

Faculty Assembly Meeting

Minutes for May 9, 2013

Members Present: Bill Cooke, Gene Tracy (alternate for Sarah Day), Michael Deschenes, David Dessler, Emmett Duffy, Nancy Gray (Secretary), Rick Gressard (President), Susan Grover, Trotter Hardy, Will Hausman, Gina Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Gül Ozyegin, Lily Panoussi, Suzanne Raitt (Vice President), Jennifer Taylor.

Members Absent: Kathleen Bragdon, Tracy Cross, Sarah Day, Carl Hershner, Brent Owens, Jeanne Wilson.

Newly Elected Members Present: Berhanu Abegaz, Eric Chason, John Eisele, Lea Theodore, Carol Tieso, Brad Weiss.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost), Terry Meyers (parliamentarian), Kiersten Boyce, Bernadette Kulas, Dennis Manos, Jen Mellor, Kate Slevin.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm.

1. Minutes of the April 23, 2013 meeting were approved.
2. Will Hausman presented incoming president Suzanne Raitt with a gavel.
3. **Introduction of New Faculty Assembly Members**
Eric Chason, Law; John Eisele, A&S Area I; Berhanu Abegaz, A&S Area II; Brad Weiss, A&S Area II; Lea Theodore, Education; Carol Tieso, Education.
4. **EVMS Update**
Jen Mellor updated the Assembly on the progress of the W&M/EVMS process. The Cohen report (outside consultant) targeted health care delivery science as a promising avenue for W&M/EVMS partnership. The joint Due Diligence Committee decided it's too early to form a partnership, but that exploration of a health care science and delivery program should be undertaken. Jen Mellor then summarized the work of the Committee to date. A plan to guide the process is in development, and is faculty focused to capitalize on existing faculty strengths and interests. Exploration of all possible areas that make sense for joint programs is underway. Once those determinations are made, goals will be set, and recommendations for action will be made. The Committee began by looking at the Cohen report, then surveyed other institutions for examples of health care delivery programs. Few were found, the best known at Dartmouth, but were determined to be too exclusive for a W&M focus; consequently the Committee defined a broader focus area: health services research, which is not only an existing discipline but also encompasses a variety of issues and research disciplines relevant to W&M. The Committee's plan includes opportunities and funding for W&M and EVMS faculty to work together on development of programs. Specific steps related to research have been delineated: 1. Create as many opportunities as possible for collaboration between faculties. 2. Hold a series of faculty retreats and seminars, the first to be on Tuesday, May 14, 2013. There has been overwhelming response, resulting in 98 attendees from both

institutions, including faculty, staff, administration, and guests, including two speakers from other institutions with programs similar to what's being developed here, and one speaker from Sentara Health Care. The Committee is particularly interested in access to Sentara's data in order to help decide the focus and goals of a W&M/EVMS joint endeavor. 3. A request for proposals will be offered to faculty wanting funding to work on collaborative research and educational projects. In addition, meetings have been held with all the deans of the schools. The Mason School of Business is working on expanding its health care program, perhaps to offer a joint MBA or Certificate of some sort. Other educational initiatives include expanded early assurance admission to students, and compliance certificates.

Questions: Suzanne Raitt asked what opportunities there may be down the line for undergraduate programs. Jen Mellor said she spoke with Dean Conley, who felt that the cultures of the two institutions are very different, and resources are so constrained, that it would be better to explore avenues that would not need already stretched resources. Michael Deschenes asked if there has been any discussion about a program to get an early degree. Jen Mellor answered, not yet. Trotter Hardy asked whether there has been discussion of including a law course. Jen Mellor answered yes, there has been some discussion of initiatives in biomedical sciences in regard to the need for those in this field to know about patent law and related legal issues. Berhanu Abegaz asked if there has been any discussion of international initiatives. Jen Mellor answered yes, through Dean Conley, and added that EVMS already has a global focus component, and that more discussions will come.

5. Provost's Report

Michael Halleran noted that Commencement takes place in three days, and encouraged everyone to attend. Colin Campbell and Warren Buck are among those getting Honorary Degrees; Robert Mueller, FBI Director, will be this year's Commencement speaker.

The William and Mary Promise has gone public, and response continues to be very favorable. So far there has been fairly muted response from parents; the only concerns raised have been from out of state parents who have asked about a "promise" for them, and have been reminded that while out of state students are not specifically included in the Promise, nevertheless it makes it possible for out of state tuition increases to be the lowest in many years.

Notice was sent out regarding the phasing out of the "8/7 bump-up" when employees retire from William and Mary. He has received only two questions so far, both easily clarified. So far the phase-out has not presented a problem.

