

MINUTES
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
2 April, 1996

The meeting was called to order by Dean Jacklin at 3:35 PM.

After some parliamentary discussion, Professor Gary DeFotis moved to amend his statement on page 5 of the minutes of the meeting of 12 March, 1996 by substituting the phrase "to set vastly lower standards for" for "not to expect the same standard of." The amendment was adopted by majority vote and the minutes were then approved as amended.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Provost Cell reported that a decision had been made by the administration not to recommend inclusion the faculty in the provisions of the Workforce Transition Act which allow state employees to apply for severance pay or early retirement. The law applies to teaching and research faculty only if their Board of Visitors approves. UPAC last year advised caution and the Budgetary Advisory Committee now advises that faculty not be included because: (1) we have no guarantee that positions will remain with the institution; downsizing of state employee numbers continues; (2) there are sizeable up front costs to institutions; (3) no other institution of higher education has included its faculty except VCU, where there are unique problems in the Medical College; (4) the law is unequal in that it is offered only to those who are members of the Virginia Retirement System, not to those on optional plans.

Dean Jacklin announced that work on next year's salaries is not yet complete, but that some points previously discussed are moot because the money just isn't there. More than 1/2% of the salary pool goes to retirement arrangements and an amount smaller than what was wanted will be available for promotion raises; the average raise will be slightly under 4% and it all must be given on the basis of merit and equity. The Dean will hear grievances through 15 minute appointments after April 15 when the contracts come out -- any longer arguments must be submitted in the form of written materials.

Professor William Hausman expressed disappointment that 5% has turned into 4% and pointed out that last year there were also retirements and promotions but 2 1/4% stayed 2 1/4%.

Dean Jacklin responded that there were far fewer promotions last year, and an unknown number of retirements.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Nominations and Elections

Professor Hoak introduced the proposed change to election procedures intended to make electronic voting possible for faculty committee elections only by amending section 7, Article V of the Bylaws by deleting the last sentence and substituting the following:

"Elections shall be completed within one week of the meeting of the faculty at which nominations close."

This change would extend the franchise, especially to those teaching at 3:30 on Tuesdays and should eliminate some confusion regarding invalid ballots, since the computer would reject such ballots while the voter was still on line and able to make corrections.

Professor Faia doubted whether this would offer any real advantage unless it also made it possible to see position papers of each of the candidates included on the computer.

Professor Kincaid asked whether this would require two computer passwords, the usual one and a special one for voting.

Associate Provost Noonan answered affirmatively.

Professor Hoak added that the second password would be programmed to disappear and not make votes identifiable.

Professor Tiefel raised the possibility that this would result in a substantial loss of attendance at meetings; he would prefer an absentee ballot opportunity of some other sort to keep the actual election within the meeting.

Professor Orwoll wondered how we would do the run-offs when not enough people get a majority.

Professor Hoak was uncertain as to whether the amendment would require run-offs to be completed in the same week.

Professor Gary Smith asked whether this could be done through email rather than WAMI and how the privacy of the secret ballot would be protected.

Professor Hoak pointed out that email might be less secure.

Associate Provost Noonan responded that one can be made as secure as the other, but he did not know the technical details of providing secrecy to the ballot.

Professor Vold interjected that technical details are too complex to be debated here, but the question is the idea of remote voting itself; if the faculty wants it, the details can be worked out.

Professor Fuchs raised the issue of whether we can exclude the possibility of someone calling the question during the nominating procedures of a meeting without some positive language in the amendment to ensure the computer vote.

Professor Rublein asked whether we could test the system with a pilot election of some sort.

Professor Hoak agreed that a dress rehearsal or trial run might be a good idea.

Professor Terry Meyers asked whether the plan assumes that everyone will be capable of accessing the web.

Associate Provost Noonan replied that some would have to use the computer labs until the end of the Fall Semester.

Professor Jack Edwards argued that this is intended to be a deliberative body and that it sends the wrong message to make it possible to vote without participating in the discussion.

Professor Morton Eckhause rejoined that he hadn't heard any discussion of candidates' qualifications in 30 years here, but the overriding issue is the increase in the size of the electorate.

Professor Houle stated that people who only care to vote and leave are not the problem.

The vote was 41 for and 28 against, causing the amendment to fail for lack of the 2/3 majority necessary to change the bylaws.

Professor Hoak then presented the following nominations:

1. Academic Status (two to be elected):
 - Kathleen Bragdon
 - Gregory Capelli
 - C. Lawrence Evans
 - Cam Walker

2. Degrees (one to be elected):
 - Thomas Finn
 - Richard Lowry

3. International Studies (two to be elected):
Waldemar Eger
Ronald Hallett
Clyde Haulman
George Strong
4. Procedural Review (two to be elected):
Donald Baxter
Carl Carlson
George Greenia
Kenneth Kambis
5. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure:

Area I (two to be elected):
Lawrence Becker
Katherine Kulick
James Livingston
Patricia Wesp

Area III (one to be elected):
John (Mike) Finn
Rex Kinkaid

Professor MacGowan protested that there were 3 openings, not 2, on the Committee for International Studies.

After a brief discussion, Professor Hoak agreed that one additional person would need to be elected to the Committee on International Studies in May.

There being no response to the call for nominations from the floor, the polls were closed by the appropriate motion, second, and voice vote, ballots were marked, and the Committee left to proceed with the counting.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Clemens began by reporting that a new chair of FAC was to be elected in May and that Harlan Schone had been nominated by the Committee.

Various policy issues had been discussed this month resulting in several letters sent by the Committee to administrators; officials in the Development Office have confirmed that "The Annual Fund" is "The Arts and Sciences Annual Fund."

He then introduced the resolution regarding impact of retirements on the salary pool which had been circulated on

WAMI and proposed it as an official motion from the Committee:

"The Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommends to the Dean and the Provost that no less than one-half of base salary saved each year by replacing retiring senior faculty with entry-level faculty be added to the general pool for merit raises for continuing faculty.

"Each year the Dean and Provost should report to the Faculty at the appropriate time on the distribution of salary savings. In any one year, exceptions to the one-half limit are possible. However, such exceptions shall be explained and the distribution of savings will be adjusted in the next year to ensure an average of no less than one-half over the course of that two-year period."

Professor James Harris asked Professor Clemens to clarify whether this is concerned only with Arts and Sciences retirements and raises and then proposed a friendly to make that clear, which was accepted. Some discussion of the mathematical theory involved in the proposal followed.

Professor Stephen Park asked whether there was any unambiguous way in which you could calculate the relative costs involved.

Provost Cell pointed out that the Strategic Plan proposes a mixed hiring practice, since it is sometimes unwise to replace always at an entry level, and that it is not always immediately clear what savings have been realized -- sometimes it takes a year or two for the situation to clarify itself.

Professor Hausman stated that he shares the Provost's concern about the wording "entry-level," but will vote for the proposal because tactics like this are important to realize our goals.

Provost Cell added that the assumption is that all positions are going to remain allocated to Arts and Sciences is not valid, but when hiring does not take place immediately and a position remains in Arts and Sciences, money is available to Arts and Sciences for other educational and general uses within the academic program, providing a very small amount of useful flexibility.

Professor Robert Archibald commented that he would accept the removal of "entry-level faculty" as a friendly amendment, but there is, every year, a net savings from retirement in any case. We are not likely to continue to increase the

size of the Arts and Sciences Faculty as we have recently, so in the future there will be some money available here.

Professor Clemens noted that putting the money in new positions also locks up the money.

Professor Hahamovitch sought to clarify the point that only one-half of the amount saved is to go back into the pool, not one-half the whole salary of the retiree. It was agreed that the former was indeed the intention of the resolution.

Professor Rublein stated that the administration is constrained from manipulating the salary pool for other purposes beyond one per cent, so the real issue is whether the size of the salary pool and the size of the faculty shall stay the same or shall we have a shrinking faculty, or shall we relieve the teaching load by increasing the faculty size.

Professor Schwartz spoke against the motion on the basis of issues of priorities: our role as a deliberative body should be to discuss priorities, but be cautious about addressing questions of means in such detail; setting a fifty per cent rule is too specific. Faculty Affairs should also be concerned with other priorities, such as student aid needs.

Professor Fuchs rejoined that he favors the proposal because it is substantive; it makes a choice of academic priorities -- we have made a great amount of thought lead to this modest nudge in proposing a move to meet our priorities.

Professor Ewell argued against the motion, since we're not yet capable of seeing what we're giving up by this motion and growth hasn't all been willy/nilly; we've been creating need for new positions by other actions taken here.

Professor Robert Welsh noted that the crucial word is "recommends" -- considerable discretion is left to the administrators.

Professor Stephen Park proposed striking every sentence except the first sentence of the second paragraph.

That amendment was defeated.

Professor Oakley then moved to restore the previous friendly amendments, which was accepted.

The motion carried.

Professor Clemens then went on to other business of the Faculty Affairs Committee, yielding the floor to Professor Rublein to address Faculty Assembly Business.

Professor Gary DeFotis inquired about discussion of post-tenure review documents in the Faculty Affairs Committee: had any evolution in their thinking occurred?

Professor Clemens responded that the Committee's role is strictly advisory, but that the critical word on the document was changed to "either."

Dean Jacklin added that discussion continues in the Faculty Development Committee and there is a fleshed out version in process.

Professor Gary DeFotis asked whether, in the light of concerns about public reaction to what might be interpreted as low standards set, it is worth comparing our draft to what sorts of language other schools are using.

Dean Jacklin: "It has been done."

Faculty Research Committee

Professor Vold presented the annual report of the Committee, emphasizing that of an annual budget of almost \$700,000 (about the same as last year's) sixty per cent went to Faculty Research Assignments and forty per cent to summer grants. There is still not enough money for all worthy projects, as indicated by the statistics for worthy but unsuccessful applications. There is, in regard to summer grants, an 87% success rate for junior faculty, versus less than 50% for experienced faculty. The committee is also reconsidering the wisdom of the provision of extra support for those receiving extramurally funded support.

Professor Houle: "Have you considered making junior leaves available for all, not just those departments which can afford them?"

Professor Vold replied that there has been no formal discussion of this, but it might have a severe impact on other programs.

Professor Houle asked whether there have been goals set to find more opportunities.

Professor Vold answered that they haven't pursued funds, but concerned themselves with what they had.

Dean Macdonald stated that the Committee needs to do this, and seriously consider sacrifices at other levels.

Professors Rublein and Vold then engaged in a discussion to clarify details of the numbers in the table of the report.

Professor Faia asked why we don't have a preference for junior faculty for semester grants if we do for summer grants.

Professor Vold conceded that the point merits discussion, but that the Faculty Research Committee was not sure that it was the right vehicle for the discussion. He looks upon his Committee's job as quality control, not policy setting.

Professor Oakley pointed out that the Faculty Affairs Committee did this three years ago, and created a scenario to start that process, but that the proposal died at the Provost's desk.

Professor Vold commented that we need new money, so as not to harm other programs.

Professor Oakley stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee agreed with that view.

Provost Cell added that we simply could not find the means.

Professor Robert Archibald affirmed that junior leave in a department has to be a right, because competitive granting amounts to a tenure decision; these opportunities have to be available to all.

Professor Cell: "This was the problem we could not meet."

Professor Houle rejoined that the present situation is inequitable because departmental leaves are not given in all departments now.

The results of the committee elections were then announced:

Academic Status:	Bragdon and Walker
Degrees:	Lowry
International Studies:	Hallett and Haulman
Procedural Review:	Baxter and Greenia
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure:	
Area I:	Becker and Kulick
Area III:	Kinkaid

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,


James R. Baron

Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences