

## **Faculty Considerations for BAC**

**4 April 2008**

### **I. SALARIES AND BENEFITS**

Like virtually all colleges and universities, Wheaton finds itself working to navigate the changing landscape of higher education. Increasingly disadvantageous conditions for homeowners and credit borrowers threaten to reduce access to two of the most important resources on which parents commonly draw in order to finance a college education. Unfortunately, the economic downturn looks set to correspond with a demographic shift that will see colleges and universities competing for fewer students over the next 5-10 years.<sup>1</sup> The simultaneity of these events will almost certainly be felt most acutely by tuition-dependent colleges such as Wheaton.

As the College prepares to mount its largest capital campaign ever and to fund major projects such as the Center for Scientific Inquiry and Innovation, a new residence hall and water treatment facility, Project Scholarship and the like, Wheaton will need to minimize the impact the slowing economy will have on our resources while proceeding aggressively to leverage those resources in ways that secure our identity as a pre-eminent liberal arts college. In short, though there may be little certainty ahead, we can be certain that the success with which we manage the transitions ahead will depend fundamentally on our commitment to the core values and priorities articulated in the “Wheaton 2014” strategic vision: academic excellence, curricular and co-curricular innovation, global citizenship, environmental sustainability and a technological infrastructure that is at once integrated and integral to all of these.

In order to ensure that we continue to compare favorably to peer institutions, moreover, we must also understand that our faculty constitute one of the College’s most important and indispensable resources. Just as the recruitment and retention of a diverse, accomplished faculty is a precondition for the instructional, scholarly and creative excellence to which Wheaton aspires, so too is the competitiveness of faculty and staff salaries and benefits a precondition to the recruitment and retention of such a faculty. After consulting with the members of the Committee on Faculty Workload and Economic Status, as well as with AAUP, we have identified the following goals and priorities that we believe will figure importantly in Wheaton’s ability to excel in these areas.

#### **1. Faculty Salaries**

- A. Since the expiration three years ago of the faculty salary plan, salary adjustments have generally been guided by a continued commitment to the goal of moving us to the mean of the Northeast 9 comparison group. With the announcement earlier this year of plans to return to the NE 9 group that reinstates Muhlenberg and removes Skidmore, current data indicate that the proposed 5.2% increase to the faculty salary pool will place us at the weighted mean of this group. Because this figure is 0.4% less than the initial figure indicated in the Preliminary Budget for FY 2009, we hope that this money might be

---

<sup>1</sup> Finder, Alan. “Math Suggests College Frenzy Will Soon Ease.” *New York Times*, 9 March 2008.

redirected to other areas of ongoing concern such as, following through on the decision four years ago to increase the College's contribution toward retirement from 8% to 10%, non-competitive benefits, efforts begun last year to increase salary adjustments for promotion, the ongoing need to relieve salary compression through equity raises, and the equalization of across-the-board increases to the faculty and staff salary pools.

- B. Although recent salary adjustments have, as previously stated, affirmed the need to bring faculty salaries to the mean of the NE 9, the fact remains that there is currently no salary plan. Moreover, suggestions to the Committee on Faculty Workload and Economic Status that a future salary plan might attach faculty salaries to the broader category of resources is troubling, especially in light of recent indications that our resources lag far behind the other NE 9 schools, and that there is, at best, very little chance of our reaching the mean in this category in the foreseeable future. With this as context:
- i. Faculty are themselves a *resource*, one the College can ill afford to underfund either at the level of recruitment or retention. Any future faculty salary plan should reaffirm the College's commitment to remaining at the mean of the NE 9 salary.
  - ii. Between 1995-2006, our total resources increased 123% — more than any of our comparison schools. The most significant movement during this period— from 33.3% below the NE 9 resources mean in FY'95 to 19.6% in FY'02 — corresponds with the expansion of Wheaton's student body and a concomitant increase in student revenue not experienced by others in our peer group. In recent years, the gap has begun to widen again, slipping to 22.6% below the mean in FY'06. We have also continued to be outdistanced in the area of endowment growth, the result of many factors to be sure.
  - iii. Faculty recognize the urgency of bridging the resources gap, and indeed participate in this endeavor both directly and indirectly (e.g., traveling to or speaking at admissions and alumnae/i events, receiving grants, publishing new scholarship or producing new creative work, etc.). Ultimately, however, the task of raising resources is something over which the faculty have little direct control.
  - iv. Should an effort be made to implement a faculty salary plan that makes faculty salaries contingent on resources, it will be important for there to be occasions for the faculty to engage the President in a dialogue about the risks and benefits of such a plan, and about the Trustees' strategy and timeline for reaching the NE 9 resources mean.
- C. After a long, deliberative and constructive process, the faculty voted last year to create the category of "Associate Faculty" for eight full-time 'staff' positions that "carry a significant teaching commitment." An important impetus behind the assignation of faculty status was to ensure that those who serve in these positions enjoy the same rights as other full-time faculty members (e.g., the ability to vote in faculty and department meetings, protection under the standards for notification for non-reappointment, academic freedom, etc.).<sup>2</sup> The change in status also extended faculty benefits and raises to these positions. The reclassification of these positions should also ensure that, in keeping with the College's long commitment to treating employees equitably, Associate Faculty salaries appropriately reflect their level of service and experience as permanent, full-time faculty members.

---

<sup>2</sup> For additional information, see Section II.O.1 in Faculty Legislation.

## **2. Salary adjustments for promotion.**

Last year's faculty report recommended that the salary adjustment (or "bump") for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, and from Associate to Full Professor, be raised incrementally over a period of 2-3 years.

Starting with FY'08, the Provost increased the figure accompanying promotion from \$2,000 to \$2,500. We hope this signals a commitment to raising salary adjustments for promotions to a level that corresponds to the change in rank, ensures we remain competitive with both the salaries and bumps of peer institutions, and complements other efforts to ease wage compression.

The administration and the Committee on Faculty Workload and Economic Status should devise a plan to ensure the periodic review and, when necessary, the increase of salary adjustments connected to promotion.

## **3. Equity raises.**

The market conditions that shape base salary for new hires all but ensure that these will continue to outpace increases to existing salaries, a reality that exacerbates existing wage compression.

Comparative salary data of NE 9 schools indicates that this is most acute at the Associate rank.<sup>3</sup> In FY'07, the average Associate Professor salary was 21.2% higher than the average Assistant Professor salary. This placed us at the bottom of the NE 9 schools, among whom the overall average difference in these categories was 27.9%. In contrast, the average difference between Associate and Full Professors this same year was 36.5%, whereas among Wheaton Associate and Full Professors this figure was 42.7%, placing us second among our peers.

Department chairs formerly had access to the salaries of faculty within their department. Renewing this practice would enable chairs to communicate with the Provost on matters such as starting salary for new hires and wage compression among existing faculty members within individual departments.

In past years Provost Woods and, more recently, Provost Smith have worked to relieve compression when possible through equity raises. The faculty appreciates these efforts and encourages their continuation. At the same time, plans to address compression both within and across departments, as well as within and across ranks should include working with appropriate parties to acquire as clear a sense of overall compression as possible in order to identify needs and to prioritize areas for adjustment with respect to the equitable distribution of salary resources.

## **4. Retirement benefits.**

As has been noted in past reports to this committee, in 2003 the Benefits Review Committee determined that we remain significantly below the mean of retirement contribution. This continues to be the case. While the College has increased its contribution to 9%, Wheaton makes

---

<sup>3</sup> Although it is essentially impossible to predict the number of years any given individual serves at either the Associate or Full rank — which in turn impacts the average salaries at these levels — the data suggest that salaries across rank may be an area worth taking into consideration as the issue of wage compression.

the smallest contribution to faculty and staff retirement of all but one of the colleges in the new Northeast 9 comparison group: Colby contributes 8%, Haverford 12%; Bates 11%, Connecticut, Hamilton, Muhlenberg, Hobart & William Smith and Trinity each contribute 10%.<sup>4</sup>

Recommendations by the Benefits Review Committee at that time included increasing contributions to retirement from the then-current level of 8% to 10%. The College has since increased its contribution to 9%. In the survey of faculty priorities with respect to benefits conducted by the committee, 92% of respondents listed retirement benefits as “Very Important” or “Important”. The cost of increasing the contribution to retirement for faculty and staff requires a considerable increase in continuing funds. Nevertheless, the longer we delay this process the greater the negative impact on employees’ long-term savings (accrued both through direct contributions and compounding interest) and on the College’s ability to offer competitive benefits to anyone considering taking a faculty or staff position at the College.

The President’s recent proposal to amend the tuition benefit for dependents would yield considerable savings to the College with respect to this benefit. The faculty see this as a singular opportunity for the College to simultaneously compete more favorably with other institutions in recruiting outstanding personnel, and make good on its commitment to providing greater long-term security for the faculty and staff on whom the institution relies to deliver an outstanding liberal arts education.

