

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**December 1, 2015**  
**Tidewater A, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:36 PM.*  
*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 80.*

**I. Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes for the meeting of the Faculty on November 3, 2015, were **approved** unanimously by voice vote:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/index.php>

**II. Report from Administrative Officers**

a. Provost Michael Halleran

- Explained that he recently reported to the Board of Visitors about the importance of scholarship at the College.
- Announced that the Board of Visitors has formally voted to continue the William & Mary Promise through the Class of 2020.
- Summarized the sequence of developments concerning the Virginia Retirement System's (VRS) recent announcement that it has selected International City Management Association – Retirement Corporation (ICMA-RC) as the new third-party administrator and sole record-keeper for the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP). The change is currently scheduled for Fall 2016 and was explained by VRS as a move toward greater simplicity and greater choice. Provost Halleran assured the Faculty that, as a Tier 3 school, William & Mary can opt out of the VRS ORP and would do so if VRS were to remove TIAA-CREF from the available options; however, he emphasized that the College will make a decision only after VRS has explained more fully this coming January which options will remain in the ORP portfolio. Suzanne Hagedorn (English) then expressed concern about the fact that the outgoing president of VRS is now head of ICMA-RC, and she noted that the potential financial savings that might be created by switching to this new third-party administrator are too small to justify the change; she asked Provost Halleran whether he was confident that VRS would retain TIAA-CREF and Fidelity in its ORP portfolio. The Provost responded that it would be premature to speculate at this point but that he expects to have more information after VRS clarifies its plan this January. Grey Gundaker (American Studies/Anthropology) asked for clarification of precisely what opting out would entail for the College, to which John Poma (Chief Human Resources Officer) replied that opting out of the ORP provided by VRS would not entail the College opting out of all other VRS programs and that, if the College were to opt out of the VRS ORP, another optional retirement plan would then be made available in its place. John further clarified that ICMA would not be able to act as sole record-keeper for all of the available TIAA-CREF options, so if TIAA-CREF were retained within the VRS

ORP portfolio, participant employees would need to consult with TIAA-CREF directly in order to exercise those options. David Feldman (Economics) asked whether there were any financial benefits to VRS's proposed change; John responded that record-keeping fees will be reduced but that this could have been achieved even without switching to a new third-party administrator. Grey then asked whether opting out of the VRS ORP might give participant employees more fund options within TIAA-CREF than had previously been available under the VRS ORP; John Poma replied that it could. George Rublein (Mathematics) asked whether opting out of the VRS ORP would require the College to hire an advisor for \$600,000/year; Provost Halleran replied that it would not.

b. Dean Kate Conley

- Announced that Gene Tracy (Physics) has agreed to serve as Director of the Center for the Liberal Arts and that Jerry Hart recently became the Center's Associate Director.
- Reported that the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences had submitted a diversity plan earlier that morning; she invited input from the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Council of Chairs and Program Directors, and the Faculty.
- Announced that in July 2016 the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be Janice Zeman (Psychology); in the interim, Lu Ann Homza (Dean for Educational Policy) will serve as the point person for the COLL curriculum and for advising.
- Reported that the Dean's Office has distributed some funds for maintenance and operations to the Center for the Liberal Arts, the Vertebrate Animal Care Unit, and the Office of Graduate Studies and Research; funds for M&O were also distributed to eleven departments and programs according to the following criteria: overall M&O in relation to the quantity of enrollments and majors; how departmental M&O is used to support students (based upon graduation rates and first and second major data); how departmental M&O is used to support faculty; and overall availability of private expendable funds. Departmental support has been increased over the past three-and-a-half years with support from the Dean's Contingency Fund.
- Showed the Faculty a chart illustrating that the base budget for Arts & Sciences has increased modestly over the past three years. She emphasized that Arts & Sciences will continue to owe half a million dollars for reallocation through the 2017 fiscal year.
- Dean Conley also explained that the number of tenure-eligible faculty has been consistent over time, with an increase projected for this year, and that the number of lecturers and senior lecturers has increased slightly to support interdisciplinary programs and increased enrollments, while the number of adjunct faculty has decreased slightly. Bill Cooke (Physics) asked how the total amount paid from the budget to tenure-eligible faculty has changed in recent years, and Dean Conley replied that this amount has increased. Cindy Hahamovitch (History) asked why the authorized increase predicted for FY 2016 is much smaller than that reported for the previous year; Dean Conley replied that this is only a conservative estimate. Leisa Meyer (History) asked whether the figures given included M&O for graduate students, and Dean Conley replied that they do. Suzanne Hagedorn (English) asked whether Dean Conley has discussed the Virginia Retirement System (see further

below) with the Board of Visitors; Dean Conley responded that she has not but that she will be meeting soon with four state legislators about the matter.

### **III. Discussion of Standards for Promotion and Tenure**

In advance of the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Faculty, Terry Meyers (English) had distributed a letter to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on November 19<sup>th</sup> announcing that he intended to introduce the following motion at the meeting:

*“Resolved, that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences asks the Faculty Affairs Committee to report to the Faculty at its February 2016 meeting and to clarify and affirm in a Faculty resolution what standards alone are proper for consideration in tenure and promotion cases.”*

Bill Cooke (Physics) initiated discussion of this matter at the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting by asking whether any document has given the Dean or Provost the ability to introduce additional standards for tenure and promotion beyond those approved by home units and the Procedural Review Committee. Provost Halleran explained that the standards outlined by home units are applied in combination with a general standard that the candidate must have made “significant contributions to their fields through research and scholarly or creative activity,” as stated in Section III. C. of the Faculty Handbook. Bill then asked whether that general standard nullifies the standards outlined by the home unit, and he expressed concern as to whether the distinction between the two types of standards is sufficiently communicated to candidates before their review for tenure or promotion. The Provost responded that external letters are solicited for cases of tenure and promotion in order to provide an outside assessment of whether or not the candidate has made “significant contributions to their field.” Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) then described her own experience during review for promotion in order to emphasize that the definition of a “significant contribution” in research must be made clear to candidates in advance of their review for promotion and especially for tenure.

