

MINUTES
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
October 4, 2016
Tidewater A, Sadler Center

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:35 PM.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 40.*

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes for the meeting of the Faculty on September 6, 2016, were **approved** unanimously by voice vote:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20160906.pdf>

II. Report from Administrative Offices

a. Provost Michael Halleran

- Updated faculty on Hurricane Matthew that was headed to campus and advised that everyone stay posted, updates given via email, but most likely little impact to campus as projected to hit during the Fall Break period.
- Announced that the annual RAFT debate between the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and computational sciences was held on October 3, 2016 was won by the humanities, who will hold this title for the year.
- Announced that on October 27, 2016 the Tack faculty lecture will be given by Bruce Campbell (German Studies), discussing German Pulp Fiction.
- Updated faculty on the Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting that was held September 21-23, 2016. During this meeting, two new buildings (Integrated Science 3 and Tyler Hall) were dedicated.
- Announced the impact of anticipated changes due to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) that will lead to the paying of overtime to certain employees on campus that meet two conditions, with both have to be met for the employee to qualify for non-exempt status and therefore overtime pay:
 - Salary threshold of \$47,476 per year for a full time employee.
 - Duties test - a determination of whether the employee completes exempt job duties including items such as supervising other, including management as a primary job role or having input into job status of others. These items being included in the job of the employee lead to exempt status and therefore would not allow for qualification for overtime under FLSA.
- Provided an update on the budget & faculty salaries.
 - The state will not contribute to the pool for salary raises. With this information, the college is now able to move forward with salary increases. The pool for this is capped by the state at 3% and the College is currently trying to make adjustments to reach the 3%. A decision on this is expected to be released soon.
 - Currently it appears that there will be no budget cut for the fiscal year 2017, but this is subject to change.
 - In the fiscal year 2018, we should expect cuts as the current model of revenue that projected 3.5% economic growth has not occurred in the last 2-3 years.
 - A question was raised by Suzanne Raitt (English) - What was the result of tuition increases, included in the promise, being used for salary increases that were capped by the state?

- Provost Halleran answered that the fiscal year 2017, there was a pool projected at 3%, .72% was taken back from by the state. College contributes to offset what state does not contribute to the pool to get to the 3%.
- A question was raised by Bill Cooke (Physics) - 5-6% salary increases were promised, then put in place, then stopped by the state. What happened to the other 2-3% of funds that we should have gained from tuition increases, are they being used for other purposes?
 - Provost Halleran answered that going into last years planning process, if no cap from state and no adjustments had taken place, relying only on tuition would have provided 4.5%, but then state capped at 3%. The BOV approved the budget in April, based on 3%.
 - We are also currently in the last year of reallocation. Prior to this year, the reallocation was directed towards salaries. This year, Arts & Sciences will keep the money from reallocation.
- A question was raised by Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) regarding whether faculty should be hopeful that we will receive percentage raises that were part of the promise.
 - Provost Halleran answered that the original goal was to have these raises by 2018 - still the goal but will not happen as soon as anticipated. The following items happened:
 - The state capped salary increases.
 - Peer institutions have done well - the peer set is 60% private and 40% public. Private schools tend to be more aggressive on this.

b. Dean Kate Conley

- Announced that a reallocation update to come soon. Arts & Sciences will keep reallocation. There was a possibility some would have gone back, now sounds like we will be able to keep.
 - One use will be 1% for equity adjustments over and above the pool. This won't be taken out of salary pool, but instead will come out of reallocation.
 - Hopefully the update will be available in November.
- Seven updates were then provided:
 - Arts & Sciences diversity council focusing on inclusion and mentoring. The council is currently not satisfied with the current plan for mentoring. They are still discussing this and welcome ideas. The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has also been brought into this conversation.
 - The Council of Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD) held its annual fall retreat, discussing inclusion/diversity for each department and program was discussed.
 - Chon Glover (Assistant to the President for Diversity and Community Initiatives) spoke at the retreat. Round table discussions held to discuss the state of planning within each department.
 - Center for the Liberal Arts (CLA) and Lu Ann Homza (Dean of Educational Policy) is currently holding brain storming sessions (emails have gone out to faculty) to plan for the COLL 300 on campus experience and the COLL 400 courses. If interested, reach out to CLA or Lu Ann Homza.
 - Dean's Office and CLA is currently working on a new model for Academic Advising. Model includes the hiring of three full time advisors, each with a specific area. One will be dedicated to advising as related to the COLL requirements, one will work with student requirements in all four years, ensuring the students complete all general ed/ COLL requirement and the third will work with transfer students. The model for the office will include a faculty director, staff and advisors.
 - The BOV was on campus in September. We anticipate that members of the the BOV will make more visits to Arts & Sciences. Three more visits from board members this fall, with two new leaders of Academic Affairs in particular.

- Dean Conley met with donors and alumni in Washington DC and New York and was able to attend the For the Bold campaign event while in New York. Spoke with over 250 alumni in Washington DC.
- The Advancement office is interested in working with Arts & Sciences. Vice President for University Advancement, Matthew Lambert plans to visit FAC and CCPD to encourage fundraising efforts by faculty.
- A question was raised by Paul Manna (Government) about the timeline for diversity plan - is this still forthcoming?
- Dean Conley answered that no actual date has been provided, but hopefully a draft will be produced this year, with Chon Glover (Assistant to the President for Diversity and Community Initiatives) possibly consulting. Dean Conley is also interested in how these discussions are going within each department as a part of the development of the plan.

III. Report from Faculty Assembly

Sophia Serghi (Music)

- Reported that the Faculty Assembly engaged in personnel issue that raised concerns with regard to harmony between the Threat Assessment Team (TAT) and the faculty handbook. The goal is to look into gap between the two in order to learn more about the committee and their function and make amendments to harmonize gap between these two.
- Announced that Cathy Forestell (Psychology, Chair of Liaison Committee) gave a summary of the faculty survey.
- Announced that John Poma (Chief Human Resources Officer) & Rita Metcalf (Senior Director of Human Resources Operations) attended and presented the Human Resources initiative regarding faculty wellness and well being. This is in the initial stages but there is a brochure.
- Susan Grover (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, and University Professor for Teaching Excellence), Kelly Crace (Associate Vice President for Health & Wellness) & Tatia Grander (Ombuds) invited to share their roles and their resources for faculty in November.
- The Committee on Planning and Resources (COPAR) will not meet until October 14, 2016 in order to discuss the initial overview of the budget with Sam Jones.

IV. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Joan Gavalier (Theatre, Speech & Dance)

- Provided information about the possibility of Student Peer Advisors being involved in making recommendation to the Dean's office about the common book that is read by entering freshman.
- Informed the faculty on the meeting with Gerald Bullock (Executive Director of A&S Development) who is eager to have the Faculty of Arts & Sciences involved in sharing stories their interaction with students. This information would ideally be publicized as a priority of the campaign to share with donors the excitement of what faculty does on campus. Any stories or ideas may be sent directly to Gerald.
- Announced that Department/Program Chairs are encouraged to nominate faculty for committees.
 - Faculty involvement in governance was discussed with regards to when involvement is more or less effective, including the work faculty conducts that leads to useful items.
 - The diversity committee's plan and mentoring were discussed.
- Currently waiting on updated Dean's memo (now with the Programming Resource Center (PRC)) based on the Dean's memo, the Provost's memo and the FAC memo from last year that looked into giving united department standards. The draft will hopefully be reviewed and released for faculty next year.
- The possibility of a tuition waiver for faculty children was discussed at the monthly meeting.

- Discussion was held regarding the Freedom of Information Act requests regarding how these are reviewed, what qualifies for exemptions, and what would be handed over.
- This month at their meeting, a discussion of COLL courses, looking into implementation and the need/distribution of resources for the courses.
- Discussion was held regarding faculty involvement in personnel issues.
- Faculty evaluations findings were presented by Bill Cooke (Physics) examining what the evaluations measure and how this are evaluated/used.

V. Report from Nominations and Elections

Brett Wilson (English)

- Explained the method of nominations for positions in faculty governance. These may be self or other nominations.
- Announced the ballots for October:
 - Ballots as follows (No nominations were given from the floor) - all positions beginning immediately:
 - EPC:
 - Candidate 1: John Charles, KINE
 - Candidate 2: Rani Mullen, GOV
 - Faculty Assembly:
 - Candidate 1: Ron Schechter, HIST
 - Candidate 2: Martin Gallivan, ANTH
 - Academic Status:
 - Candidate 1: Constance Pilkington, PSYC
 - Candidate 2: David Feldman, ECON
 - The ballot will be opened and distributed on October 5th, 2016.

VI. Update from ad hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations

Bill Cooke (Physics)

- Members: Bob Archibald (Economics), Tom Linnemen (Sociology), Bill Cooke (Physics), Chuck Bailey (Government), Kim Wheatly (English), Dennis Morris (Information Technology), Anne Rasmussen (Music)
- Update provided the following information:
 - FAC was concerned about the role of student evaluations with regards to emphasis on flexible merit and the increased emphasis on the teaching merit that resulted. There was a call for a larger range of Merit Scores by the administration. The major concern became was the numerical result the only measure of teaching merit?
 - Potential problems that were examined:
 - What difference in merit scores was important?
 - Other measures more indicative of teaching quality?
 - Overall teaching effectiveness correlated to other factors?
 - Do return rates matter?
 - Broader measures to be included?
 - Reviewed several departments and literature and received the raw data from the Dean's office from 2014 and the merit score distributions from represented departments. The evaluation procedures from different represented departments were also examined.
 - No variable control on with the statistical analysis.
 - The major concern of the investigation was to determine if there is evidence that the student course evaluations should effect the faculty merit scores.
 - The literature shows various patterns:

- Students should be the best as they are in class every day but are they prepared to evaluate ability and quality?
- Inside Higher Ed published that there is no correlation.
- Student course evaluations vary by size and type of institution
- Data at W&M indicated that the students like the professors at the College, with slightly higher values for Tenure Eligible/Tenured (TE/T) faculty as compared to those taken with Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE), but the numbers are almost identical.
- Findings:
 - Class size:
 - Fewer than 10 invites (small classes) 88% of students gave the faculty receive a 4 to 5.
 - More than 100 invites (large classes) 68% of students gave the faculty receive a 4 to 5.
 - Class Type (TE/T only) also can effect - top scores are observed in the upper level or seminar courses while lower scores are observed in introductory courses.
 - Does yield matter?
 - Typically a low yield of responders - very happy and very unhappy respond to the evaluations .
 - Does gender and rank matter? (TE/T only)
 - No clear pattern for rank of Associate Professor, but at rank of Full Professor, females scored .2 higher than males.
 - Are the differences dependent on time and day of courses? Does start time effect this?
 - MWF courses had higher scores than TR classes.
 - Differences noted in time of day as well.
 - Teaching merit distributions are similar to the Student Course Evaluation scores
 - The following conclusions were made based on the data collected:
 - Perhaps the assignment of class type is more important in the determination of teaching merit score than ability.
 - Teaching effectiveness scores generally higher but should not be the primary source of determining the merit scores.
 - The following recommendations were made based on the findings:
 - De-emphasize the numerical scores and focus on the written comments.
 - Evaluate with a method that reflects our values for teaching.
 - Credit for course generation and student mentoring should be included.
- Questions related to the report:
 - A question was raised regarding of how teaching merit scores are used in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) decisions.
 - Bill Cooke indicated that at this stage the committee had no guidelines of how RPT utilizes this data.
 - Joan Gavalier (Theatre, Speech, and Dance) raised the question of what are other methods that could be used? What could be used to supplement the student evaluations?
 - Bill Cooke answered that the main concern was examining the numerical scores. The committee and others consulted pointed to the written responses given but that these require judgement calls. Another item considered and discussed was classroom visits.
 - Marc Sher (Physics) indicated that faculty should perhaps receive all scores and written comments.
 - Bill Cooke indicated it may not be actionable.
 - Brett Wilson (English) raised the question of whether the term “effectiveness” and its implications had been discussed.
 - Bill Cooke indicated that it had not.
 - Kim Wheatly (English) commented that there is a vast variety of wording on questions between departments.
 - Bill Cooke indicated that this was the first attempt to compare different programs at the College.
 - Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) raised a question regarding merit and the weight that can be assigned to the Teaching Effectiveness score.

- Bill Cooke and other comments indicated that there is a rule in Arts & Sciences that you have to have two methods of evaluation but no percentage on which these things are based. Certain types of evaluations are not counted as highly due to lack of ways to measure.
- Another comment was made about students all expecting A's & B's - is this indicating what grade they expect or what grade they deserve? Correlation between final grades and spread - low grades correlated with the perception of low grades by the students and therefore effecting the evaluation.

Dean Conley - closing

Comment - Faculty evaluations are required for re-accreditation and therefore the College must follow expectation of SACSCOC.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Ashleigh E. Queen (Kinesiology & Health Sciences, aeeverhardt@wm.edu)
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences