

Faculty Assembly Meeting
Minutes for September 30, 2014
3:30 – 5:00pm
Blow Hall Board Room

Members Present: Berhanu Abergaz, Brent Allred, Lynda Butler, Eric Chason (Vice-President), Bill Cooke, Sarah Day, David Dessler (President), John Eisele, Catherine Forestell, Courtney Harris, Carl Hershner, Scott McCoy, Brent Owens, Suzanne Raitt, Ron Rapoport, Megan Tschannen-Moran, Patricia Vahle, Sibel Zandi-Sayek, and Lily Panoussi.

Members Absent: Liz Barnes, Chris Gareis, and Brent Owens.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Iyabo Osiapem, and Francis Tanglao-Aguas.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 pm.

1. The minutes of the May 8, 2014 meeting were approved.
2. Provost's Report: Michael Halleran
 - a) The Provost reported that the Diversity Presentation at the Board of Visitors went well, and produced active interest by the Board members, as shown by their questions and conversations with the Provost since then.
 - b) The Provost described the recent State budget actions which are now expected to result in a further decrease of 5.72% of the state allocation to the University budget for the current year, and for the next year. The university response this year is likely to be achieved by one-time savings and some delays in staff hirings.
 - c) The Provost presented slides showing the increase in faculty salaries over the past few years, and compared them to the very small increases mandated by the State. He said that this appears to be on track to get us to the 60 percentile of our SCHEV peer group within the next five years.
 - d) The Provost said that he expects the coming BOV meeting to begin to address the continuation of the William & Mary Promise, which is sometimes referred to as Promise 2.0.

Questions:

Ms. Vahle asked if salaries are here driven by the highest earners. Mr. Halleran said they were not.

3. Report of the actions of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Dessler reported that during the summer recess the Executive Committee acts on behalf of the Faculty Assembly. During August, the Executive Committee took two actions: it approved a policy about space for emeriti faculty, which was essentially codifying the current practice; and it appointed representatives from the Faculty Assembly officers to serve on standing committees of the Board of Visitors.
4. Report of the Arts & Sciences Budget Working Group

Last year, an Arts & Sciences working group analyzed budget data that had been provided to them by Vice President Sam Jones. Mr. Cooke presented this report as a member of the Arts and Science working group, repeating a presentation that was originally made at an Arts & Sciences faculty meeting in the spring of 2014. It compared net tuition income and budgeted Education and General (E&G) expenses for the Mason School of Business, the School of Education, the

Law School and Arts and Sciences over the period of Academic year 2007/08 to Academic Year 2012/13. Ms. Butler asked if this report included private funds and Mr. Cooke answered that private funds had not yet been made available to the group. Mr. Dessler asked how spending per student was calculated. Mr. Cooke answered that the number presented was the total E&G budget divided by total number of students. Ms. Butler expressed surprise that administrative costs were going up in view of the improved building efficiencies. The Provost responded that we have added 1.2 million square feet of buildings, and their custodial costs are part of the increase. Mr. Cooke pointed out that the state funds for new buildings did not include custodial costs. Mr. Chason asked whether the underlying data could be made available. Mr. Cooke responded that the working group did not currently have permission to distribute the underlying data publicly, although the data had been released to COPAR. The Provost stated that although he thought this presentation was “directionally correct” (as would be said by consultants), he was concerned that expenses were less clear. He said that undergraduate admissions and Swem library are not used equally by all units and so their expenses should also be allocated differentially. He said that over time, with more detailed information, we would have the opportunity to make better informed decisions.

5. Report to the BOV about diversity among the faculty:

Ms. Raitt reported that Ms. Grover presented the Faculty Diversity presentation to the BOV even though she is no longer on the Faculty Assembly because this presentation had been postponed from last April. Ms. Raitt pointed out that two of the most striking results presented by the Provost were the increasing gap between student diversity and faculty diversity, and the low position of W&M faculty diversity among our SCHEV peer group. Ms. Raitt described the presentation which included comments by several faculty members of color and a discussion by Ms. Glover, the Chief Diversity Officer, of the difficulties that W&M has in recruiting and retaining faculty of color, and the effort made by the College to enhance their recruitment. Members of the BOV asked questions about what best practices are for recruiting and retaining faculty of color, and whether there was anything to be learned from Admissions. One noted that the Africana Studies program seemed to be a shining star, and another noted that he, as an African American in the 1980's, had no problem finding excellent mentors, although they were white.

Ms. Raitt then mentioned that Ms. Grover had compiled a document of all the comments she had received from the faculty she had interviewed, which she had intended to forward to the Provost and the President. However, the interviewed faculty members requested that it instead be used by the Faculty Assembly as a starting point to compose a fuller report, with recommendations. This process will be overseen by the Faculty Assembly's President, Vice-President, and the Academic Affairs subcommittee, but will include participation by other faculty who are not members of Faculty Assembly.

6. Faculty Survey Redesign:

Mr. Dessler reported that last year the Faculty Assembly decided that the current model of the faculty survey was not sustainable. He then introduced Mr. Rapoport, who had led the committee that reviewed the Faculty Survey last year, and had just now been appointed to the Faculty Survey to fill a vacancy. Mr. Rapoport reported that the survey has grown far beyond the initial instrument. The subcommittee had thought that the survey should be replaced with a much smaller (5 minute long) instrument that would be given every year, with a more

comprehensive instrument (but still much smaller than the current survey) given every three years. He reported that a UCLA based HERI survey was given over the summer, but it had a very low response rate compared to our typical response rate. Mr. Rapoport also reported that the HERI survey was also long, and he worried that the responses to the later questions might be more questionable due to fatigue of those taking it. The advantages of the HERI survey would be that it would be painless, although if the response rate were not higher, then results would not be particularly useful.

Mr. Dessler asked how to address the problem of a large workload falling in onto a few faculty members. Mr. Rapoport responded that this was the potential benefit of the HERI survey – its analysis would be done externally. But, HERI might not care about including the questions that we most care about. Mr. Cooke asked if there were any information about what questions of the current survey have been actually useful. Mr. Rapoport responded that he had ideas of questions to cut. Ms. Vahle asked if the committee had tried to cut down the survey, and Mr. Rapoport responded that they had not yet tried to cut it down because that would require consulting with the various constituencies to determine what they saw as important. Ms. Raitt pointed out that the last survey had grown because it introduced a section for the Non-Tenure Eligible faculty, and that she had used the demographic data from that part, but that it introduced much more work in generating the report. She stated that one of the possible benefits of the HERI survey was it would not require the same level of work by the Faculty Assembly. She did note that some faculty members had complained to her about the HERI survey that they preferred a survey generated from within the university. She also stated that the HERI survey allowed some customization. Mr. Rapoport stated that another advantage was that the HERI survey would provide some comparison to other universities. Ms. Butler said that if we wrote our own questions for a HERI survey, we would likely end up in the same boat as now. Mr. Rapoport asked to see the data from the last W&M survey to see how much drop-off in quality occurred due to its excessive length. Mr. Cooke noted that he had taken the HERI survey, and found many of the questions seemed very biased with an apparent agenda in their expected answers. Ms. Day said that she felt the same way, that there were a few questions where she felt that she understood what they were trying to ask, but that due to the wording there was only one answer that she could give, and it did not represent what she wanted to say. Ms. Vahle asked if the HERI survey results were available. Ms. Raitt responded that they should be posted on the Faculty Assembly website. Mr. Rapoport said that these results should not be released to a wider audience because it might appear that Faculty Assembly had validated the HERI survey results. Ms. Vahle also wants to review our survey to determine if there are questions that can clearly be left out. Mr. Rapoport suggested that it would be better to consider sections, rather than questions, and leave the specific wording of questions to a smaller, expert group. He also suggested that some pre-tests could be run to see if cutting various sections achieved what we wanted.

7. Standing Committee Reports

- A. Academic Affairs: Lily Panoussi
No report.
- B. Faculty Affairs: Sarah Day
No report.
- C. COPAR: Berhanu Abegaz

FUPC/COPAR have had one meeting, where the process of the reviewing the Planning Budget Requests was reviewed. COPAR will meet again in two weeks to begin that review.

D. Executive Committee: David Dessler

In addition to the two important issues discussed in today's meeting (Faculty Diversity and the Faculty Survey) the Executive Committee has planned two more issues to be discussed soon, gender climate and retirement incentives. Next month the Women's Network will present their findings on gender climate at the Faculty Assembly meeting.

E. Liaison Committee: Eric Chason

The Liaison Committee arranged for Susan Grover's report on Faculty Diversity to be presented at the last BOV meeting, and then discussed how action might be taken as a result of that presentation. This topic will now be considered by the Academic Affairs Committee. Mr. Chason also said that the Amendment allowing NTE representation on the Faculty Assembly has been approved by the Business School, the School of Education, and by VIMS. The Law School and Arts & Sciences have not yet voted.

The President adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.