Questions: Suzanne Raitt asked how the Provost plans to approach item 8 of the Promise, regarding continued innovation and greater contribution to the instructional mission. The Provost will send a memo to all deans next week asking for plans on how they will address this issue. The intent is to leave a fair amount of latitude and flexibility; he hopes deans and faculties will stay away from becoming bean counters; much of what we do is not defined in a fixed way, which allows us to maintain flexibility. Thus his advice to the deans will be to keep plans as simple as possible, to meet the spirit of what the Board is looking

for. Jenny Taylor asked about guidelines to departments and deans for more standardized practices. The Provost will look into it, but wants to preserve the independence of the various schools and departments to use models that work best for them. Bill Cooke asked for the Provost's thoughts on how we make invisible teaching visible and count it as an example of "more teaching." The Provost said that invisible teaching is part of our base, but is just un-described; he's quite confident that if all the schools come up with sound plans that explain what we actually do and plan to do, it will work well. Susan Grover asked about the data the Provost gathered about a year ago on student contact hours, and whether it would be a viable measure for setting a base line and communicating it to the Board. The Provost said that next year is earmarked for devising a policy to be implemented the following year. There was some discussion of contact hours versus credit hours, and Susan Grover noted that they measure different things. The Provost said he's working on the balance between the political and substantive dimensions of any model adopted, and that credit hours is a more telling metric than contact hours, but neither captures the full picture. Michael Deschenes asked if the increased emphasis on more teaching is likely to blow over. The Provost said no, because we will continue to face downward pressures on cost. Suzanne Raitt asked if the Provost foresees providing funding for those who want to teach more. The Provost answered that he is open to all sorts of ideas, that weighting systems and evaluative systems are both part of the merit process, and that there will likely be increased possibilities for how we think of and measure that.

6. Report on Intellectual Property Policy

Trotter Hardy reported that he had heard no objections to the revised policy proposal, and asked if the Faculty Assembly is ready to let it go forward. Rick Gressard said he passed it on to Provost this morning. The Assembly thanked Trotter Hardy for his work in making this outcome possible.

7. Discussion of Retirement Incentive Program

Rick Gressard asked if there was any further discussion from last meeting. There was none.

8. Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs: Tracy Cross

Tracy Cross was not present, so Rick Gressard reported that the Faculty Compensation Committee will meet later in the month and will post its report; the Library Advisory Committee has not met; and Admissions will get a report to him soon.

B. Academic Affairs: Jennifer Taylor

This committee's only task was to review the Intellectual Property Policy, and that task was passed on to Faculty Affairs.

C. COPAR: Bill Cooke

COPAR's full report is included as an addendum at the end of these minutes. Bill Cooke summarized the Committee's activities. The issues that took the bulk of the Committee's time were working on the Promise, and the fee imposed on Business majors and minors to support Business School education. The Committee also began looking in more detail at the overall College budget, and will begin getting presentations from Sam Jones so as to have more information with which to inform decisions.

D. Executive/Liaison: Rick Gressard, Suzanne Raitt

There has been no meeting since the last Faculty Assembly meeting. Rick Gressard reported on the Faculty Survey to the Board of Visitors at its April meeting. He's still working on the full report, and hopes to have it completed by the end of May. He was reminded that there are several Faculty Assembly members who are willing to help with that full report.

9. Old Business

10. New Business

The Provost presented Rick Gressard with gifts in appreciation of his work as President of Faculty Assembly.

Suzanne Raitt presented Rick Gressard with a gift from Faculty Assembly in appreciation of his work as President.

Rick Gressard thanked us all and said a few words of appreciation in return.

Election of 2013-14 Officers and Committees

The sequence for elections, per our by-laws, is that the order of voting is first for President, if necessary, then for Vice-President, and finally for Secretary. Only continuing and new members shall vote.

A call for nominations from the floor yielded none. Nominations were closed.

Since Suzanne Raitt will, by acclamation, succeed to President, the Assembly proceeded to the vote for Vice President. The two candidates were Bill Cooke (Arts & Sciences Area III) and Susan Grover (Law). The vote was by secret ballot; Nancy Gray and Gina Hoatson counted the ballots.

After five tie votes, Susan Grover was elected as incoming Vice-President.

Lea Theodore was the only candidate for Secretary, and was voted in by acclamation.

Suzanne Raitt distributed proposed sub-committee memberships and asked if there were any objections to assignments. There were none. The Assembly unanimously agreed to accept the roster as distributed.

Suzanne Raitt reminded everyone of the reception at Berret's at 5:30.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03pm.

ADDENDUM

Summary of FUPC/COPAR activities 2012-13 Submitted on May 9, 2013

COPAR Members: Sarah Day, Michael Deschenes, Emmett Duffy, Rick Gressard, Trotter Hardy, Scott McCoy, Vasiliki Panoussi, and Suzanne Raitt.

Faculty Compensation Board Chair: Mark Patterson.

FUPC members(ex officio): Virginia Ambler, Susan Bosworth, Carrie Cooper, Kate Conley, Sharron Gatling, Jim Golden, Earl Granger, Sam Jones, Dennis Manos, and Anna Martin.

Students: Curtis Mills, Trevor Daubenspeck

Co-Chairs: Bill Cooke, Michael Halleran

The Faculty University Priorities Committee (FUPC) consists of the following voting and non-voting members:

1. As voting members, the Faculty Assembly's Committee on Planning and Resources (COPAR) and the chair of the Faculty Compensation Board; and,
2. As ex officio non-voting members, the Provost, the five Vice Presidents, the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate/Professional Studies, the Dean of University Libraries and one other academic dean selected by the Deans, and the Presidents of the Student Assembly, the Graduate and Professional Student Association, the Professional and Professional Faculty Assembly and the Staff Assembly.

During the 2012-2013 academic year, FUPC met seven times, and COPAR met separately four additional times, with three of those meetings occurring at the conclusion of a regularly scheduled FUPC meeting.

The FUPC has historically been tasked with evaluating Planning Budget Requests (PBRs) to allocate incremental changes in the budgets. FUPC regularly receives reports from the Vice President for Finance that show the expected changes in budgets from the current year to the next year. This year, in response to requests from the Faculty Assembly, he has also provided the FUPC with much more detail about the current budget, including E&G budgets for each unit, and expenditures for a wide variety of support services outside of the E&G budgets of the units (such as E&G expenditures for the Swem Library, for Information Technology, and Facilities). COPAR appreciates this additional information, and believes that it will better inform future discussions of PBRs. Consequently, COPAR requests that this information become a regular report from the VP for Finance.

One of the primary duties of the FUPC is to review and prioritize the submitted Planning Budget Requests (PBRs). During this academic year, the PBRs were separated into two categories: baseline PBRs and Strategic PBRs. The baseline PBRs were the primary responsibility of the FUPC, while the strategic PBRs were discussed by the Planning Steering Committee. At the last meeting of the FUPC, there was some discussion as to how the PBRs might be better separated into these two categories. In at least two cases, very similar PBRs were submitted to from two different units to the two separate review processes. The Provost has suggested that some triage in

the early stages should be implemented to prevent this in future years. Nevertheless, as a result of years of cuts, most submitted PBRs were judged worthy of funding, although clear prioritizing was difficult in view of the lack of clarity on the funding side. This has been a continuing problem for FUPC because the BOV traditionally sets the next year's tuition at its last meeting, shortly after the state has finalized its budget. Such a late time frame makes it difficult to readjust the planned budget to match any tuition changes that the BOV can be anticipated to support. For example, in 2012, the BOV adopted a budget that was significantly different from the one seen at the FUPC meeting prior to the BOV's last meeting. This year, Sam Jones reported no major changes between the budget approved by the BOV and the one last seen by FUPC. The stability offered by the W&M Promise, which sets tuitions for several years ahead, should make the budget process more predictable, although the State legislature can still introduce changes.

There was general agreement among the FUPC participants that the top priority of the university should be the improvement of faculty and staff salaries, which are well below the 60th percentile target. Much of the spring meetings were devoted to reports from Sam Jones about the actions of the Virginia legislature and the plans for the W&M Promise, as it was developed. The W&M Promise was an integral part of the budget plan that will allow us to follow the BOV's adopted six-year plan, which plans to bring faculty salaries to the 60th percentile of our peer group.

FUPC/COPAR also discussed several other important items at various meetings throughout the year. Specifically, in response to requests from COPAR, Sam Jones presented a budget overview at the October 13, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Assembly. This overview was based on his final presentation to the BOV in the spring of 2012. Two FUPC meetings devoted significant discussion time to the proposal by the Mason School of Business to implement a fee for undergraduate Business Majors and Business Minors. Several COPAR sessions were devoted to discussions of the division of income and resources among the four academic units (Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, the Law School and the Mason School of Business). Because the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) has a separate budget from the state, it was not included in these discussions. Finally, Earl Granger reported on Development at the final FUPC session.