

Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Science
February 4, 1992

The meeting was called to order by Dean David Lutzer at 3:30 in Millington 150.

Minutes of the meeting of December 3, 1991 were approved with a correction: Mr. Finifter, identified as a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, is no such thing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Dean supplied a printed copy of useful remarks and also announced that only members of the Arts and Sciences Faculty may vote at the meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

The Provost, Mr. Schiavelli, reported briefly on money matters. The Governor has given agreement to a large tuition increase at the College (and at other State institutions) in '92-'93. All of the positions vacated by retiring faculty are being replaced, though at entry level salaries. A general obligation bond (subject to referendum approval) will allot \$28 million to William and Mary for capital improvements. Principal expenditures planned are the renovation of James Blair Hall, construction of a toxicology laboratory at VIMS and construction of a laboratory facility (Tercentenary Hall) on the old campus. For comparison purposes, \$36 million is allotted to UVA, and \$37 million to VPI.

In the second year of the biennium, another large tuition increase is planned. The two increases are intended to raise an additional \$1.5 million for inclusion in the College's budget. None of these funds is intended to finance salary increases. Such increases could only occur in the context of salary increases for all state employees.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nominations and Elections

Ms. Walker, chair of the committee reported nominations for Arts and Sciences seats on the Assembly. Confusion generated by the distribution of allegedly official ballots prior to the meeting was resolved, and only votes cast at the meeting itself were deemed valid. Subsequently, Ron St. Onge, Berhanu Abegaz, Robert Archibald, Deborah Ventis (2 year term only), Eric Bradley and Roy Champion were elected.

Faculty Affairs

Mr. McGlennon reported very briefly that FAC was working on the famous "Stipend Problem", and expected to report on same at the March meeting.

In Assembly business, he said that the report of the Faculty Compensation Board had been received and discussed briefly. (The Dean had earlier remarked that a mere misunderstanding had led to Mr. Meyers's rejection of the Assembly's invitation to appear on

behalf of the FCB). The Assembly had also agreed with certain recommendations of the Faculty regarding budget priorities in the upcoming biennium and had transmitted these to the administration. He also commented favorably on the work of the Presidential search committee.

Taking advantage of a brief pause in the proceedings, Mr. Holmes asked for Faculty assistance in locating potential recipients of the Renick Scholarships. These, he said, are supposed to permit William and Mary students to become serious contenders for various National programs: Rhodes, Marshall and Fulbright, among others.

Faculty Compensation Board

Mr. Remler, the Chair of FCB, presented two statistical profiles intended to inform the Faculty of the results of its lengthy study of salary increases for '89-'90. Some uncertainty about the meaning of these profiles was cleared away by Mr. Remler's brief lecture on the theory of linear regression.

In response to Mr. McCord's specific question about the discrepancy between average increases reported by FCB and those announced in the public press, the Provost pointed out that faculty salaries are paid out of two sources: state and private. Although the state might announce a certain percentage increase *in the salary pool*, there would not necessarily be a matching increase from the private sources. Hence, public statements about salary increases could and did disappoint many faculty as they studied their own individual increases in total salary.

Mr. Axtell asked about the nature of the State's commitment to peer group schemes for adopting salaries. The State has written that it is, indeed, committed to such a salary structure, if and when it can afford it, said the Provost. And how come tuition keeps going up and up while we don't get raises, asked Mr. Haynie. Because the State wants to continue a trend to smaller and smaller general fund contributions to universities, said the Provost. The Provost expressed guarded optimism for a salary increase in the '93-'94 academic year.

Mr. Remler complained that FCB was having a difficult time getting information it wanted regarding salary increases, especially as regards faculty versus administrative staff. Details of who was administrative and who was faculty were clouded by shifts in these categories for certain people. Mr. Daley, a member of the Provost's staff tried to clarify, and the Provost said that while his office wanted to be cooperative, it did not have infinite resources to respond to requests for information..

Nevertheless, Mr. Remler's point about access to information remained. Mr. McGlennon explained a constitutional problem: The (elected) FCB predated the formation of the Assembly, and still maintained an existence independent of the Assembly. Consequently, it did not enjoy the benefits of the recent cordial and useful exchanges of information between the administration and the Assembly.

Mr. Finifter, a former chair of FCB, said that during his tenure, FCB had gotten all the information it had requested of the administration. He recommended that FCB and the Assembly join forces to minimize duplication. He said that many of the functions earlier performed by FCB had been taken over by the Executive Committee of the Assembly. But Mr. Meyers maintained that the FCB should keep independent of the Assembly, though there was certainly room for cooperation.

Mr. Axtell thought that all this discussion was more than moot. There is no new money for raises, so why are we talking about this ?, he wanted to know. But Mr. McCord thought that if FCB knew everything about all sources and all expenditures, it might find money for salary increases. Mr. McGlennon said that such an undertaking would be very time consuming and would make micro-provosts out of the members of FCB, who would all have to serve for extended periods to come to an understanding of a very complicated budget process.

The real Provost said that the discussion was, in part misguided. He explained the Fundamental Principle of good administration: Academic Policies drive the Budget, not the other way around. As an application of this principle, he said, it is ridiculous to pick out a particular line item in the budget and attack it in isolation. Discussions about particular line items *must* start with the policy that is parent to the item. Moreover, the Faculty had to understand that in any such discussion, the Faculty would be heard but not necessarily heeded.

The Dean said that he personally had always felt that his concerns were given appropriate attention by the administration. He therefore concurred with the Fundamental Principle. Mr. McCord, however, was not so certain, and as a test of the Principle, moved that any subsequent tuition increases be balanced by decreases in the athletic fee. Mr. Ward's quorum call prevented the Faculty from learning the outcome of the controversy.

The Meeting adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully submitted,



George Rublein
Secretary to the Faculty