

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
March 2, 1993

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer at 3:30 p.m. in Rogers 100. The minutes were corrected to show that the statement "Mr. von Baeyer pressed the issue of the needs of different faculties, asking why needs in the rest of the College are seen as less important than the needs of the Law School. He also warned about the consequences of the proposed Law School raise on the morale of other units" was not made by Mr. von Baeyer. It could not be ascertained who made the statement. Also, the statement "Mr. Welsh expressed his concern about explaining the Law School salary initiative as necessary to facilitate the search for a Law dean. He pointed out that we are now searching for a Provost, an even more important position than that of dean, and candidates for the Provost position may be reluctant to accept a position, given the level of upset of the vast majority of the College's faculty about salaries" was not made by Mr. Welsh, but was made by Mr. Oakley. With these corrections the minutes were approved. Commenting on items in the minutes, Dean Haulman remarked about the delay in discussing the Law School raise in UPAC which was mentioned on page 3 of the minutes. His understanding is that it was not discussed at the November UPAC meeting, and the December meeting was cancelled, and by the time it was actually debated in UPAC in January, the decision was a fait accompli.

Dean Lutzer reminded the meeting that only Arts and Sciences members can vote in the faculty meeting and reminded departments that they have been asked to submit development proposals describing departmental priorities and suggestions for Arts and Sciences budget initiatives for use later in the spring.

Ms. Slevin, Chair of the Provost Search Committee was asked to remark on the progress of the committee. She said that the candidates had been reduced to 12 and on March 14th they would be reduced to 5. The 5 would be brought to campus for interviews which would follow the format used in the Presidential Search. The tentative dates for the faculty interviews are March 19, March 23, March 26, March 30, April 2 and April 6 from 3:30 - 5:00 p.m. These are subject to change. There will be a 15 minute presentation by the candidate followed by a question and answer session. It was brought to her attention that the date of April 6th is the date of the regular Arts and Sciences faculty meeting. She said that we would work on changing the meeting announced for this date.

Dean Lutzer asked Mr. Ventis to report for the Board on Faculty Compensation regarding peer group percentages. Mr. Ventis reported that almost all of Virginia's state universities have fallen farther than has William and Mary in their salary peer groups. If one looks at where Virginia's seventeen colleges and universities stand in their own peer groups, we are ninth from the top of a list of seventeen.

Dean Lutzer gave a legislative session report. He said that the projected 3.55% salary increase on the state salary base will translate to roughly 3.1% on overall salary and that promotion raises and retirement agreements will be paid from that pool. Classified employees will receive higher percentage increase. The equipment trust fund was re-authorized. The teaching support initiative was approved, but at a much lower level than we proposed, and the Law School salary initiative was approved.

Mr. Eckhause asked if 3.55% will come from general funds. Dean Lutzer said it is a mixture of general and tuition funds, and Mr. Grayson, a member of the General Assembly, agreed. Mr. Eckhause asked whether the administration is using the full amount of tuition authority allowed by the Legislature for the next year. Lutzer replied that the Brafferton had not discussed the matter with deans.

Mr. Fuchs asked if 3.55% would be a percentage of annual salary. Lutzer replied that 3.55% would be an increase in annual rate, starting in December, 1993. Mr. Finn asked whether the proposed Law School salary raise of 12% would be added to the 3.55%; Lutzer replied that he did not know President Sullivan's plans, but that he (Lutzer) would not do things that way.

Mr. Axtell asked whether we will ever get back to the old practice of starting new salary rates at the beginning of the academic year. Lutzer responded by pointing out the apparent advantage to the state's political leaders of the December date, in that it allows them to announce a larger percentage raise for the year than they actually need to pay for out of the current year budget. Since there seemed to be a real public relations advantage to such a scheme, Lutzer thought it might be a long time until Richmond would go back to the former method.

The Dean reminded the faculty of the meeting on Wednesday for Curriculum Review.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### Faculty Affairs Committee

Mr. Oakley reported that the President asked for a special meeting with the FAC. FAC pushed and got agreement for full study of salaries by decanal unit which will be completed by May 15. FAC had another meeting with Sam Jones and Tom Daley about gathering material for various peer groups to be used in the salary study and settled on using our state salary peers, the alternate peer group created by the undergraduate admissions report several years ago, the group of public ivys, and the doctoral universities in Virginia. The Faculty Assembly will name a committee of seven to oversee the study.

In recent meetings, FAC formulated a series of questions for Provost candidates. It seemed probable that FAC would propose that Arts and Sciences elect alternate members of the Assembly so that we could have full voting representation at Assembly meetings when one or two of our elected members could not attend. In closing, Mr. Oakley reminded the faculty meeting that in his presentation to us, President Sullivan explained the Law School Salary initiative in part as necessary to allow the College to find a new Dean for Law School. He then told Arts and Sciences faculty that tomorrow it would be announced that the Law dean search had failed to yield a suitable candidate.

Mr. Welsh reported on activities of the Faculty Assembly. He began by commenting on the Faculty Liaison Committee's meeting with the Board in which the Committee presented data showing that Virginia is not a high tax state and does not fund its higher educational system very well. He noted that the Student Association had managed to get the Board to set up a committee to study the issue of having an undergraduate student as a member of the Board. Welsh and his colleagues on the Liaison Committee pointed out that expanding the Board to include members from various on-campus groups could be a tricky matter and that faculty members might also deserve representation. In the faculty meeting, Welsh noted that students from the graduate and professional schools would probably also want representation on the Board. Indeed, he pointed out, since there are seven faculty constituencies, perhaps seven faculty representatives should be added to the Board. One wonders whether the current Board room is large enough to hold all of these additional voting representatives. He felt sure that the Board would consider this wider issue.

Welsh reminded the faculty that about a year ago, Arts and Sciences sent a recommendation to the

Assembly that only the three Assembly officers, and not the other four members of the Assembly Executive Committee, should receive released time for their special Assembly service. Recently, the Assembly voted not to accept that recommendation. He suggested that FAC might want to revisit this issue. Originally, the plan had been for each of the three Assembly Officers to receive one course per semester in released time, with other Executive Committee members receiving one course per year in release time. Complications arose because some Executive Committee members from the Schools held twelve month appointments for which course release time was not relevant, and others had curricular responsibilities which simply could not be released.

Ms. Reilly asked whether the May 15 salary study would include data by department. Oakley replied that FAC had advised the administration not to attempt to collect such data at this time. FAC experience in 1986 (when FAC and Institutional Research conducted a similar salary study at the request of President Verkuil) showed that getting such data would significantly delay the May 15 study because this data is simply not available from some institutions on one of our peer lists.

Mr. Ward pointed out that the stipend study of two years ago was still not complete, not having fully addressed the question of chairs' stipends. Dean Lutzer pointed out that Mr. Ward had written a letter protesting that the surveys conducted as part of that study were flawed, and that the March department chairs' meeting would address the issue of chairs' work loads.

#### Educational Policy Committee

Mr. Prosl stated that at the February meeting, he had presented the first semester EPC report and had added mention of the change in the name of the Fine Arts department that had been approved by EPC. The new name will be "Art and Art History". He also reminded that faculty meeting of EPC's position which breaks the former tie between contact hours and credit hours, allowing (in certain very special cases) four credits for a course which meets three times per week. Dean Haulman pointed out that the State Council's most recent report had called upon universities to move away from a "credit for contact" model of undergraduate education, and that EPC's position was entirely consistent with that SCHEV proposal.

Mr. Welsh asked about the student proposal to allow self-scheduling of final examinations. Prosl said that EPC had not yet received a detailed proposal about how such a system would work. Dean Haulman pointed out that there might be courses in which such a system would work and others in which it would not. Prosl commented that most faculty members do not seem enthusiastic about such a proposal, and suggested that it might be tried as a pilot project in a small department. Mr. Eckhause asked whether EPC had the authority to allow or impose such a system, or whether a vote of the faculty would be needed. Dean Lutzer intervened at that point to say that according to the Faculty Handbook, his office has responsibility for scheduling examinations. However, he assured the meeting that he would listen closely to faculty advice on this matter, as expressed by EPC or through a faculty vote. A faculty member asked whether moving to self-scheduled examinations would result in a compression of the examination period so that faculty could have some reasonable chance to complete and grade examinations before Christmas break. Mr. Prosl agreed that such a proposal would probably lead to compression of the examination period. Dean Haulman concluded this discussion by noting that the self-scheduled examination proposal would be on the back burner until the Curriculum Review is completed.

### Athletic Policy Committee

Mr. Conlee, chair of the Athletic Policy Committee, introduced Barbara Blosser, acting director of Athletics. The Committee's report having been circulated, the meeting turned to questions. Mr. Welsh asked Conlee about NCAA policy on the numbers of athletic scholarships to be allowed. Conlee noted that there will be a continuing effort to reduce the number of football scholarships.

Mr. McCord asked about the percentage of out-of-state students among our athletic admits. Conlee replied that, while he was not completely sure of the figures, his best guess would be that the percentage often approaches sixty percent. Ms. Blosser agreed with Conlee's estimate. This compares with roughly thirty percent in the student body as a whole, and Mr. McCord pointed out that, if Conlee's figure is correct, then at least a quarter of all of our out-of-state students must be athletic admits.

Mr. Edwards asked about admissions standards for athletes, and Conlee agreed that they are a bit lower than for other students. Various faculty members asked Conlee to present a further report showing admissions data, including SAT scores, on athletic admits, broken down by in-state/out-of-state, by sport, and by gender. The report should include information on academic success of athletic admits at the College, including graduation rates in four and five years, and data on class rank of graduating athletes. Dean Haulman pointed out that other things must also be considered as the faculty thinks about athletic admissions, e.g., the contribution that these programs make to ethnic diversity in our undergraduate population.

Mr. Conlee concluded by stressing that the College has been lucky to have such high quality administration of its athletic program over the last several years.

### International Studies Committee

Mr. Baxter said that when he was asked by FAC and the Dean to present a report from International Studies, he found that the most recent report had been three years ago. There have been many changes in the curriculum over that period, as outlined in the report that he circulated, all of which have been approved through regular EPC channels. Summer programs overseas have seen significant declines in enrollment over the last two years, and this might lead to decisions to cut back or even drop some money-losing programs. On the brighter side, Mr. Baxter said that summer program enrollment seems to be rebounding slightly this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Barbara Moore*

Barbara Moore,  
Secretary Pro-tem