

Faculty Assembly Meeting

Minutes for February 26, 2013

Members Present: Tracy Cross, Sarah Day, Michael Deschenes, Emmett Duffy, Nancy Gray (Secretary), Rick Gressard (President), Susan Grover, Trotter Hardy, Will Hausman, Carl Hershner, Gina Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Brent Owens, Suzanne Raitt (Vice-President), Jeanne Wilson.

Members Absent: Kathleen Bragdon, Bill Cooke, David Dessler, Gul Ozyegin, Lily Panoussi, Jennifer Taylor.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost)

Before the meeting began, an announcement was made by Jenny Kirsch, graduate student in Counselor Education: the W&M Health and Wellness Team will present three educational sessions on how to recognize and respond to situations in which students are in distress and at risk. Information flyers were given to Faculty Assembly members.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.

1. Approval of Minutes: minutes for January 29, 2013, were approved.

2. Provost's Report

The State Assembly has concluded its business, the results of which include a favorable budget for William & Mary, with a 3% base salary increase for faculty and a slightly more modest increase for staff. The Board of Visitors will likely provide an addition to the salary increases authorized by the State. The veto session is yet to come; until then the Assembly's authorization is not final.

The Board of Visitors met a couple of weeks ago, and continues to be supportive of the plan to "right our fiscal ship" in regard to salary increases. The plan is for some increases to be across the board and some merit-based. At the Board meeting there was also some discussion of differential teaching loads for faculty members in relation to levels of research productivity – i.e. those doing less research would teach more. Michael Deschenes brought up the issue of a potential disconnect between the Board's having recognized William & Mary as "research" university and what seems to be a push for more teaching.

The Provost reported that in the data gathered on how much of the College's teaching is done by NTE faculty members, the crux of the findings is to be found on the second to last power-point slide in the materials provided for Faculty Assembly. That slide shows that over a five-year period, NTE teaching rates based on the number of student credit hours, across all schools, increased slightly over that period: 31.9, 32.6, 34.1, 36.1, 35.5 credit hours taught by NTE faculty members (broadly defined). This confirms the perception that the trend is toward a slight increase, but it shows that trend as not precipitous. Suzanne Raitt noted that overall it's no surprise that more credit hours are taught by NTEs each year, but that it would be helpful to know the rate of growth in our faculty numbers in relation to the data on credit hours. The Provost replied that the data on faculty numbers is being worked out and will soon be available. Suzanne Raitt also noted that salary differentials between TE and NTE faculty members in

Arts & Sciences are much wider than in the Schools. The Provost speculated that this likely has to do with the heterogeneity of areas of specialty. That is, the differential is largely based on academic and research specialty, which is more heterogeneous in Arts & Sciences. Gina Hoatson asked if NTEs get benefits, even when hired on a one-semester basis. The Provost and others replied yes, if full-time, even for one semester.

The Provost sent to all members, through Rick Gressard, his written responses to the set of questions about the WM/EVMS study that Faculty Assembly posed at our last meeting. He asked if any of us had questions about those responses. There were none.

3. Report on Intellectual Property Policy: Trotter Hardy

A draft of the completed memo was sent to Rick Gressard. Of central concern was the need for clarity on what constitutes “teaching” and “research.” As the current policy’s attempts at definition are not clear, Trotter Hardy’s draft revision divides the umbrella term “research” into “academic work product” and “administrative work product.” The two terms differentiate “faculty-owned” materials from those “jointly owned” (by faculty members and the College); the latter belongs to College. Rick Gressard suggested we post the draft and have a Faculty Assembly discussion of it at the next meeting. Questions today: Gina Hoatson asked for clarification of “customarily” in the policy’s reference to faculty members’ use of materials “significantly more than customarily provided.” Trotter Hardy replied that the revised language makes clearer what that phrase entails, and that a fuller definition is detailed in the draft. For instance, if a faculty member produces a teaching video with a resource such as a special filming studio, that resource would be considered “significantly more than customarily provided.” Jeanne Wilson asked about “joint ownership.” Trotter Hardy replied that the effect of “joint ownership” is that if any money is made, it must be shared; otherwise any use of materials can be made by either party. Sarah Day asked if it would be possible to add time limits to the section on “joint ownership” so that such ownership is not in perpetuity. Trotter Hardy replied yes.

4. Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs Committee: Tracy Cross

Update on the Retirement Incentive Program Recommendation: The committee is continuing to work on it. So far it has looked at what other universities have done, and has found that not many do incentive programs anymore. The committee is purposely taking its time so as to be thorough, and is not yet ready to share a full report with Faculty Assembly. Faculty Assembly members expressed a good deal of interest in going over possible options; a fairly lengthy discussion ensued. Both Suzanne Raitt and Gina Hoatson spoke in favor of any savings from retirements going back into the salary pool. There was some discussion favoring a focus on Virginia universities as the committee surveys what other schools have done, because of the history of the VRS system and its role in the potential need for a new retirement incentive program. Tracy Cross will come back to the Assembly soon with a recommendation. Rick Gressard asked for at least a draft within a month, and something to vote on by April. Tracy Cross agreed.

B. Academic Affairs: Jennifer Taylor
No report.

C. COPAR: Bill Cooke

Bill Cooke could not be present, so Scott McCoy read the COPAR report into the record:

(1) COPAR met as FUPC on February 15, and heard the first installment of Sam Jones's report on the tuition incomes of the Schools, and on the major expenditure by them and the other units. The net tuition for the University for the 2011-2012 academic year was approximately \$110 million. The largest expenditures outside of the School academic budgets were approximately \$19 million for Administration, \$7.4 million for Information Technology, \$7.2 million for Swem, and \$6.4 million for the Provost's Office. COPAR will meet separately to develop an overview of income and expenses for the various academic units which it will then present to the Faculty Assembly before the end of this academic year.

(2) During an Executive Committee, COPAR was also tasked with having the Vice Provost for Research report on the fixed costs supported by Facilities and Administration (F&A) income from external grants, and on how the other F&A income was divided under the new F&A allocation plan. Because F&A income is only available during the year after it is charged to external grants, the new F&A allocation plan will not go into effect until July 2013, so a report will not be possible until the Fall of 2013.

D. Executive Committee: Rick Gressard

At its February 12 meeting, the Executive Committee put together four recommendations in response to the CAIT policy comment period, and passed them on to Kiersten Boyce, the College's Compliance and Policy Officer.

Update on Faculty Survey: the faculty response rate has been sluggish, but is picking up. So far there are 142 responses from TE faculty members and 52 from NTE faculty members, far less than the rate from the Survey of three years ago. Nancy Gray asked what time of year that Survey went out. Rick Gressard responded that it went out in the Fall – so timing may be a factor. Rick Gressard will ask A&S department and program chairs and directors to help encourage people to fill out the Survey. Suzanne Raitt asked, if we report Survey results to the BOV in April, do we need final tabulations by our March Faculty Assembly meeting? Rick Gressard said he may be able to get a draft done over spring break, and complete a more formal report by the March meeting.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business: None

Meeting adjourned at 4:51pm