

**Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
The College of William and Mary**

March , 2001, Millington 150

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Dean Barbara Watkinson

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the February 12, 2002 meeting were approved as posted with editing corrections.

II. Elections

Faculty assembly [1 one-year replacement term 2002-03, Area II]

Will Hausman (Economics)

X Scott Nelson (History)

Procedural Review [1 four-year term, 2 years on + 2 years as alternate]

Stefan Feyock (Computer Science)

X David Lutzer (Math)

International Studies [1 one-year replacement term, 2002-03]

Ken Kambis (Kinesiology)

X Gary Smith (Modern Languages and Literatures)

Retention, Promotion, & Tenure Committee

[2 three-year terms, 2002-2005, one in Area I and one in Area III]

Area I

John Morreall (Religion)

X Suzanne Raitt (English)

Area III

X Heather MacDonald (Geology)

George Rublein (Mathematics)

Educational Policy Committee [3 three-year terms 2002-2005, one in each Area]

Area I

X Arthur Knight (English)

Tim Costello (Philosophy)

Area II

X George Grayson (Government)

Larry Beckhouse (Sociology)

Area III

Gary DeFotis (Chemistry)

X Cindy Van Dover (Biology)

Academic Status

2 three-year terms, 2002-2005, not Area specific

X Carey Bagdassarian (Chemistry)

X Jesse Bohl (Philosophy)

Richard Palmer (Theatre, Speech and Dance)

Edgar Williams (Music)

III. Administrative Reports

In the absence of Provost Cell and Dean Feiss, who were attending budget meetings, Dean Watkinson reported briefly that undergraduate registration had been delayed one week (from April 1 to April 8). The fall schedule will be available on-line only, not in paper form.

IV. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Katherine Kulick began with a brief update on Faculty Affairs Committee activities:

Budget: FAC continues to advise the Dean on budget considerations, with special concern about shielding faculty positions, maintenance and operation budgets, research and library funds.

Merit Evaluation: FAC continues reviewing departmental merit procedures, in order to determine which may need updating or changing; it will report on this item in April or May.

Department/Program Policy Handbook: A subcommittee is clarifying (not change) this handbook

Committees: FAC is seeking to fill spaces on about 20 appointed committees. All faculty members will receive a form allowing them to volunteer their services.

Professor Kulick then opened discussion of Grade Review Procedures. She noted that the faculty had modified these procedures in May 1999, but FAC is now advancing some additional minor modifications for consideration and approval. They include cleaning up the language in order to cover Program Directors (as opposed to just department chairs), clarifying some ambiguities on deadlines, a clause to cover contingencies where the

professor involved is no longer accessible, and finally a clause to cover the possibility that the professor involved might be the Dean.

The most significant proposed modification deals with paragraph 5's stipulation that a review committee set up by the Dean would have two choices-recommending that a grade being challenged should stand or recommending that it be changed. There was a feeling that, based on cases, this was too narrow a charge for the review committee: proposed new language would thus allow it to determine that a grade a) stands or b) was inappropriate, and that it should be changed or merely that additional material (such as a late test) could be factored in.

In answer to a question, the Dean said that there were on average about five or six cases each year, about half of which result in the change of a grade. Other faculty suggested that the new revised policy language clarify that the review committee has options (a) or (b) above, not both.

FAC's proposed changes were unanimously approved by voice vote.

Professor Kulick then opened discussion of Post Tenure Review, raising the question of whether there is satisfaction with the current Arts and Sciences procedures under which all faculty are reviewed every six years or whether some could be exempted based on other measurements. The chairs have discussed this issue and requested that the FAC seek broader faculty input.

One faculty member noted that since PTR may also generate commendations, limiting reviews to just certain faculty would eliminate this possibility. Moreover departmental merit reviews vary.

But several department chairs voiced the view that all faculty are reviewed annually for merit (which for many peer schools is the method by which any PTR consideration is triggered), and that even current Arts and Sciences PTR language urges consistency with merit reviews: having a separate PTR review subjects us to more evaluation than necessary and lots of paperwork. Moreover variation in departmental merit review procedures does not matter since standards are department specific anyway. At the request of faculty, Kulick provided comparisons from peer schools, several of which trigger PTR only for those with low merit scores.

It was pointed out that another proposal is currently before the Faculty Assembly, a proposal that would strengthen the current PTR process by requiring full approval of

individual faculty performance not just by the department, but also by the Dean and Provost. Some faculty indicated that this would be a more dramatic change in policy, making PTR more like tenure review (albeit without outside evaluations) with independent assessments by administrators.

A question was raised as to whether basing PTR reviews strictly on merit score problems would leave the entire decision about triggering such reviews to chairs in some departments.

In referring back to the current proposal before the FASS, others noted that departmental autonomy should be protected-that unless a department's procedures are flawed, individual merit scores should not be subject to review. It was noted that the Dean and FAC never intended to tell departments what to do, but some were turning in all maximum scores, a concern that should go beyond autonomy. Several faculty suggested that this implied a need for department procedures.

Another question about the FAC discussion item was whether the State would allow greater flexibility to base PTR on merit. Kulick replied that this was indeed FAC's understanding.

