

Minutes
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, April 3, 2012 3:30-5:00pm
Sadler Center-Tidewater B

Dean Gene Tracy called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 28.

I. Minutes of the last meeting, March 13, 2012 were approved as amended (VI, Report from the Faculty Assembly: read “NTE policy” for “tuition waivers”)

II. Report of Administrative Officers:

Vice Provost Kate Slevin on behalf of Michael Halleran reported the following:

- Richmond has yet to approve a budget, and the Provost and President will consult with the BoV,
- nor have any decisions regarding the curriculum been made, despite reports in the press to the contrary.
- nonetheless, Western Civilization is safe, and we’ve not ceded our standards.

questions and discussion:

- John Oakley (Classical Studies) inquired about reports in the Virginia Gazette regarding the VRS, to which the Vice Provost replied that no decisions have been made.

Interim Dean Gene Tracy reported the following:

- a grant from the Mellon Foundation, \$770 million for “bridging positions in the humanities”.
- Tucker renovation is on schedule.
- Integrated Science Center 3: Richmond has approved conceptual drawings (to be shown to the BoV); construction management team is in place. The design is innovative and distinctive.
- because of a lack of alignment between the House and Senate in Richmond, the Tyler renovations remain in a holding pattern.
- regarding the seat crunch in our classes, conversations with the DAC are constructive and congenial. The problems include: complaints over lack of seats and lack of flexibility. 10% more seats needed. Finding resolution to this issue will reduce complaints from parents which in turn may reduce complaints from the BoV that we should teach more classes. We are reticent to throw adjuncts at the problem, and, after the reallocation, there is no money left over for hiring more NTEs and adding more sections. Some solutions include employing graduate students and advances undergraduates as TAs.

questions and discussion:

- is room size the problem? Kelly Joyce, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, explained that a space crunch continues despite the efforts of some departments to add seats

and move classes to bigger rooms. One solution is to encourage 90 minute slots on MW for some courses in the Spring term.

- is the problem perception of the students? Might a universal wait list system alleviate some of the stress? Dean Joyce responded that options for wait-listing are not successful in our current iteration of Banner, a problem that the Registrar is trying to address. The problem is in part an issue of seats which has been building for years. This problem is further exacerbated by the psychology of registering for classes: students perceive a lack of choice. Students also cannot search for classes with open seats (as is possible at Christopher Newport).
- Suzanne Raitt (English) inquired if there was pressure on particular courses. Dean Joyce stated that a study to this effect has been shared with the Chairs and Program Directors. A 10% increase is needed across the board, with greater stresses at the lower levels: 100-200 more seats for freshmen/sophomore courses.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English) inquired about data regarding under-enrolled courses. Dean Joyce admitted that there were some weird things going on in English, but most Departments and Programs are not experiencing under-enrolled courses. As the economy tightens, students may be taking more “practical” courses.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) followed up on the waitlist issue, seeking clarification of the problems. It is a technical problem on Banner.
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science) suggested that access to wait list data would help with planning and provide a stronger sense of which particular courses are in demand.
- Debbie Bebout (Chemistry) inquired if the 10% increase would become a 20% increase for sophomores, 15% increase for juniors? Dean Joyce replied that the DAC is seeking a short term solution for the year but is striving to find a long-term resolution.

Dean Tracy continued with his report, reporting that:

- there is the assumption that there will be raises, but no clear plan on funding raises, nor who gets raises.
- a House Bill is suggesting a bonus (which we do not want in lieu of a raise).
- retirement bumps are still in place.
- raises will theoretically be awarded on a delicate balance of merit and retention, with the hopes of restoring meaning to the merit process.

further questions and discussion:

- Will Houseman (Economics) inquired if there was discussion about restoring raises to take effect in August rather than December.
- Leisa Meyer (History) asked if the raises were to be awarded only to faculty. Is there no allocation for staff? *4% for the staff is still in play.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) inquired about how NTEs figured into the raise issue. Would they become base funded? *Once the NTE policy is place, there is every expectation of bringing them into the merit system. But that conversation has not yet occurred.*
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) inquired about clarification of the phrase “bridging the Humanities”. *Referring to bridging retirements. The Mellon Foundation is dedicated to bringing more junior members into the Humanities.*

Dean Tracy continued, addressing the status of the reallocation plan: E&G; the need for more external monies; increase of revenue from Summer School and St Andrews Programs; Salary Savings.

- all 23 searches for the year were kept open.
- 1 search for next year (approved by Dean Strickwerda).
- other significant budgetary issues include: Graduate Stipends; increase of E&G for SSRL; start up (continues to rise, and only decreases in years wherein we defer hires).

additional questions and discussion:

