

Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The College of William and Mary

April 2, 2002, Millington 150

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

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

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

II. Elections

Faculty Affairs Committee and Faculty Assembly (1 three year term 2002-05, Area II)

X LuAnn Homza (History)

Ken Kambis (Kinesiology)

Committee on Degrees (1 four year term)

X Elizabeth Wiley (Theatre, Speech, and Dance)

Chris Abelt (Chemistry)

Faculty Compensation (1 four year term)

X Katherine Kulick (Modern Languages and Literatures)

Brent Owens (Geology)

Educational Policy Committee Chair

X Joan Gavaler (Theatre, Speech, and Dance)

Secretary of the Faculty for Arts and Sciences (three year sentence)

X John Morreall (Religion)

III. Administrative Reports

Provost Cell reported on efforts to build a budget for the whole biennium and noted that it was very helpful to have the Budget Policy Advisory Committee's assistance (BPAC will meet again this coming week to discuss the tuition increase issue). The Board of Visitors Finance Committee will meet on April 12 to do a preliminary review of the budget which will then go to the entire Board later in the month. The initial intent was to keep any tuition hike to no more than 9%, but steps taken at George Mason University have drawn more attention to this issue, which may prompt the Assembly to get involved once again (something the College would prefer not happen). When the tuition cap was lifted the state just increased the amount of budget cuts, and since the College is loathe to make more reductions, that means tuition will rise.

[In answering questions, the Provost noted that cuts of six million dollars, rather than the original four million, are now under discussion. Governor Gilmore originally proposed a 6% tuition hike; Warner has proposed 5%, but with an equivalent sum to be withdrawn from the budget of state universities. That linkage died, disconnecting the two measures, but the higher cuts remain].

[In replying to additional questions, Provost Cell confirmed that the College now faces larger cuts than were previously expected, but can choose to offset them with tuition rises. She indicated that she could not yet discuss the range of possible tuition hikes. At the same time, she noted that in-state tuition is currently lower in real terms than at any point since 1992].

[In reply to questions, she added that the College was given the option to allocate its 2.5% bonus incentive salary increase either on merit basis or across the board. It could choose the latter since salaries have been frozen and since it will not go into base salary anyway. Since the money is on a one-year basis only, no part of it can go into base pay; however the 2.75% increase planned for the second year of the biennium will be in the base but it is contingent upon the economy].

[Provost Cell also replied to questions about the General Assembly's cuts: the Senate restored ten million dollars to the equipment trust fund but did not restore money for eminent scholars; it left in cuts in minority student summer programs (which the College will now fund by itself); it did restore funds for new facilities (Swem and the Keck lab). The Assembly has been back and forth on the maintenance reserve budget but in any case the College has only half of what it needs].

[In reply to a question the Provost indicated that a one percent tuition hike across the board generates about \$450,000 in revenue, so a 9% hike would plainly help offset budget cuts].

[In response to questions the Provost noted that the current BPAC proposals for 2002-2003 envision funding 30 Faculty Research Assignments at \$13,500 each (a lower replacement cost that will plainly impact departments), and

30 Summer Research Grants at \$4500 each). The Faculty Research Committee will as usual have discretion to adjust these numbers somewhat. She also said that she had strongly recommended restricting SRG money to untenured tenure eligible faculty. In addition there will be \$10,000 for Minor Grants, all for students. She voiced her hope to begin rebuilding the faculty research budget in the second year of the biennium].

[In reply to questions about the impact of budget cuts on the Muscarelle Museum, she cited the ongoing work of a committee, including herself and a representative of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts. The College aims to keep the Museum open albeit on a more restricted basis and to do so with private money (thus one purpose of the above committee). The main immediate concern is to maintain its accreditation. It is too early to tell how the fundraising will go].

Citing the fact that William and Mary undergraduates have recently been awarded both the Truman and Goldwater scholarships, the Provost said it is yet another indicator of a frustrating dichotomy: the achievements of those at the College go up, but its budget declines.

In response to a question, the Provost confirmed that a decision has been made not to change the status of graduate programs in Chemistry and Psychology.

IV. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

In light of other agenda items, Katherine Kulick announced that FAC would defer its report.

V. Faculty Research Committee

Clay Clemens reported on the Faculty Research Committee's 2001-2002 recommendations. The Provost allocated a record high of \$885,000 in research funds, envisioning a rise from \$18,000 to \$19,000 in replacement funds for faculty on FRAs. In response to faculty input after the 2000-2001 recommendation, the FRC introduced two new procedures in 2001-2002: FRA proposals from all faculty with six or more years of service since a previous FRA would be considered in the same pool (dropping the previous practice of considering those with seven or more years first), and non-tenure eligible faculty would no longer receive SRG bonus points.

The FRC received 39 FRA proposals (15 from faculty with six years of service); it recommended funding 34 of them (13 of those from faculty with six years of service). It received 83 SRG proposals (50 from untenured faculty), and recommended funding 44 (42 from untenured faculty).

Clemens noted that the Provost has allocated less funding for research in 2002-2003 (see Administrative Reports, above). In reply to questions, he and Dean Feiss confirmed that there is a high priority placed on coordinating FRC-administered grants with those from elsewhere, such as the Charles and Reves Centers. As for the suggestion that private endowment money be used to supplement the research budget, Feiss and Provost Cell noted that such funds are usually heavily restricted by donors (only 20% is unrestricted and most of that goes to student aid). A donor with a specific interest in Arts and Sciences faculty research would be needed.

In reply to another question, Clemens noted that about five FRAs were allocated to professional school faculty (who apply under Area II for purposes of FRC funding).

VI. Educational Policy Committee

Professor Joan Gavalier noted that in its February 2001 report, EPC had recommended a common computing proficiency requirement, a baseline of skills independent of concentration. In April 2001 the committee recommended a digital information literacy pilot program with modules for communicating digital information, ethical issues surrounding it, evaluating data and finding data. Students largely ignored the chance to take part in the fall pilot program but the spring version was web-based and advertised, so 95 freshmen (7.3% of the class) did take part. They performed well, with an 80-90% pass rate. Student feedback was positive on the search and plagiarism sections, and most seemed to find the exercise useful.

The aim is now to test the system in fall 2002 and to have this proficiency in place by fall 2003. All freshmen should have to pass all the modules (with tutoring for those who do not). To keep it updated, the program will be reviewed every other year.

On behalf of EPC, Professor Gavalier introduced a resolution endorsing plans to continue the pilot project and requiring all freshmen to pass all modules in fall 2002 as a test of the system. The program can be expanded to include modules proposed by the faculty.

In reply to questions, she said the fall 2002 version would not yet include tutorials (which would not be ready until fall 2003). Dean Watkinson noted that the latter are intended to be instructional, adding elements beyond pointing and clicking. Professor Gavalier noted that this coming fall it would still be necessary for students to do all four quizzes from the original modules, but that since things would still be in the study phase, passage would not be required. In answer to questions, Dean Feiss noted that ways could be found to enforce taking the quizzes even before the proficiency is in place, such as by withholding a PIN or registration. It was pointed out that requesting students to take it again this fall seems somewhat weak, but this is part of the transition from a testing phase to a sanctioned requirement. It was suggested that the testing could be done in Orientation Week, but Dean Watkinson

noted that the completion rate was better when students did not need a four hour bloc in order to complete it.

In answer to a question as to whether there would be a module for computer-based presentation skills like PowerPoint, Gavalier noted that EPC did not want to tie the program to one software.

In answer to the question of whether the College could really update this system or whether there was not instead a commercial one, Dean Watkinson said that Microsoft has one called TechExam but that it is expensive and that EPC felt none of those available captured what the College wants.

The resolution passed unanimously on a voice vote.

VII. Graduate Program Task Force Report

Dean Feiss thanked Professor Gene Tracy for serving as Acting Dean of Graduate Studies and then turned things over to him to deliver the Task Force report.

Professor Tracy said it might seem academic to set out criteria for new graduate programs given that budget constraints had forced discussion of the elimination of two programs this year. Nonetheless there is a need to consider the future. This Task Force got its charge from a previous task force that revisited the 1994 Strategic Plan. It received input from the Committee on Graduate Studies, took into account SCHEV guidelines, sought input via the Arts and Sciences listserve, and spoke with the Dean's Advisory Committee. Today's report is part of the process of seeking input.

Professor Tracy outlined the Task Force's guiding principles--that any graduate program be consistent with the College's mission; that it entail significant faculty commitment; that it be competitive at the national level; that it must be evaluated by comparison to peer schools; that the proposal must show the benefit to students and faculty; that it will receive the resources; that there will be no negative effects; that the primary justification is faculty research and thus that normally the program would be PhD level (possibly with a transitional MA). A Masters only program proposal would require special justification, such as the Public Policy program.

In answer to the question as to whether any of the College's graduate programs have been nationally competitive at the time of launch, or whether they are started in hopes of ultimately achieving that status, Professor Tracy said that standard will be defined in relation to peer schools.

Another faculty member suggested that initiation of any graduate program be made contingent upon a formal College-level obligation to ensure adequate funding and also added that some terminal MA programs can be very useful without a PhD.

Provost Cell noted her concern about talk of fostering new graduate program, which seems to imply that all good undergraduate programs move in that direction--something beyond our resources. The College has chosen to have just a few, which is part of its uniqueness. There are reasons for it to have the ones it does, and the world is not seeking new PhD programs. Some faculty echoed that point, expressing concern about the growth of graduate programs, but Provost Cell added that the College does indeed want to remain a research university.

Professor Tracy agreed that the Task Force wants to preserve the College's values and voiced confidence that it generally does graduate programs right.

He then went on to outline the process by which future graduate programs would be approved. There would be an informal discussion paper describing the program, profiling the likely students, assessing its impact, listing peer programs etc. This would be distributed to deans and COGS for feedback. Multiple iterations of the latter would be possible. A White Paper would then result, with updated contents, as the basis for a proposal to SCHEV and with an addendum on the impact on the College. This would be externally reviewed by a three member committee, followed by an internal review, with the reports coming back to COGS. The final stage would be approval by the Arts and Sciences faculty. The evaluation criteria would be scholarly strength, resources, strength of program, the job market for graduates and the local context.

Provost Cell asked whether demand would be a factor. Tracy replied that this could be taken into account under the job aspect. He added that SCHEV now requires a comparison of any proposed programs to others in Virginia, but Provost Cell noted that the College would be concerned not just with those of the Commonwealth but with others nationally.

Faculty members noted that all of the above criteria could be met with graduate students from abroad (Tracy agreed that the residency of the students was not built into the evaluation). This being the case, then it would be relevant to ask about the impact on undergraduates, especially if the graduate students are teaching (some universities have been sued over this issue).

The Dean adjourned the meeting at 5:25

Respectfully submitted,

Clay Clemens

Professor of Government