

MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
4 October, 1994

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer in the Commonwealth Auditorium of the Student Center at 3:36 PM.

The minutes of the meeting of 3 May, 1994 were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Lutzer read the following updated list of faculty fellowships into the record:

Paula Blank	ACLS
Judy Ewell	Fulbright
Clyde Haulman	Fulbright
Talbot Taylor	Guggenheim
Dale Cockrell	NEH and American Antiquarian Society
William Fisher	Smithsonian
Robert Gross	NEH and Rockefeller
Laurie Sanderson	NSF Presidential Young Investigator Award
Mary Ann Melfi	NEH Summer Grant
Anne Henderson	Woodrow Wilson and Pew Trust
Cindy Hahamovich	NEH Summer Grant
Anthony Anemone	IREX Summer Fellowship
George Harris	NEH Summer Grant
John Delos	University of Colorado Astrophysical Laboratory
Katherine Preston	NEH Summer Grant
Robert Fehrenbach	NEH
Jack Martin	NEH
Dan Preston	NEH

Between July 1, 1993 and June 30, 1994, the total of grants and contracts received by faculty members in Arts and Sciences was \$7,460,021. That represents a 21% increase over the previous twelve month period.

Hans von Baeyer has received outstanding science writing awards from Bild der Wissenschaften and from AIP.

The Dean also reported that we made fourteen tenured and tenure eligible appointments, of which seven went to women and two to members of minority groups; 57% of these appointments made affirmative action progress for the College.

After consultation with the FAC, the Dean has recommended that Heather Macdonald be named as Dean of Undergraduate

Studies, rather than Acting Dean. With the agreement of the Provost, the Board of Visitors made that change at its September meeting.

It is EPC policy that no final examinations are allowed to be given during the final week of classes.

The Dean has drafted budget initiatives regarding curricular changes, technology, a teaching center, and computational science.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

President Sullivan reported that preliminary news about the Governor's budget amendments suggested that the climate in the next few months might be unsettled with a tendency to stormy. Four different commissions with educational concerns were due to report before the end of 1995, and the restructuring reports required of all institutions of higher education are important to avoid further returns of a percentage of the budget. We may be in a little better shape than a few years ago, since there is a sense in some quarters in Richmond that higher education has already been hit enough, so there are two proposals to test the climate: one to restore the reduction in general funds, and the other a 5 year plan to bring salaries back up to the 60%ile, which proposes a 5% raise for the next budget; all this is subject to the effects of fears which may emerge from the 1995 fall elections.

Professor Gary DeFotis asked whether there was a significant faction in the General Assembly for whom research is not a good word, since it was not mentioned enough in recently proposed College documents.

President Sullivan responded that there are a significant number of legislators who consider research a rip-off of the public.

Professor Fuchs asked for a clarification of the connection between the Strategic Plan and the restructuring documents and whether a delay in the latter would run afoul of budget cuts.

President Sullivan replied that strategic planning began before restructuring, but that their work was used in preparing the restructuring report, which must be in on time.

Professor McGlennon noted that the state's role in support has declined, but research funding from other sources has improved, and asked how development money will help and

urged that a section on development become part of the College's Strategic Plan.

The President answered that development and efficiencies must replace state support, so successful fund raising is critical. The results of the strategic plan will be a blueprint for the Development Office, [REDACTED].

Professor McGlennon commented that it would take more than 3 weeks to develop so important a document.

President Sullivan added that the schedule for submitting our Restructuring and Strategic Plan has been set for us -- we MUST do that.

Professor Terry Meyers responded that this is too complicated a document to rush.

The President declared that the plan is a critical step, the result of a long year's labor by a representative committee, and that for now he is only an interested bystander who will hand on the document to the Board of Visitors in November.

Provost Cell announced that the new registrar arrived on 19 September and immediately took up her duties. Gary Kreps is now serving as a faculty assistant to the Provost for one year to aid in the updating of College policies regarding outside and overload employment and conflict of interest, the latter as required by the NSF.

Unrestricted discretionary funds from the endowment have been allocated to the Dean of Arts and Sciences for faculty support.

Comments on the Strategic Planning document have revealed areas which need immediate attention, and more needs to be said about the process of implementation.

Professor Alan Ward suggested that we contribute Morton Hall to the state prison system to help the state balance its budget; murmurs from the assembled faculty suggested that it would not meet current court mandated standards for such purposes. Professor Ward then inquired about the status of the Faculty Handbook project.

Provost Cell responded that Lynda Butler has constituted a subcommittee of the Faculty Assembly to address the handbook problem; she wants it done before the Southern Association visitors arrive on campus.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Nominations and Elections

Professor Alan Ward placed the following names in nomination for the Board of Faculty Compensation:

Norman Fashing, Biology
Alan Fuchs, Philosophy
William Morrow, Government
Margaret Schaefer, Mathematics

Dean Lutzer then called for nominations from the floor. There were none. A motion to close nominations then was made, seconded, and passed, votes were cast, and the ballots collected.

