

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes for November 18, 2014 3:30 – 5:00pm Blow Hall Board Room
--

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

Members Absent: Liz Barnes, Catherine Forestell, Chris Gareis, Scott McCoy, and Brent Owens.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Matthew Lambert, Chantel Smith and Daniel Frezza.

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 pm.

1. The minutes of the October 28, 2014 meeting were approved.
2. Provost's Report: Michael Halleran
 - a) The Provost reported that William & Mary ranked first among public universities in the annual report on study abroad, with a total of 45.8% of our students studying abroad. This places us 20th among all universities. Our goal remains at 60% which today would rank us 4th. The University of Denver currently ranks #1.
 - b) The Provost reported that the Board of Visitors will be meeting later this week, and nothing on the agenda seems likely to cause a major controversy. The formal Master Plan will be presented, and then will become public.
 - c) The Provost summarized the recent report of JLARC, (Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee), which is a non-partisan legislative committee presented its long report on academic costs with lots of data. A few major points were that (1) Higher Education is expensive; (2) the single largest cost is the reduction in state support; (3) the cost of athletics is high; (3) the recent building boom has been expensive; (4) there is concern about financial aid and its effect on student debt.
 - d) The Provost said it is not clear what will happen next, although some of this is likely to be taken on in the legislative session.

Questions:

Mr. Rapoport asked if the administration had received any negative feedback after a JLARC chart that showed W&M as an outlier *before* the Promise, with tuition twice as large as the next institution. The Provost responded that there had not yet been any negative feedback, and that Sam Jones is trying to determine how that chart was generated because it does not agree with any data that we have. This chart was not provided to us before the release of the JLARC report.

3. Report by Mathew Lambert and Daniel Frezza of the office of advancement. The office of Advancement is a new structure that combines the Alumni Association with the Office of Development to better serve the university. It has three major efforts: (1) improved engagement of alumni, parents, faculty and staff; (2) to obtain 40% participation rate among undergraduate alumni; and (3) a likely \$1,000,000,000 campaign goal. Towards the engagement goal, Advancement is working to move alumni services away from the strictly social

model by better incorporating career services and other intellectual involvements. This also involves a much larger geographical footprint as we now have a much broader national, and international, alumni presence. Towards the second goal, our last year's participation rate was up a full percentage point to 25% so that we now are the top Public Ivy in terms of student participation. Last year, a student, Lindsey Buckheit, led one effort to increase participation by challenging other athletes to "Give 10 back for the Tribe". She reached an astonishing 99% participation rate among athletes by going to each team and talking about the need and the benefits of giving back. Towards the last goal, Mr. Lambert noted that pledges and gifts for the last fiscal year totaled \$104 million dollars, and this is only the third time that W&M has surpassed \$100 million. Advancement expects to continue with \$100 million being the new floor for contributions. The endowment has been increasing, to \$800 million (in June 2014). Mr. Lambert said that he was enthused last year when he was contacted by Suzanne Raitt as the Faculty Assembly President, to find out how the Faculty Assembly could help with development efforts. Mr. Lambert said that a high participation rate by faculty and staff, regardless of the dollar amount, would help with external fundraising.

Mr. Frezza continued the presentation, pointing out that 21.4% of the faculty and staff contributed during 2010-2014, although this number falls to 11-12% for those faculty and staff who are not alumni or parents of alumni. Some units have had high rates at times, such as the Business School reaching 85% at the time of the dedication of the new building. The School of Law reached 60% in 2013. The faculty participation rates can be important to students, when they decide to whether or not to support the university, and to foundations, as indicators for the culture of the university. Mr. Frezza introduced Chantel Smith as the coordinator of the efforts with faculty and staff. Her plan is to send a letter to all staff and faculty with a message that says give anywhere you want to the university and a follow-up note at Charter Day, and monthly notes updating the participation rates, starting on April 15 to end the fiscal year. Mr. Frezza said that they would like Faculty Assembly to endorse this plan.

Questions:

Mr. Cooke asked about small local contributions to departments to support things like colloquium funds. Should they show up on as contributions? Mr. Frezza responded that they should show up as contributions, if they are given to the university. Mr. Cooke said that some small contributions go into a cash drawer or are spent to support your students' research without going through the paperwork of contributing through the website. Mr. Frezza said that gifts of less than \$250 from our students amount to a total of more than \$1 million dollars, but that they still want to focus on the act of giving rather than the amount that is given. He said that if it is able to be counted at the college, they really want to count it and give credit to those who give. The new web site makes this easier. Mr. Abegaz said that he was told by an administrator that although we are a Public Ivy, our alumni do not have the profile of Ivy League graduates. Specifically, prior to 1976, most of our graduates became teachers. This administrator also said that our alumni were always generous with their time, although they did not have the wealth necessary for a large campaign. Do we have data about our alums? Mr. Lambert responded that we do have the data, and that approximately 24,000 do have the resources necessary to make a major contribution, but that only about 5,000 have had face-to-face meetings. Face to face meetings are absolutely necessary to get major contributions, and student

involvement is also crucial for this. Furthermore, it is hard to change philanthropic habits and it is difficult to get into these habits if this is not started during student days. Ms. Butler said that as a graduate from the 70's, she knows many graduates who have done very well, but have never been personally contacted for contributions.

Mr. Dessler said we must consider where we fit into this process. Are we endorsing this campaign, and if so, how do we participate. Mr. Hershner said why would we not? Ms. Raitt asked how many donors we already have among faculty? Mr. Frezza said that the data was not ready for today, but that it is available. He said the problem was separating instructional faculty from others. Ms. Raitt said we also talked about having different letters for each unit. Does that fit into the planned program? Mr. Frezza said that was the plan last year, but that this approach was complicated, and he would advise a more general letter that says give to wherever you would like. Mr. Chason said that it would be useful to have different signers for the different units so that any faculty member would receive a letter from someone they knew. Mr. Lambert said that the plan was to launch the effort with a general letter, and that follow-up letters from within each unit could then follow. Ms. Panoussi said that the letter should recognize that people already give in ways that are not recognized. Mr. Lambert said that the message is very similar to the message for alumni and students, which is time, talent and treasure are all necessary. Ms. Vahle asked if departments could create specific funds, such as to support colloquia. Mr. Lambert said that he believed the minimum requirement for a new fund was \$2500 in order to avoid having thousands of funds. Mr. Frezza said that it is possible to write in the text field how it is to be used. Mr. Rapoport asked what is a major gift? Mr. Lambert responded that they consider a major gift in excess of \$100,000. Mr. Rapoport also said that the discussion last year was about participation, and that if the focus is on that, rather than the amount, that it should be well received. Mr. Allred said that this is the first year that one can designate W&M through the CVC. Does Advancement capture that data and show it as faculty or staff contributions? Mr. Lambert said that it counts, but the information comes late, so it is a little more complicated. Mr. Frezza said that they will extract the information as quickly as possible. Mr. Frezza said that they would like to draft a letter and have the Faculty Assembly review it. Mr. Dessler said that we could discuss it at our next meeting, on December 9.

Ms. Raitt said that in conversations around campus some faculty had expressed anxiety about being involved in asking students for contributions. They feared that it would look like extortion from students whom we are grading. Mr. Frezza said that we would never want our faculty to be in that position. Rather than asking for contributions, being an example of supporting the university is a better model.

4. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs: Lily Panoussi

Mr. Cooke reported for the Retirement Incentives Working Group. The group had its first meeting and agreed to include one or two members from the Faculty Compensation Board (FCB), to collect the history of previous attempts, to collect information from other universities, and to collect demographic data on faculty both at W&M and at other universities. They discussed a number of topics that could play a role, a number of methods, financial and otherwise, and decided to meet again in December, with the new members from the FCB.

B. Faculty Affairs: Sarah Day

The Working Group on the Faculty Survey. Mr. Rapoport reported that the group is using the survey from 1999 (only four pages long) to help make decision about cutting out portions of the most recent instrument so that the next survey can be shortened significantly. They will meet again in December.

C. COPAR: Berhanu Abegaz

Mr. Abegaz reported that COPAR met last Friday to discuss Planning Budget Requests (PBRs). It endorsed all five, with some recommended more strongly.

D. Executive Committee: David Dessler

Mr. Dessler reported that there will be reports from the other two working groups (Faculty Diversity and Gender Climate) at the December Faculty Assembly meeting. The Gender Climate Task Force will be asking the Faculty Assembly to discuss what kind of penalty should be used to enforce the expected requirement for faculty training. Mr. Cooke asked if there will be an assessment of the training to make sure it works before people are required to take it? Mr. Dessler responded yes.

E. Liaison Committee: Eric Chason

Mr. Chason reported that the Liaison Committee had prepared a presentation for the Board of Visitors emphasizing the importance of faculty research. The report includes faculty research presentations by Jaime Settle (Government Department, Arts & Sciences) and Jason Chen (Education) to be previewed immediately after this meeting concludes.

The President adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.