Chairs reported on their near total unanimity on the need for streamlining PTR reviews.

Another faculty member noted that according to AAUP figures only about 6% of faculty on average need to be weeded out by such procedures as PTR. But it was also noted that this process was supposed to encourage faculty development, not merely to identify deadwood. Some faculty replied, however, that this latter idea was linked to a pledge of additional resources in order to promote faculty development, and no such funds have been forthcoming from the State.

Some faculty defended the current procedures, arguing that if departments are spending massive amounts of time on paperwork it is their fault-current reviews can be done in shorter order. Moreover the current system has caught some faculty who need assistance.

Dean Watkinson voiced her impression that most participants seem to favor some reduction in the amount of reviewing involved in PTR, and suggested that the faculty request FAC to investigate ways of reducing that burden. This motion passed on a voice vote.

Discussion then returned to the related but separate item currently before the Assembly. In reply to questions, it was noted that this particular document (giving the Dean, Provost and President an independent say in PTR) has been evolving for some time and has come from the Provost. Ultimately it will be coming to the Arts and Sciences faculty for discussion as well. Some faculty noted that they thought the Provost already had a veto and it was added that the Provost herself believes that the current proposal before the Assembly would in fact merely codify practice. But in a voice vote the faculty voted its support for preserving the current RPT reporting procedure (there was not support for making it more parallel to the tenure process with independent evaluations beyond the level of the department's own procedures)..

V. Committee on Graduate Studies

Acting Graduate Dean Gene Tracy prefaced the COGS report by noting that the budget situation makes the current stipend situation even worse than was noted in his report last year, and indicated that he would advance two specific resolutions to expand COGS role in the budget, and to reallocate overhead in order to provide more funding for stipends.

Prior to that, however, he quickly listed other items in the report. David Finifter has agreed to take over as Graduate Dean. There will be a discussion of the Graduate Program Task Force at the April meeting. The Graduate Center Program Review committee is underway. A new director for the Graduate Center, Hans von Baeyer, has been appointed. COGS had expressed its view that teaching assistants be classified as students under the new Consensual Amorous Relations policy. Finally COGS approved a number of courses.

Professor Tracy then introduced a resolution recommending that COGS be invited to talks with the administration and relevant faculty committees where the graduate budget is at issue. Its rationale is that COGS has total oversight of graduate programs (there is no equivalent at the undergraduate level). Moreover, graduate programs bring in the lion's share of overhead (89%) which then gets redistributed : the longterm vitality of graduate programs would thus have an impact beyond graduate programs themselves. Finally two Arts and Sciences graduate programs, Chemistry and Psychology, are candidates for elimination in the current budget crisis; COGS thus needs to be a party to any discussion of the budget.

Professor Tracy focused in particular on the status of graduate stipends, noting that they had increased in 1996-97 thanks to reallocation of funds from terminated MA programs, but that since then there have been no increases. As of 2001 stipends in all of the Arts and

Sciences graduate programs are below the 50th percentile among peer schools. Funds can be reallocated internally, but only by offering larger stipends to fewer students, eroding the size of the programs.

In answer to questions, he said it was difficult to tell about the source of stipend funds offered by our peer schools (e.g how much comes out of a dean's own budget) as many have endowments. In reply to another question he said that no adjustment had been made for different living costs.

Professor Tracy stressed that, despite these financial problems, our graduate programs are top quality: twelve junior faculty have won NSF grants, History's PhD program in Colonial America History is ranked second nationally in US News and World Report, and external research funding has doubled since the restructuring of the early 1990s.

He reiterated the importance of graduate programs to the entire academic program: they help ensure that our peer group remains that of research universities (which in turn affects salaries, library funds, etc.), enhances the undergraduate program, brings in external support, and assists in economic development in the Williamsburg/James City County area. The College is a research university: 25% of its students are graduate or professional students, one third of its degrees are graduate or professional, graduate students contribute to faculty research output, and the Public Policy program plays a major role in service. The Carnegie Endowment rates the College as a "doctoral research intensive" university and we should want to retain that status as it also helps determine the overall peer group. The College has done things right in its balance between strong undergraduate and strong graduate programs, and its assumption that one enhances the other; thus it should work to maintain that balance. The College ranked first in research funding and third in faculty research productivity among 136 schools in a Research Corporation study.

Professor Tracy then introduced a second resolution urging the administration to modify the present distribution of overhead recovery funds. Currently 30% go to the State, 17.5% to the President's discretionary fund, 17.5% to departments, and 35% to the faculty research budget. Unless the latter share is redirected into graduate stipends, the quality of graduate programs that fund the research budget in the first place would be at risk.

In answer to questions, Professor Tracy voiced skepticism that the share sent back to Richmond could be redirected into stipends.

Several faculty expressed concern about the status of the graduate stipends but noted that the faculty research budget will already be cut substantially in the upcoming year; there must be funds elsewhere that can be diverted to graduate stipends, such as from athletics.

Given the lateness of the hour it was decided to defer further discussion and a vote until April.

The Dean adjourned the meeting at 5:20

Respectfully submitted,

Clay Clemens

Professor of Government