- Will Houseman (Economics) sought clarification of start-up expenditures, which seem to require a 3-year commitment.
- Bob Archibald (Economics) inquired about a bulge in the retirement return to work policy for faculty hammered by VRS. *VRS is no longer honoring retirement bumps. Phased retirement is still in place, and is completely separate from the VRS decision.*
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) inquired about SSRL money. *The Provost is committed to supporting the program, but no figures have been agreed upon. The SSRL must be fully funded, and the funding model changes with overhead.*
- Nancy Gray (English and Women Studies) asked how the SSRL plan is implemented. *The Provost must accept it. This subtle exercise in part shows the BoV that schools are making sincere and hard choices about budgetary allocations, in the hopes of obtaining a tuition increase.*
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English) queried if all of this is based on the \$54 million reallocation. Although we (A&S) are the star of the show, we are being denied star status and instead are being treated like the poor step child. Our School is being denied the resources that are going to other Schools. *Our share of the pie is not what it ought to be. They treat us like the stars but we are not being paid like stars. We generate \$90 million in tuition revenue. As the student body increases, so does the revenue. We could charge more overhead for grants.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English) observed that some of this is theatre. If we get the tuition increase, will we have to do all of this? *Doing this helps make the argument for the tuition increase.*
- George Rublein (Mathematics) asked if there were any recognition in the plan concerning the extra burden of extra students on class size, etc. *The BoV seems to want a greater reliance on NTEs, which will change the mix of how we use NTEs. We will try to move contingent NTEs to base funded and continuing NTEs. The problem is in part a personnel problem. A 3-3 NTE teaching load offers gives us more teaching power. We hope to hire additional NTEs (for the St Andrews program) during the reallocation and switch to more TEs afterwards. The 3-3 load starts now, the NTEs have been hired.*
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): could this be the beginning of more to come? *The interest among the BoV in differential teaching is high. Dean Joyce advised that significant growth in the student body has been occurring for 10-12 years. Although we have missed the trends, we have noticed the increasing problems in individual classes. Dean Tracy interjoined that it is important to remove any*

excuses for BoV not to implement an aggressive tuition increase. The BoV has a sense that the faculty have not made hard budget choices.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): “Is there a commitment from the President to resign if do not get the increase? If we get a beating, at least I’d like to see some upper level heads roll (and we all heard the same things three years ago)”. *general nervous laughter.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): will the vote on an aggressive tuition increase occur at the April meeting? *The budget is still hung up in Richmond, and the BoV usually holds a special meeting to vote on the budget, deferring their vote until after Richmond decisions. The proposed tuition bump is: 50% incoming in-state freshmen; 10% for current students.*

III. Nominations and Elections

Debbie Bebout (Chemistry) reported the following:

ELECTED IN MARCH

- *Retention, Promotion & Tenure Area I (3 year term):* Simon Joyce (English)
- *Retention, Promotion & Tenure Area II (3-year term):* Pam Hunt (Psychology)
- *Education Policy Committee Area I (3-year term):* James Armstrong (Music)
- *Education Policy Committee Area II (3-year term):* John Gilmour (Government)
- *Education Policy Committee Area III (3-year term):* Josh Erlich (Physics)
- *Committee on Academic Status Area II (3-year term):* Bill Fisher (Anthropology)
- *Committee on Academic Status Area III (3-year term):* Brent Owens (Geology)

APPOINTMENTS FOR RETIREMENT REPLACEMENT 2012-2013

- *None*

APPOINTMENTS FOR LEAVE REPLACEMENT 2012-2013

- *None*

BALLOT FOR APRIL 2012 ELECTION

Elections to terms as indicated; Committee tenure will commence August 2012

- *Procedural Review/Personnel Policy Committee Area III Repl.: 2 year active + 3 year alternate*
 - Keith Griffioen (Physics)
 - Robert Hinkle (Chemistry)
- *Procedural Review/Personnel Policy Committee Area Unrestricted: 3 year alternate*
 - Nominee identification still in progress
 - If you are reading this, consider your interest in nomination.
 - Please contact Debbie Bebout (dcbebo@wm.edu) or another N&E member.
- *Faculty Hearing Committee Area III: (3 year active + 3 year alternate)*
 - Paul Heideman (Biology)
 - Robert Pike (Chemistry)
- *Faculty Hearing Committee Area Unrestricted: (3 year active + 3 year alternate)*
 - John Eisele (MLL)
 - Laurie J. Wolf (Theatre, Speech & Dance)
- *2012-2013 Chair, Educational Policy Committee (from Committee)*

Kim Wheatley (English)

- 2012-2013 Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee (from Committee)
Nominee anticipated from FAC for April election
- Soon after the adjournment of the meeting, ballots would open

IV. Report from Faculty Affairs

J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry) reported that

- the FAC is running the election for Nominations and Elections (no nominations from the floor)
- and there will be a link to volunteer or nominate candidates to appointed committees
- a reception for retiring faculty would follow the May meeting

V. Changes to A&S By-laws: J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry)

unanimously approved as amended (both clauses to read “may”).

VI. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt (English) reported that the FA met once, and continued an on-going discussion of integrating NTEs. Should they have representation on the FA?

VII. Update on Curriculum Review

Teresa Longo (Dean for Educational Policy) reported that:

- The town hall meetings to discuss the curriculum review (February 28, 29) were well attended
- she encouraged faculty to attend one of the town hall meetings scheduled April 4 and 5
- the purpose of the meetings is to present ideas for the curriculum as paradigms
- the committee strives to be responsive to faculty comments and continues to clarify its design
- the supporting documents will be posted to BB eventually, but they are intended only as supplementary to the conversation with committee members
- there will be a formal presentation at the May A&S meeting

questions and discussion:

- Suzanne Hagedorn (English) inquired about closing the meeting at which the plan would be presented to the faculty, and if there were scheduled a formal presentation to the BoV. *No formal presentation to the BoV who have been receiving regular updates from Michael Lewis.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English) thanked the committee for being so open with the faculty during the process.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia Irby, Secretary
Associate Professor of Classical Studies
glirby@wm.edu