Dean Search Committee

Professor Linda Reilly reported that the committee had circulated questionnaires to the Faculty on the interviewing and selection process, had circulated and published appropriate announcements and advertisements of the position, and held an open meeting to discuss the characteristics desired in a successful candidate. Everyone seemed optimistic about getting the best Dean possible.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Chappell placed in nomination for the Nominating Committee the following names:

Area I (vote for 1): William Cobb (Philosophy)
 Martha Houle (Modern Languages)

Area III (vote for 2): Morton Eckhause (Physics)
 Bruce Goodwin (Geology)
 David Thompson (Chemistry)
 David Stanford (Mathematics)

Dean Lutzer called for nominations from the floor. There were none. A motion to close the nominations was made, seconded, and passed and the previously distributed ballots were collected.

Professor Chappell then proceeded with the rest of the Faculty Affairs Committee report, including the nominations for College and university wide committees; discussions of retention, promotion, and tenure issues; recommendations on drafts of personnel policy documents regarding search and selection and sexual harassment; and a recommendation to continue the Multi-cultural Fellows Summer Program. The

Committee has also discussed several issues regarding the Strategic Plan. Questions have been raised about the situation of three members of the Faculty Affairs Committee being also on the Strategic Planning Committee and whether they could adequately represent all concerned.

Professor Willis commented that this situation does not serve the Faculty well -- we must in the future have elected representation on any new committee of this importance.

Professor Chappell responded that it should be done. He then outlined other concerns which had been voiced at the meeting of 3 October: questions of the responsibility and jurisdiction of the schools, departments, and committees regarding merit and curriculum issues; suggestions that the implementation of the various actions proceed separately after those which must happen immediately have been identified; and a call for clearer explanations of the roles of clusters and related departments, of research opportunities, and of public service issues.

Professor McGlennon then raised the question of whether the operating procedures and rules of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) preclude the proper advising and informing of the faculty by Faculty Assembly members. This must be changed.

Professor Strong asked how the members could be told not to advise us if they had been elected to represent us.

Professor Rublein explained that their only choice had been to abide by the agreement regarding consensus reports or resign from the Strategic Planning Committee.

Provost Cell added that no conflict of interest issue had been raised when the committee was originally created.

Professor Johnston pointed out that the consensus rule has been variously interpreted -- some guidance earlier would have been helpful to departments in preparing their responses to SPC.

Professor Chappell stated that some detailed guidance about answering SPC questions was given to MA department chairs during the summer.

Professor Willis reiterated that an elected committee would have better served various other interests and that it needs to be done that way in the future.

Professor McGlennon then rose to circulate a memo which he had prepared and to move the following resolution contained within it:

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences recognizes and is committed to a thoughtful and serious response to the mandates from the Commonwealth that each public university and college undertake a careful reexamination and propose comprehensive plans for restructuring our institutions to meet the needs of Virginia's citizens, both taxpayers and students.

The response to this mandate by the Strategic Planning Committee appointed by the President is a document filled with thought-provoking issues. Its recommendations include significant reordering of priorities, dramatic curricular changes, including the termination of some degree programs and the creation of others, and a basic shift of authority over academic programs away from the faculties of the university toward administrative committees at the university level.

The implications of these recommendations demand the considered attention of the faculties affected by these proposed changes. Relevant committees in Arts & Sciences, the Schools of Education, Law, Business Administration and Marine Science have the right and constitutional responsibility to make recommendations on such sweeping changes in existing policy.

Because the current schedule for consideration of the Strategic Plan precludes such consideration, as provided in the Faculty Handbook and the by-laws of the faculties, therefore be it resolved that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences requests that the Board of Visitors delay consideration of the Strategic Plan report until its February meeting, or such special meeting as may be scheduled to allow for a reasonable opportunity for the faculty to provide the Board with guidance on the implications of the plan.

Professor Philip Funigiello asked whether it was intended that this be sent to the President to be passed on the Board of Visitors.

Professor McGlennon answered affirmatively.

Professor Deborah Green expressed a desire that a very concrete and defined structure be imposed to prevent a larger waste of time.

Professor Terry Meyers suggested that the structure already exists in the organization of the faculties and their committees.

Dean Lutzer pointed out that various committees have been asked for their input, including Faculty Affairs, Educational Policy, Graduate Studies, and the Committee of Department Chairs and Program Directors.

Professor Hausman stated that this is a plan, not automatically to be implemented, but that the Dean's Advisory Committee wants a statement added that it must be implemented through the current committee structure.

Professor Rublein asked for the opinion of the Graduate Studies Committee.

Dean Scholnick responded that an executive summary has been prepared to be submitted.

Professor Rapoport asked what our representatives were allowed to say -- what does the consensus rule really mean?

Professor Rublein summarized that they were to make no personal attributions and express no outright opposition to the terms of the document, but that they were allowed to give enlarged explanations of the view of the committee and its intentions and to comment on procedures, schedules, etc.

Professor McGlennon reasserted that there is not sufficient time for every committee to consider all the implications of this document. The Self-Study needs to be completed first, because we seem to know where we're going, but don't really know where we are.

Professor Tracy said that the Educational Policy Committee intends to meet, but needs time to do analysis rather than just comment, and that the Faculty needs to take control of the implementation.

Professor James Harris argued that this resolution was worth supporting because of the value of the Faculty's control over its own business and added that he was puzzled by the sense of urgency, which seems to be externally imposed.

Professor McCord concurred that the Faculty Assembly needs more time to become informed and vote its endorsement, as do other committees.

Professor Ann Reed asked to whom the committees should report.

Professor McGlennon replied that they should follow existing procedures and report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Clemens stated that it was necessary to recognize the difference between the time needed for input and the time

needed for the Faculty to take appropriate action in accordance with its prerogatives.

Professor Kennedy labelled the resolution as premature, since there has been only one open meeting for the committee to respond, and added that delay involved risking 2%, 4%, or 6% budget cuts from Richmond. The consequences of a \$1.7 million cut are too serious to delay; peoples' concerns will be addressed in the next few weeks.

Professor Reilly added that it was necessary to vote against the resolution because the stakes are too high, and that the committees could not make that much difference by February.

Professor Gary DeFotis argued that it would help if the Strategic Planning Committee assured us that they do not intend to impose the implementation of these plans dictatorially.

Professor Eckhause reaffirmed that there were very serious issues of faculty autonomy in hiring and so forth at stake here, and that the relationship between Strategic Planning and the restructuring document was still not clear.

Provost Cell announced that the Committee has begun to receive comments, criticisms, and suggestions, but hasn't had time to consider and evaluate them; some comments indicate that the proposals have been perceived in ways not intended: suggestions for new degrees are not firmly to be implemented, and there is no intent to make faculty governance totally different from what it has been. Implementation in most areas will come back to traditional procedures, but the crafting of the document required an institution-wide committee.

Professor Kreps said that he liked the dialogue and objected to some aspects of the plan, but doesn't have any problem with the process by which the document has been produced, trusting that faculty involvement will continue in the implementation process. We need more involvement in open meetings, and by the younger faculty, too.

Provost Cell then reviewed the timetable in response to Professor Alan Ward, pointing out that SCHEV and the Secretary of Education must have the final text of the Restructuring and Strategic Plans by early November.

Professor McGlennon pointed out that the Faculty Assembly will be voting before our Faculty can see the revised version.

Professor Slevin argued against the McGlennon motion because it was premature -- there was no time to deal with the issues comprehensively and coherently.

Professor Finn questioned whether Board of Visitors approval meant that everything stated will happen, and whether he was still confusing a planning document with its implementation.

Provost Cell pointed out that the Board of Visitors has the power to phase out programs, but that details can be worked out with the departments.

Professor Willis was still bothered by such profound changes.

Professor Alan Ward moved to postpone vote on the resolution to the next meeting.

Professor James Harris spoke against the postponement.

After debate of the motion to postpone, it failed by a vote of 37 for and 40 against.

The McGlennon resolution then passed by a vote of 38 for and 34 against.

Educational Policy Committee

Professor Tracy introduced two items for action by the Faculty. The first was a proposal to create a "course Limbo" under which courses which had not been offered for four years would be placed in an inactive status and removed from the Catalog; if they were not offered within the following two years they would be completely dropped. Courses on inactive status could be reinstated any time a department wished to place them back into the schedule provided the department chair certifies that the course has not changed in any substantial way. But once dropped, the procedures for an entirely new course would have to be followed in order to reinstate the course.

Professor Finn inquired about the status of courses which presently had not been offered for four years.

Professor Tracy: "They become inactive."

Professor Reilly asked if departments have been notified of the list of courses not taught for four years.

Professor Tracy answered affirmatively.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

The second motion was a proposal to institute a new type of transfer credit to bring the College into conformity with new state laws for transfer students from Virginia's state supported community colleges, which require that they be

given junior status if they arrive with an appropriate Associates degree granted by the previous institution. The proposal adds a third category to the equivalent vs. elective transfer credit distinction that is now in force.

It was asked whether it wouldn't be better to create a separate category of "junior status."

Dean Macdonald stated that this would not correspond to the intent of the legislature. The problems involved in denying admissions in the first place were also addressed. No one is happy with the problem.

Dean Lutzer added that complying with the mandate in the fashion proposed by EPC avoids being forced to transfer 'D' grades.

The motion carried by a voice vote.

Dean Lutzer announced the following election results:

To the Nominating Committee:

Martha Houle
Morton Eckhause
Bruce Goodwin

To the Board of Faculty Compensation:

Margaret Schaefer
Alan Fuchs

The meeting adjourned at some really awful late hour.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Baron
Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences