolution allowing a second session of this meeting after the Faculty had exhausted itself in the first. Some informal straw-votes induced Mr. Fuchs and Mr. Oakley to jointly sponsor a motion to reconvene the meeting on Thursday, March 14 at 3:30pm in case the current meeting adjourned without completing its work. The motion passed by voice vote, and the meeting continued.

#### Faculty Affairs

Mr. Eckhause, chair of the committee reported that in addition to the general statement just published by FAC concerning the budget, they would give a fuller account at the April meeting on the impact of current budget problems. Also, in line with remarks made earlier about the desperate need for more information, Mr. Eckhause said that a very detailed agenda for Faculty Assembly Meetings would be published. Department chairs would have documents dealing with agenda items available for faculty inspection.

After thanking the chair of the Educational Policy Committee for her assistance, Mr. Eckhause presented a resolution of FAC to the effect that the Arts and Sciences representatives to the Faculty Assembly should advocate three goals as the College's priorities in these times of budget reduction:

- (1) The Academic Program.
- (2) Personnel protection.
- (3) The Library.

The resolution also asked various committees to keep the Faculty informed in a timely way as budget problems impinged on their respective areas of charge.

Mr. Eckhause then amended the printed version of the proposal by inserting language emphasizing the importance of equipment and supplies to laboratory courses in the Academic Program. The addendum was a friendly suggestion of the Chemistry Department. Mr. McGlennon commented that FAC had taken note of Faculty concerns regarding budget problems and was anxious to make a record of the impact of cuts on the academic program.

Mr. Fuchs proposed an amendment adding the Dean's Advisory Committee (= Committee of Chairs and Program Directors) to the list of those who might report to the Faculty. The amendment passed by voice vote.

Mr. Selby wondered why it was necessary to specifically mention laboratory equipment in a general resolution like this. Only that in laboratory courses, instruction and equipment go hand-in-hand said Mr. Eckhause. You mean glass beads are more important than Faculty travel asked Mr. Hoak ?

Mr. Funigiello moved an amendment which would add "books" to the things necessary to maintain course offerings at the College. His motion failed by voice vote.

Ms. Ventis expressed some concern about the volume of reports that this motion would impose on faculty committees. These committees are already overburdened she said. But Mr. McGlennon said the Faculty cannot have it both ways: If it is going to be involved in budget debate it has to be involved in digesting and

presenting data. Ms. Marshall wondered about the identity of the "Library Committee" in the list of reporting committees. The "University Library Committee" replied Mr. Eckhause. Both said the Dean.

Mr. Edgar Williams wondered what was the subject of the debate, the friendly amendment or the main proposal. The Dean said the editorial change was to be regarded as part of FAC's proposal, so we were debating the main motion. Mr. Williams then moved to strike the editorial change, but there was no second.

Ms. Jackson wondered about the relationship between FAC's motion and the similar motion published by EPC. Mr. Eckhause explained that EPC had its own agenda and that the two proposals were independent of one another. The FAC motion passed.

Next, regarding compensation paid to members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly, Mr. Eckhause reported that FAC discussion had concluded that such compensation was proper, though the specific mechanisms used had not yet been considered in detail. The topic would likely remain on FAC's agenda.

Mr. Kreps said he thought that compensation for committee work sent a bad signal to the Faculty, since many other committee chairs and committee members have burdensome tasks not similarly rewarded.

Mr. Johnson now offered a motion discouraging compensation for committee work and asking that compensation for work done outside the academic year be permitted only after disclosure of such compensation to the Faculty.

Mr. Crapol wanted to know the amount of compensation for Assembly duties. Mr. Eckhause said he didn't know the schedule, but Mr. McGlennon said the rate for Officers of the Assembly was the "equivalent" of 1 adjunct course per semester (\$6000 per year), and for other members of the executive committee of the Assembly, 1 adjunct course per year (\$3000 per year).

Mr. Welsh wondered whether Mr. Johnson's resolution applied to a chair's stipend as well as ordinary committee work. Yes it would, said Mr. Johnson. If the chair of an active department does a substantial amount of work during the summer, then compensation is appropriate, otherwise not.

Mr. Selby gave some background on Assembly compensation. The Provost had originally proposed the idea when we had many more adjuncts whose positions he wanted to bundle. By allowing the compensation to be given as a summer stipend, the need for hiring adjuncts could be reduced. The idea of giving summer stipends for work done during the academic year seemed equitable for those senior members of the faculty whose singular expertise precluded their replacement by adjuncts. Mr. Selby agreed however, that a policy of no compensation of any kind would make perfectly good sense.

Mr. George Harris agreed with Mr. Kreps that there are many onerous committee jobs which might deserve compensation. He could not see how the payment of a summer stipend made whole the person who did the Assembly work in addition to a normal course load. The dollar amount of compensation (to those who took stipends in lieu of course reduction) seemed quite large to Mr. Gary DeFotis. The

equation: (course reduction = summer stipend) seemed incoherent to him also.

But Mr. Willis said that he, among others, simply could not take a course reduction during the academic year. The summer stipend permitted him to do research made impossible by the terrible volume of Assembly work. It was his feeling that while the entire executive committee might not need compensation, the officers certainly do.

Mr. McGlennon thought that Mr. Johnson's proposal amounted to a suggestion that the Executive Committee was being "bought" by the administration. Did Mr. Johnson's proposal permit payment for summer work, for instance, by officers of the Assembly? Mr. Johnson denied any intent to malign members of the Assembly.

And, indeed, are department chairs included in your resolution asked Mr. Selby. Mr. Johnson, apologizing for his clumsy literary style, said he had done his best to convey the purview of the proposal, and Mr. Selby should consult the printed statement to answer his own question.

Mr. Conlee suggested that other "irregular" modes of compensation: the May seminars, Freshman advising, etc., would also need to be examined if we adopted this motion.

Mr. Eckhause moved to refer the motion to Faculty Affairs who could study the problem more carefully and consider the import of general application of Mr. Johnson's idea. Mr. Fuchs offered an amendment asking FAC to consider equity issues as well: How does the amount of stipend compare with work load in these various situations. Also, FAC should identify a principle for application in all contexts.

Mr. Hoak pointed out that other committees, for example, Academic Status, do work during the summer. Perhaps they should be compensated. Mr. Johnson said both the motion to refer and Mr. Fuchs' amendment were fine with him, and both passed by voice vote.

After reminding the Faculty that the meeting would continue on Thursday next, the Dean closed this session at 5:30pm.