Terry Meyers (English) stated that any standards applied that are not a unit’s as formally adopted and approved are improper and explicitly forbidden in the Handbook; he stated that neither the Dean, the Provost, nor any faculty committee have a mandate to substitute or overlay other standards that have not been approved by the home unit. Scott Nelson (History) clarified that the standard of “significant contribution” derives from the Faculty Handbook and not from any mandate by the Dean or Provost. Terry then stated that the criteria for a “significant contribution” have been defined in recent years by the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee in contradiction to the criteria outlined by some home units. Scott responded that the RPT is an elected committee that must debate the merit of a case particularly when the evaluation of a “significant contribution” by external reviewers has contradicted the evaluation provided by the home unit. Deborah Morse (English) explained that when she served on the RPT between 2009 and 2013, the RPT began its definition of a “significant contribution” by first consulting with the home unit to clarify its standards. Leisa Meyer (History) responded that this procedure has not always been followed by the RPT during the past three years. Deborah replied that home

units can alleviate some of the ambiguity by providing a more explicit definition of a “significant contribution” in their departmental handbook. Grey Gundaker (American Studies/Anthropology) emphasized that the lack of consultation between the RPT and home units is particularly problematic in the case of joint appointments, and she expressed concern that the standards for adequate service might also need clarification.

Terry Meyers then introduced the motion quoted above in italics from his November 19<sup>th</sup> letter to the Faculty. The motion was called to question and then **passed** by a voice vote.

#### **IV. Discussion of Retirement System**

Suzanne Hagedorn (English) moved to suspend the rules, and the Faculty voted in favor of suspending the rules. Suzanne then moved to change the order of the agenda so that the Faculty could consider new motions related to the Virginia Retirement System, and the Faculty voted in favor of changing the order of the agenda. Suzanne then introduced the following previously circulated motion (hereafter Motion 1):

*“WHEREAS, on October 15, 2015, the Board of Trustees of the Virginia Retirement System voted to move the administration of all Optional Retirement Plan for Higher Education (ORPHE) accounts to the ICMA Retirement Corporation (ICMA-RC),*

*WHEREAS this decision may deprive faculty members at William & Mary who enrolled in the Optional Retirement Plan of the option to invest their retirement funds with TIAA-CREF or Fidelity as they presently do,*

*WHEREAS, VRS did not adequately inform faculty enrolled in the Optional Retirement Plan that it planned to make this major change in plan administration in advance of its decision,*

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT we, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the College of William & Mary in Virginia, express our outrage at the VRS’s incompetent handling of this issue. We respectfully request that our President, Provost, Dean, and the Board of Visitors take whatever steps may be necessary to ensure that the William & Mary faculty who elected to participate in the Optional Retirement Plan can have continued access to TIAA-CREF and Fidelity to handle their retirement investments, including setting up an independent retirement system, as the University of Virginia, Virginia Tech, Virginia Commonwealth University and George Mason University have already done.”*

Will Hausman (Economics) then expressed concern that the phrase “incompetent handling” had been worded too strongly; he moved that Motion 1 be amended to strike the word “incompetent,” so that the first sentence of the final paragraph in Motion 1 would read instead as follows:

*“BE IT RESOLVED THAT we, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the College of William & Mary in Virginia, express our outrage at the VRS’s handling of this issue.”*

The Faculty then approved Will’s proposed amendment to Motion 1 by a voice vote. The majority of the Faculty voted in favor of calling the question on Motion 1, and Motion 1 as amended then **passed** unanimously by voice vote.

Suzanne Hagedorn then introduced another previously circulated motion as follows (hereafter Motion 2):

*“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the College of William & Mary in Virginia, express our dismay at the possible conflict of interest in the VRS’s decision to award ICMA-RC the contract to administer VRS Optional Retirement Plan accounts. We note with concern that Robert Schultze, who served as the Director of VRS from 2005 until January 2015, has been the President and Chief Executive Officer of ICMA-RC since February 2015 and that this change in the ORPHE involves approximately 5,000 individuals holding retirement accounts with investment assets that amount to approximately \$885.4 million dollars (as of December 2014).”*

Leisa Meyer (History) proposed to amend Motion 2 to change the phrase “possible conflict of interest” to “apparent conflict of interest.” George Rublein (Mathematics) asked whether the previous financial performance of VRS under the directorship Robert Schultze might justify VRS’s selection of ICMA-RC as the new third-party administrator with Schultze as its President and Chief Executive Officer; Leisa explained that Robert Schultze was not previously involved with choosing the investments of VRS but served instead as an administrator. Leisa’s amendment to Motion 2 was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

David Feldman (Economics) questioned whether the College would gain anything from Motion 2, and Will Hausman (Economics) proposed that any conflict of interest would be instead a legal issue to be reported to the state’s fraud hotline, not an issue necessitating a motion from the Faculty of the College. John Gilmour (Government) added that the issue is already being examined by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC), and he proposed therefore that Motion 2 would be unnecessary. The majority of the Faculty then voted in favor of calling the question on Motion 2, and Motion 2 did *not* pass on a voice vote.

*The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeremy Pope (History, [jwpopo@wm.edu](mailto:jwpopo@wm.edu))  
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences