

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**December 4, 2018, 3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Tucker 127A**

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:33 PM.*

*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 52.*

- I. Approval of minutes from meeting of faculty on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting - <https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20181106.pdf>
  
- II. Report from Administrative Officers
  - a. Dean Kate Conley
    - i. The Dean opened the meeting stating the importance of the slides that the Provost and Sam Jones will show today. This presentation will inform us as we participate in the process of thinking forward as an institution, especially in light of the strategic planning process that will take place in the future. Today, we will see where we are now.
    - ii. The Dean also explained how she works with the Provost Diversity Initiative. This initiative provides partial funding to hire faculty who qualify as diversifying faculty according to government criteria. This funding is seen especially in the first four years of employment. Dean Conley reminded faculty that she expects departments/programs to see the advantage of diversity in hiring for its own sake. In the action plan for Arts & Sciences Diversity & Inclusion, one of the primary goals is to see the diversification of the faculty. Dean Conley encouraged the departments/programs to write position requests that are likely to attract a diverse group of candidates. She also encouraged departments/programs to position strong candidates from diverse backgrounds as the top choice in the pool. If there is a candidate who brings excellence and is from a diverse background, she encouraged that departments/programs place these individuals first in the pool, as they will bring a fresh perspective to the department/program. It is possible to meet the goal of hiring diverse candidate without effect to diversity fund and it is important that these candidates know they are the top choice of the department/program. The Dean also provided the following information about the Initiative:
      1. Since 2014, we have added 14 faculty from diverse groups, with 6 hires initiated from the Provost Diversity Initiative. We have been slowly diversifying beyond government requirements.
      2. If you see an opportunity to hire outside of an approved position, this will be reviewed by the Dean's office for what can be afforded. This is then sent to the Provost's office for approval. All searches that are approved have been vetted for enrollment pressure and budget constraints. Occasionally, departments/programs ask to make offers to multiple individuals from the pool. Sometimes the answer is yes. The enrollment in

the department or the composition, specifically in terms of positions opening due to retirement, of the faculty can merit. The Dean's office can't say yes all the time due to the overall picture of A&S in terms of enrollments and budget constraints. Ideally, if you do have two top choices and you ask if the Dean's office will help to hire both individuals, the Dean can go to the provost to ask for help. In these cases, ideally the top candidate would not be white, followed by a non-white. candidate Ideally this would also not be used as a strategy to increase department FTE but should be seen only in exceptional situations.

3. Any additional hiring beyond the positions authorized in a given year will mean hiring less elsewhere in A&S or less hiring in the department who requested beyond the authorizations in the future. Every time a request for resources is made, it requires a reshuffling of resources. Over 93% of the A&S budget is invested in salaries.
  4. One item that is written into the A&S Diversity & Inclusion action plan is the funding of a speaker who may be a future candidate. This has never been asked but the Dean is happy to fund this.
  5. Successful negotiation with Provost through the Provost Diversity Initiative includes funding for the position at 100% for one year, the 2<sup>nd</sup> year is funded at 75%, the 3<sup>rd</sup> year is funded at 50%, the 4<sup>th</sup> year is funded at 25%. This 25% funding then continues perpetually.
- iii. Last week, the CCPD had a conversation with Katherine Rowe about diversity and inclusion in hiring in which she shared strategies that she has used in the past that have been effective in hiring diverse faculty members. We will be pursuing her suggestions over the next several months in the Dean's Office with the Council for Diversity & Inclusion and also with the new ad hoc task force that has been asked to recommend concrete achievable, measurable goals towards increasing diversity, inclusion, and equity across campus.
  - iv. Dean Conley thanked all of the faculty for participating in climate survey as we had 72% participation. This is helpful for Katherine Rowe as she prepares for her pre-strategic planning process. Representatives from HR will be invited to come speak at a future meeting about the results of the survey.
  - v. Dean Conley provided information about the Advancement Initiative under the leadership of Gerald Bullock (Executive Director for A&S Development) . This week, nine different letters will be sent to 3500 households to request funding for their home departments in support of researching teaching in the sciences. Gerald worked with the chairs of these departments to compose the letters and a specific list of recipients. This was a targeted approach to appeal to our alumni and donor base directly based on their background at the university. In the spring, there will be a similar mailing to alumni and donors in the Arts and Humanities. When the FAC met last week with Matthew Lambert (Vice President for

University Advancement) he indicated that we have raised \$814.7M towards our \$1B goal. A&S has raised over \$94M.

- vi. We just received a sizable estate grant in support of a new professorship in A&S – The Calkins-Ritter Professorship Endowment. This is named for Emily Calkins, an alumna from the class of 1924 and a member of PBK. She was also a Professor of Mathematics from 1927 to 1961. The professorship is also named for Mr. William Ritter who was a student for two years in the 1940s before being drafted into the navy during WWII. Prof. Calkins had a great impact on Mr. Ritter. Gerald Bullock is currently researching Prof. Calkins’ career and reviewing her papers that are in Swem Library. This is part of his effort with Valerie Cushman (Advancement) to recognize female faculty who were trailblazers over the last 100 years.
- b. Provost Michael Halleran
  - i. Ginger Ambler and the Provost have formed a working group to look at First Amendment issues on campus. The charge letter and membership for this group is available for review on the Provost’s website.
  - ii. Provost Halleran also commented on the latest CCPD meeting. He indicated that we need to recognize the importance of diversity and inclusion in all aspects of what we do, not just hiring. We have to realize that this is a collective commitment, not something that falls only to one or a few people in campus. This also requires persistence as this is not an area that you move the needle quickly. From the faculty perspective, the average churn is less than 5% a year. Every search, whether funded through A&S or through the Provost’s office, should be aimed at trying to diversify faculty.
- c. Sam Jones (Senior Vice President for Finance & Administration) & Provost Michael Halleran - Operating Budget Overview – this represents a high-level overview to aid the university community as we begin to think about the strategic planning process that will take place in the future. Listed below are the important highlights from the presentation. An emphasis was made by Sam Jones that most of our priorities require money, and therefore, we need to know where we have money and where we are lacking.
  - i. Operational Model – we operate, in many ways, like a private institution, but we are funded as a public institution.
    - 1. Lower undergraduate enrollment
    - 2. Highly residential population
    - 3. Moderately low student-to-faculty ratio
    - 4. Highly tenured/tenured eligible faculty
    - 5. More closely aligned with private institutions.
  - ii. Financial – We are funded as a public institution. We have limited resources per full-time equivalent student relative to our “operational peers”. We have a lower total endowment per student, resulting in lower income streams. We are also early in our endowment/private giving fundraising programs as compared to other institutions in the Commonwealth

- iii. William and Mary's Response 2014 to present
  - 1. The William & Mary Promise
    - a. This represented a new financial model with a tuition guarantee. Behind the scenes, the university was resetting tuition. We have incorporated systematic increases in tuition, being concerned that we not lose students through raising price.
    - b. The purpose of the Promise was to strengthen the university as a "distinctive public ivy", provide predictability for VA students and their families through a four-year guarantee, create more seats for in state students, enhance low-and-middle income affordability for VA students, and improve administrative/academic productivity.
    - c. We gained about \$60M in new revenue, mostly from tuition, through the Promise.
      - i. Over half of these funds went into faculty/staff compensation, as the state only funds 25% of any state funded raise.
      - ii. Some of this went to fund the costs associated with the COLL curriculum and enrollment growth.
      - iii. 20% of these funds went to student financial aid.
  - 2. Strategic investment of about \$13M went to items such as base operations (new facilities coming online), eLearning, curriculum improvements, campaign money, and diversity initiatives (\$1M over two years for the Provost Initiative for Diversity).
  - 3. Despite the increases, in-state tuition remains less than half of out-of-state tuition. We have a relatively wealthy student body, with only about 1/3 requiring financial aid under federal qualifications
  - 4. We invested in Need-Based Aid for in-state undergraduates by bringing in tuition to move it towards financial aid. FY18 presented good news in that we have a more diverse student both, but with this came an increased amount of financial aid required. This increased the cost to \$6M. William & Mary remains among the most affordable institutions for low- and middle-income Virginians. Overall student debt has declined and remained well below national averages.
  - 5. The question to now consider is how much further can we push tuition? In looking at institutional aid from IPEDS, it is apparent that publics more expensive because of the lower amount of institutional aid. Significant increases in state support seem unlikely as these have been on a downward trend over the last 20 years. Recessions are associated with budget drops with the first and deepest cut felt in higher education.
  - 6. Tuition, fees, and state funding comprise over 75% of revenue. Tuition and E&G account for 43% of this amount, followed by

auxiliary money, private money, state general fund money, and grants or contracts.

7. The majority of university spending is accounted for by the academic enterprise (54%), with instruction (52% of the enterprise money) taking the largest amount. This is followed by auxiliary services, student financial aid, and research, grants, and contracts.
  8. Arts and Sciences drives the instructional expenditures, accounting for 59% of instructional expenditures.
  9. Personnel is major budget driver for academic and administrative programs, accounting for 82% of the budget.
- iv. The status quo will not support future investments, and we need to keep in mind the following assumption.
1. The university will keep the Promise but increase tuition 6.5%.
  2. The university will increase out-of-state and graduate student tuition.
  3. There will be a baseline of salary increases.
  4. The effect would be seen starting in FY22 forward.
  5. No money is included in this picture for new initiatives beyond FY20.
  6. No inflationary costs are included in this information.
- v. Philanthropy is a major component of future success, but its impact will take time. Below are some items for consideration:
1. Philanthropy is critical to the long-term health and stability of the university.
  2. Major gifts and endowments tend to be restricted, and university level unrestricted gifts are limited. Most donors give to the programs that are meaningful to them.
- vi. Key takeaways
1. We need to plan for change from a moment of relative prosperity.
  2. Market and political pressures limit tuition as “the solution”.
  3. The campaign has been successful but a lot of it is deferred or restricted.
  4. State taxpayer support is not a long-term strategy.
  5. W&M will need to be innovative and explore multiple solutions.
  6. Faculty and staff remain our strongest assets and one of our biggest investments.

d. Questions

- i. What is the effect of increasing student enrollment? The individuals who raised this question indicated he hadn't experienced a loss in quality as we have grown the student body, so is this something to factor into the revenue projections?
  1. Sam Jones indicated that there was a faculty group that looked at this issue. This might be a part of the solution. On average we grow 1-2% per year. The reason we don't see impact is that we also always add resources on faculty side. The university doesn't want to distort and devalue what we have here.

2. The Provost commented that we should look at last 10 years and notice the increase. In the last 5 years, we have been relatively flat, but in the years of growth, we have grown without loss in quality, when measured by the usual metrics. The pool is not infinitely deep, to increase enrollment greatly, we would have to increase the net for students we recruit.

III. Motion from EPC to create a BA in Linguistics (Elizabeth Harbron & Jack Martin)

- a. The EPC considered this at recent meeting. Currently, we have a major in Interdisciplinary Studies with a Concentration in Linguistics. The Linguistics faculty have provided compelling arguments as to why our current arrangement of this major is not ideal
- b. A thorough proposal has been created with compelling rationale for the change to a standalone major, which was approved unanimously by EPC.
- c. This proposed major will fall under the Charles Center, meaning that this will only result in a change in the degree. Neuroscience has a similar administrative organization under the Charles Center.
- d. Questions –
  - i. A question was raised about the course offerings, as some courses are electives but can count as required courses.
    - a. Jack Martin indicated that this does not represent a change the concentration in any way. This is a is the smaller program and the faculty believe in advising students one on one for their interests. Another limiting factor is that some courses are not always taught.
  - ii. Suzanne Raitt asked about the accuracy of describing this major as interdisciplinary.
    1. Jack Martin indicated that he doesn't see any issue with this change at the institutional level. At the state level, justification will have to be made to SCHEV for this change, as this is the first BA of Linguistics that would be offered in the Commonwealth. There is no budget impact with this change to the major.
- e. This proposal was put to a vote with the motion being carried by unanimous vote.

IV. Nominations and Elections (Sal Saporito)

- a. Faculty Assembly/Faculty Affairs Committee (Area II) three-year term commencing at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester.
  - i. Joshua Burk (Psychology)
  - ii. Admasu Shiferaw (Economics)
- b. Faculty Assembly (Area II) a three-way race for two positions. The candidate who receives the most votes serves a three-year term commencing at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester. The runner-up serves a one-year term commencing at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester

- i. Brennan Harris (Kinesiology & Health Sciences)
  - ii. Constance Pilkington (Psychology)
  - iii. Brad Weiss (Anthropology)
- c. International Studies Advisory Committee (Area II) three-year term commencing at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester.
  - i. David Feldman (Economics)
  - ii. Marcus Holmes (Government)
- d. International Studies Advisory Committee (Area III) three-year term commencing at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester.
  - i. Deborah Behout (Chemistry)
  - ii. Denys Poshyvanyk (Computer Science)

No nominations were added from the floor. The ballot will be sent out following this meeting and remain open for a week.

- V. Report from Academic Advising (Tom Linneman, Faculty Director of the Office of Academic Advising)
  - a. Tom and Shelly Laurenzo (Associate Director) started these positions in Summer 2017. At this point, the office is beginning to implement new initiatives. The Office of Academic Advising is located in Swem. In addition to Tom, Shelly, and Janice Zeman (Dean of Undergraduate Studies), who oversees this office, there is an Administrative Coordinator and three staff advisors.
    - i. Each advisor holds appointments to supplement the information provided to students by faculty advisors. The office held over 500 of these meetings last year. The were related to academic planning, major declaration, and working through the university's forms.
    - ii. Each staff advisor has a specialization for working with students.
      - 1. Gail Williams – first year experience, peer advising
      - 2. Carmen Crosswell – transfer students
      - 3. Dane Pascoe – data
    - iii. Data is a focus of this office, with a goal of trying to be proactive instead of reactive, trying to prevent serious problems before they occur. For example, Shelly initiated a project to identify juniors and seniors with acceptable overall GPA but with a low major GPA that could prevent graduation. The office this uses this information to inform faculty advisors so that they can be involved in working with students to rectify this situation.
    - iv. The office is now using a new algorithm, developed by the Mathematics Department, to match students to faculty advisors based on numerous characteristics. This seems to have been received well but will be assessed at the end of the academic year. This is the second year under the new departmental quota system. This also seems to be working better and will be also assessed at the end of the academic year.

- v. The Office of Academic Advising also oversees many forms that students fill out under Janice Zeman's office, such as exam change forms and course substitution forms. Within one academic year, the office typically receives 300-500 exam change requests. This is now technologized to make more the process efficient. The exam change form is now online. When submitted, the Office of Academic Advising and the professor receive an email. The professor approves/denies the request and then it is sent to the Dean's office.
  - vi. One item under consideration is advising past the first year. Many times, sophomores have the question of how to declare their major. The Office of Academic Advising is working with chairs and directors to make sure that this information is easy to find.
- b. Questions
- i. One question was raised about increasing the mandatory advising meetings to sophomore year.
    - 1. Tom Linneman indicated that this has been occasionally discussed but would require additional resources to fund. He would want to talk to students as well.

The Dean thanked the faculty for coming to the last town hall held by Katherine Rowe and the meeting today.

*The meeting was adjourned by Dean Conley 4:40 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,

Ashleigh E. Queen (Kinesiology & Health Sciences, [aeverhardt@wm.edu](mailto:aeverhardt@wm.edu))  
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences