

MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
1 March, 1994

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer in the Commonwealth Auditorium of the Student Center at 3:34 PM.

The minutes of the meeting of 1 February, 1994 were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Lutzer announced a change in the system of distributing minutes: the basic mode of distribution will become an electronic bulletin board, with hard copy circulation to be phased out gradually, except for archival copies.

The Dean also reported that the following rumors were circulating: Professor Judith Ewell was about to receive a Fulbright award; Professor Talbot Taylor, a Guggenheim; and Professor Tomoko Hamada, a state Outstanding Faculty Award.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Provost Cell announced that President Sullivan was prevented from appearing at the meeting because of College interests in Richmond and the visit of the Dutch Ambassador.

She then reported on the status of the legislative budget as the conference committees begin their work; we seem to be doing pretty well compared to the original proposals of 20 December, 1993, but the details of specific amounts and which Centers and Institutes have been restored vary considerably from one house of the legislature to another, as do proposals for tuition caps. The capital budget will include money to equip Tercentenary Hall, and it is a comforting sign that the members of the legislature realize that higher education has been hit hard enough. The House bill calls for salary increases of 3.2% for the first year of the biennium, the Senate, for 3.4%; both offer 2.25% for the second year, subject to revision in next January's session.

The restoration of the Centers shows that there remains some commitment to quality, and the rejection of the idea of taking funds from one school for another is a hopeful sign. As for the mandatory restructuring plans, the House dropped the idea of withholding 1.5% of each school's budget, but its Higher Education Appropriations Committee has sent out a letter stressing the seriousness of restructuring, and the

Senate bill still withholds the 1.5%. The Conference Committee report is to be issued on 8 March.

Provost Cell then introduced Vice-President Stewart Gamage, the College's new publicist, this being her first day on the job.

Vice-President Gamage greeted the Faculty and praised President Sullivan's success in overcoming the unfairness of the original budget bill.

Professor Fuchs asked whether the proposed salary increase would be effective on 1 December, 1994.

The Provost affirmed that that seems to have become the standard practice.

Professor James Harris asked what the practical effects of the decentralization proposals would be.

Vice-President Gamage replied that not so much paperwork would have to be sent to Richmond: travel and other small purchases could be handled locally, without the current state contract problems.

Provost Cell added that the greatest effects initially will be in Richmond: so many things are now done over after being done once here, and delays waste money. There should be some efficiencies on campus, but great savings in Richmond. The thrust of restructuring is to better management, but "re-deployment of faculty" is a phrase which worries her. Our new curriculum is the sort of self-analysis which should get praise as part of the process.

Dean Disque distributed and discussed a printed summary of the purposes and structures of New Student Orientation. She pointed out that orientation planning is a balancing act between social, personal, and academic concerns, and various campus groups pull in opposite directions.

A question was raised as to whether or not there were still many complaints about courses not available.

Professor Randolph Coleman, Director of Academic Advising, responded that we have tried to provide help which has minimized complaints.

Dean Disque pointed out that the opportunity for new students to preregister for part of the courses during the summer has helped a great deal.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Chappell reported that his committee had met 4 times since the last Arts and Sciences Faculty meeting in order to respond to a number of concerns expressed by faculty members. They discussed and then forwarded a proposal for reducing the athletic fee to the Self-study Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and to the Provost. They also recommended a procedure giving the Nominations and Elections Committee a more even spread of committee elections during the Spring Term. They have recommended a proposal concerning the eligibility of chairs to serve on the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, which is currently being discussed by that committee. They have also discussed a request for a consideration of the value of the Faculty Assembly, and that issue will be the principal topic for the 22 March meeting of the Faculty Assembly. Finally, they have recommended the make-up of the Search Committee for the Dean, met with the Provost to discuss that committee, and will make nominations for its members to be selected by the Provost; the committee will consist of 9 members, including the chair, from Arts and Sciences, 1 non-Arts and Sciences member, and 2 students, 1 undergraduate and 1 graduate; nominations and suggestions for these persons can still be made.

Professor Hausman asked if the students on the committee would have a vote.

Professor Chappell: "Yes."

Professor Hausman then asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee would recommend the student members.

Professor Chappell answered affirmatively and added that they were soliciting suggestions.

Professor Chappell then reported on Faculty Assembly business. Professor Welsh testified before a subcommittee of the House of Delegates on the problem of the "Death in service benefit before age 65." New Affirmative Action guidelines are being prepared and will be discussed by the Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Compensation Board met with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly and they reached 2 conclusions: past actions regarding faculty compensation have overlooked the Board and the Faculty Assembly will recommend that the chair of the Compensation Board sit on the University Policy Advisory Committee.

Dean Lutzer commented that the death benefit problem was a serious hit on the rights of surviving spouses and needs to be changed.

Educational Policy Committee

Professor Fowler first moved the items on his committee's March report which were up for action at this meeting.

The motion that Freshman Seminars will normally be taught for 4 credits, but that they may be taught as 3 or 4 credit courses provided criteria for Freshman Seminars are met, passed by voice vote.

The motion establishing transitional scheduling guidelines evoked some discussion.

Professor Alan Ward asked why the committee excluded the 12-2 MWF time slots from 2 hour periods.

Professor Fowler answered that it would affect too many time blocks.

Professor Chappell asked if there could still be 9 AM MWF classes.

Professor Fowler responded affirmatively.

Professor James Harris again asked why the 10-12 and 12-2 blocks were excluded.

Registrar Savely explained that we don't have enough time blocks if we eliminate too many 1 hour time slots because of the number of classrooms we have available.

Professor Kreps stated that he assumed that this motion involved some sort of projection of the number of 4 credit courses which would require 4 classroom hours.

Registrar Savely responded that at present there would not be very many, but that if the English Department's proposal passes, it will increase.

Professor Kreps then expressed the hope that the new Faculty Handbook be silent about normal teaching load.

Professor Hausman said that 12 was the normal load specified in the old book, but it is 9 in the new one, which is not yet adopted.

Professor Kreps urged caution for this reason.

The motion was adopted by voice vote.

Discussion then moved to the proposed guidelines regarding pilot projects to convert departments' regular course offerings to 4 credits. Professor Alan Ward asked for clarification as to when the review would be conducted; the experimental period did not seem long enough if it is based on data from only 1 or 1 1/2 years of experience.

It was added that all students will have only partial experience with the new courses, which would not be scientific enough. A 2 year cycle requires that the evaluations be done in the 3rd year.

Professor Kreps asked whether the Educational Policy Committee or anyone else had developed a rationale for the accompanying conversion from a 5 to a 4 course load.

Professor Fowler responded that the current proposal was only for a very limited experiment or pilot project to assess the problems to be considered in developing such a rationale.

Professor Willis asked why the experiment was not put on a 4 year basis.

Professor Fowler answered that 2 years is one cycle of majors.

Professor Schwartz said that we don't yet have any criteria for these evaluations.

Professor Fowler pointed out that we do have some criteria in this document.

Professor Schwartz then asked what are the criteria by which the Music Department might conclude that it doesn't work.

Professor Fowler responded that they would examine the effects on students' courses, faculty time, and relevance to the new curriculum.

Dean Lutzer suggested that the correct parliamentary move to delay passage of this motion would be to recommit it to committee.

Professor Tiefel spoke against recommitting because of other delays which it would cause.

Professor Alan Ward reiterated that time problems require that the evaluation be done after 2 years, not during the 2nd year.

Professor Fowler replied that he would accept that as the correct interpretation of the proposal.

Professor Axtell said that apprehensions about this matter are not at a departmental level, but about its effect on our total program, so the evaluation needs to be about the larger effects.

It was objected that the understanding had been that this pilot program was to be evaluated, but that it was not meant to be a general reevaluation of the Music Department.

Professor Kreps pointed out 2 criteria implicit in the document: that teaching faculty were to report their experiences, and students would do the same, after which each would be considered.

Professor Harris asked under what circumstances we had ever imposed similar reviews -- on new concentrations?

Professor Fowler said there had been none, but that the faculty had asked for it in this case.

Dean Lutzer asserted that it could be imposed on new concentrations, but hasn't in the past.

Professor Axtell declared that it seemed to him that one department isn't an adequate test.

Professor Fowler allowed that we don't know for sure in advance.

Professor Axtell inquired as to whether we had looked at other schools.

Professor Fowler responded that the evidence is mixed.

A member of the Physics Department stated the concern that coverage of breadth will be lost -- that it is not possible to offer enough courses to cover all topics as it is, and therefore we need to be cautious about a general conversion.

Professor Kennedy presented the perspective of the English Department, that the debate is delaying the progress towards implementation of their proposal.

Professor James Harris argued that what we had asked for was a consideration of the wider implications of the issue, not a waiting period.

Professor Fowler pointed out that the Faculty did ask for a suspension of further conversions.

Professor Conlee rose to propose an amendment to delete point 5 of the proposal, which suspends further conversions.

Professor Axtell seconded the motion. He then declared that this is not an experiment if only one department does it.

Professor Fowler replied that the Music Department evaluation won't actually delay the English Department.

The amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

The motion, as amended, was then adopted by a voice vote.

The Athletic Policy Committee

Professor Conlee reported on the activities of the committee over the past year, including the monitoring of programs, the drafting of a new document on principles for the Faculty Senate, and discussions in the Strategic Planning Committee. A gender equity report from the athletic administration, which remains confidential at this time, has been sent to the President for action, with comments by the Affirmative Action Officer. Proportionality is a difficult problem, since women compose 55% of the student body; this is likely to require a cap on squad sizes in men's sports and an increase in women's. The Self Study will look at gender equity, cost containment, and athletic fees.

Dean Lutzer asked whether proportionality required not just a certain number of participants, but also a certain level of support and quality.

Professor Conlee: "No."

Professor Wiseman pointed out that the expenses for football throw it all out of whack, and that we must have a 5 year plan.

Professor Rublein asked for Professor Conlee's comments on the NCAA vote to reduce the number of grants-in-aid for Division I-AA football.

Professor Conlee reported that the committee had split, and that the President of the College had authorized a vote in favor of a reduction to 55 grants-in-aid, but not down to 45.

Professor James Harris asked whether there was a presidential exemption from affirmative action guidelines for hiring coaches.

Professor Conlee: "I don't know. Do you have examples?"

Professor James Harris: "Hirings seem to happen overnight."

Professor Conlee: "I will inquire."

The question was raised as to why resources weren't allocated equally.

Professor Conlee: "Football costs \$3,000,000.00."

Professor Griffin asked about the argument that women's interest in intercollegiate participation is less.

Professor Wiseman asserted that this doesn't stand up in court.

Professor Tiefel inquired about the scheduling of games during the final examination period.

Professor Conlee responded that the problems would have been big if the football team had gotten farther in the playoffs.

Professor Axtell asked how many games the baseball team plays.

Professor Conlee said that their coaches claim that it is the same as practice, as far as time is concerned.

Professor Axtell responded that this is not true when they are playing away games 3, 4, or 5 games a week.

Professor Conlee added that the Athletic Department has a policy, but perhaps what is needed is a comprehensive policy covering all types of absence from class -- choir trips, etc. too.

Professor Welsh asked why the President can tell the committee chair how to vote.

Professor Conlee responded that the NCAA wants the administration, not the faculty, to be in charge.

Professor Welsh asked whether the Self Study will cover matters such as the ratio of in-state to out-of-state athletes.

Professor Conlee: "Yes."

In regard to Athletic grants-in-aid for basketball, Professor Conlee said that we voted to stay at 13.

It was moved and seconded to adjourn at 5:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,


James R. Baron