When existing retirement benefits are applied to 2007 average salaries at all ranks, Wheaton ranks ninth in the comparison group and is 15.2% below the mean. An increase from 9% to 10% would move Wheaton to sixth place, leaving us 6.7% below the mean. A two-percent increase (from 9% to 11%) would move Wheaton to 1.5% above the mean, tying for fourth place with Trinity College (\$0.83 would separate the two in this scenario).

With these factors in mind — particularly if the tuition benefit for dependents is modified as has been suggested — the College should move aggressively not only to complete, but to move beyond the recommendations of the 2003 Benefits Review Committee by increasing the contribution to faculty and staff retirement from the current 9% to 11% in order to bring us to the mean of the NE 9 in this category.

## **5. Tuition benefits for dependents.**

Discussions about the tuition benefit for dependents have been undertaken with considerable regularity for several years now. Faculty and staff have conducted workshops, polls and surveys. Data have been collected, views recorded, numbers crunched. And though the need to modify the existing benefit has gained increasingly wide recognition, consensus about any specific resolution has remained elusive. Responses to the President’s recently proposed change to the existing benefit have been, in keeping with previous conversations on the subject, wide-ranging.

The President’s proposal, unveiled at a joint meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee and the Committee on Faculty Workload and Economic Status, would provide dependents with 50% of

---

<sup>4</sup> These figures do not reflect variations within plans that occur at certain thresholds or under certain conditions. Notable among these are the fact that Bates contributes an additional 1% to supplemental retirement accounts to any employee who contributes 1% of his/her salary, and that Colby, which contributes the least in retirement, has the highest salaries in the NE 9 (10.1% greater than Wheaton across all ranks in 2007).

the tuition to attend the school of one's choice up to 50% of Wheaton's tuition. Such a plan presents our community with a path to a meaningful resolution. This resolution has the potential to reaffirm several major principles, principles that are often (mis)perceived as being at loggerheads: a proactive plan to ensure the fiscal strength of the College; a commitment to providing financial support to dependents of employees to attend college; the distribution of benefits resources in a manner that is equitable and that invests in the short- and long-term quality of life of faculty, staff and their families.

Data accompanying the President's proposal confirm that the existing tuition benefit will continue to represent a disproportionate expense to the College, depleting the available resources available to fund other benefits. It also moves this benefit more toward the level provided by other schools in the NE 9 comparison group.

More importantly, the proposal protects against the uncertainty faced by employees planning to use the tuition benefit under the current plan by guaranteeing that all employee dependents will receive a significant contribution toward the cost of a four-year college education. This eliminates the current problem faced by dependents who do not wish to or who are not able to attend Wheaton, as well as those who do not receive funding through the tuition exchange program. Under the existing benefit, these students receive \$2,000 per year, less than 10% of the support provided to other dependents.

In exchange for the reduction of this benefit, the savings realized by the College under the new plan will (need to) be recommitted to faculty and staff benefits as described, for instance, in the above section on retirement contributions. Initial figures suggest the eventual savings would provide sufficient continuing funds to support a two-percent increase in this area.

In short, the proposal aims to increase the equitable distribution of benefit resources on two levels — first, among the faculty and staff who plan on using the tuition benefit for a dependent, and, second, among *all* faculty and staff, who would finally receive contributions to their retirement funds at a level consistent with our peers groups.

In order to be very clear, the potential advantages of the President's proposal are many. However, in order to move forward in a way that enjoys the support of as many faculty and staff members as possible, it is vital that no change to the existing benefit be implemented without providing opportunities for faculty and staff to pose questions and express their views. Suggestions that have emerged from within this committee provide good starting points — informational workshops, public Q&A sessions, the publication of pertinent and easy-to-understand information about the implications of the change to the B.A. C. Web site, and so forth.

## **6. Medical and dental benefits and policies.**

The faculty recommend that the College consider options for further improving health and dental coverage in ways that neither impose disproportionate financial burdens on certain faculty and staff nor compel college employees to change health care providers.

Wheaton's current parental leave policy "*normally*" offers a one course reduction and two weeks of paid maternity leave – or – 6 weeks of paid leave with the rest of the semester off

without pay. This benefit may only be taken if a child enters a household during the academic year. This policy is problematic for the following reasons:

- A. The policy cannot be applied equally amongst all new because it only applies to children born or adopted during the academic year. In other words, if a child is born or adopted on August 15, the parent receives nothing.
- B. The use of “normally” in the policy language allows flexibility in accommodating unique cases but invites inequities in arrangements.
- C. Prenatal or pre-adoption complications should fall under disability leave but may be interpreted by administrators as part of parental leave.
- D. *Pre-tenure faculty* are in a position of disadvantage because they have to advocate for leave on their own behalf through the Provost’s Office, and doing so may affect their standing and/or increase their vulnerability within their departments.
- E. *Departments* are put at a disadvantage because they are not offered replacements for faculty who take maternity leave. Thus departmental colleagues are responsible for picking up the work of the absent colleague.
- F. *Students* are at a disadvantage because they may have revolving professors in the same course during one semester, when a faculty member is on leave for six weeks. This is clearly undesirable for students, and can be extremely problematic when it comes to grading criteria, pedagogical practices and learning outcomes.
- G. The *College* may be vulnerable to lawsuits because Wheaton’s current policy may fail to meet state (the Small Necessities Leave Act and the Maternity Leave Act) and federal legislation (the Pregnancy Discrimination Act) by not allowing an option of 8 weeks unpaid leave after a delivery.
- H. Several new hires (in recent years) have expressed hesitation at accepting employment at Wheaton because of the lack of a competitive and just parental leave policy. Thus the College may also be vulnerable in terms of recruiting and retaining faculty due to this specific reason.

For these reasons, we recommend that new parents receive parental leave that includes:

Release from two courses based on a five-course load (or its equivalent) with full pay and benefits; course releases could be taken following the birth or adoption of a child *regardless of the calendar date on which this occurs.*

*Or*

Release from three courses at less than full pay.

*Or*

A full-year leave at 1/3 pay.

The benefit should also be such that it can be split between two parents if both parents are faculty members at Wheaton.

## **7. Medical insurance and prescription drug benefits for retired faculty members.**

Access to health care and prescription drug benefits following retirement remains an important concern. At the November 16, 2007 meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee, Director of Human Resources Barbara Lema announced that Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, one of the College's current providers, will begin offering such a plan, First Seniority Freedom. The College should work to inform staff and faculty of this potentially important new option.

## **II) FACULTY RESEARCH AND CREATIVE WORK**

Adequate support of faculty research and creative work is vital to achieving Wheaton's strategic goals, especially the goals of enhancing the intellectual climate of the college and realizing the transformative power of Wheaton's curriculum. Building upon last year's progress, some additional improvement has been made this year in the following areas:

- travel reimbursement funds have been raised from \$1,100 to \$1,200, with an additional \$50 for attendance at workshops and up to an additional \$100 for conducting a May workshop;
- funding for faculty scholarship over the summer has been increased substantially by increasing the number of awards for faculty/student projects, by increasing the number and amount of Arnold Awards from one at \$1,000 to five at \$2,500, and by increasing the number of Mellon grants;
- startup funding for new faculty has been doubled;
- the streamlining of the grant writing process, made possible by the hard work of the Grants Officer and the Faculty Scholarship Committee, and the full year availability of the Grants Officer.

To meet our strategic goals, we must keep moving in the right direction on faculty scholarship, and so we offer a few recommendations for immediate action below.

### **1. Travel and Research Funding.**

Though we greatly appreciate the recent steps taken to improve this funding, the current amount of \$1,200 available per faculty member still does not usually cover the full cost for one trip to a major national or international scholarly conference. Continued increases in airfare costs will only expand this reimbursement gap. Raising the funding amount to an adequate level, then inflation-adjusting it annually, will help faculty to present their work at least once per year to colleagues in their field. And if possible, increased flexibility should be considered to allow someone to expense up to \$2,400 over a two-year period.

## **2. Summer Support for Faculty Research.**

As pointed out by the Provost's Office, Wheaton still lags behind the Northeast Nine in the level of support available for faculty and faculty-student research over the summer. We have less resources per faculty member relative to our comparison group and we strongly support the Provost's continued efforts to increase funding in this area.

## **3. Startup Funds for New Faculty.**

Especially in the sciences, job market candidates routinely expect to have sufficient startup funds available to them when they become new faculty so that they may gather the necessary equipment, software and computers to get their research programs off the ground. Inadequate funding in this area will make us less competitive in the recruitment process and hamper our ability to hire our top candidates.

## **4. Endowed Faculty Funds.**

We strongly believe that the income generated from endowed faculty funds should be used, as intended, to provide additional support for faculty. At the beginning of each fiscal year the Provost's budget should be credited with these funds so that the existing Provost budget does not have to absorb the cost of providing this additional faculty support. To the extent that the current operating budget depends upon endowed faculty funds for general budget relief, we should move as quickly as possible to reallocate these funds to the Provost's initial budget.

## **III) WORKLOAD**

Workload continues to be a major concern for Faculty. This year, we present again many of the concerns that were part of this set of considerations last year, and as was the case last year, these comments are framed by NEASC Accreditation Standard 5, which speaks directly to faculty workload and seems especially pertinent as the College prepares for the 2009 re-accreditation process. These standards summarize the range of activities that make up faculty workload, and orient our thinking in three ways:

- They offer a national/regional standard for the types of work undertaken by faculty, which is more particular than the usual tripartite division of teaching, research, and service: Standard 5.3 describes the "class and out-of-class" responsibilities of teaching faculty to "include instruction and the systematic understanding of effective teaching/learning processes and outcomes in courses and programs for which they share responsibility: additional duties may include such functions as student advisement, academic planning, and participation in policy-making, course and curriculum development, research, and institutional governance" (5.3).

- They suggest a framework in which the balance of workload (specific to the college's mission and rank) should be considered, in addition to the appropriateness of the overall workload: "Faculty assignments and workloads are ...equitably determined to allow faculty adequate time to provide effective instruction, advise and evaluate students, contribute to program and institutional assessment and improvement, continue professional growth, and participate in scholarship, research, creative activities and service compatible with the mission and purposes of the institution" (5.7).
- The periodic review of support for faculty and faculty workload is defined by NEASC as a measure of the quality of the institution: "Faculty workloads are appraised periodically and adjusted as institutional conditions change" (5.7) and "[t]he institution periodically evaluates the sufficiency of and support for the faculty" (5.22).

Faculty members of the Budget Advisory Committee wish to recognize and express our appreciation of the Provost's commitments with regard to moving toward a 10:1 student/faculty ratio and a 2/2 teaching load. We are currently at 10:1 ratio; approximately 60 course-releases are part of the workload pool (Chairs, first-year faculty, Endowed Chairs, etc.) We wish also to emphasize the fact that faculty concerns with regard to workload, once again, reflect a desire to provide the best possible liberal arts education to students at Wheaton College. In discussions regarding workload, members of the faculty emphasize the fact that many responsibilities take time and attention away from teaching and research, both of which are central features in the reputation of the college. The discussion that follows under sub-headings should not be taken as exhaustive of faculty concerns about workload, but rather focuses on those that have more immediate budgetary implications.

### **1. Service.**

The balance of faculty members' time devoted to campus service beyond committee work continues to increase. We have previously pointed to such responsibilities as work on the recent and future building plans on campus and much more off-campus travel on behalf of the college. Faculty members have been asked to travel to other campuses and to various alumni groups, to conferences of various education associations, and to workshops and meetings that pertain to campus initiatives (the new curriculum, assessment, student engagement issues, facilities planning) rather than to individual faculty members' teaching or research. We also referred to the planning for and implementation of the new curriculum, including course redesign in relation to connections, infusion, and increasing writing instruction; new advising pressures from the curriculum and the increased emphasis on study abroad; and new expectations for evaluation. Some of this work was initially recognized by stipends, which are no longer available. Course releases have also provided a measure of relief, but have created additional work for department chairs, as well as creating an unacceptable rise in courses taught by adjuncts. We continue to take note too, of the extra burden carried by faculty in the division of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Computing since the smaller size of this division puts a proportionately higher service demand on each individual than for the other divisions.

As we noted in our 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 reports, strategic planning, preparations for the capital campaign, the campaign itself, departmental reviews, and preparation for the 2009

NEASC re-accreditation add yet more responsibilities. Essential and valuable activities in themselves, taken together they promise a significant workload that is unwarrantably burdensome to the extent that this work has been added to existing responsibilities, and seems likely to have become a regular part of faculty members' workload, rather than extraordinary work demanded on an occasional basis.

Faculty members of BAC appreciate the Provost's innovation in proposing cross-departmental searches as method for expanding the number of FTE faculty. We wish to note, however, difficulties in process that have resulted in frustration on the part of numerous members of the faculty who have expended great time and energy in these searches for little return.

## **2. Use of Adjunct Faculty.**

The time faculty members spend on administrative responsibilities is necessarily time taken away from effective teaching, advising, scholarship, and community activities. Dependence on adjuncts arises for many reasons, including sabbatical replacements, endowed chair releases, the fluctuations in student numbers associated with Wheaton's success, and with the management of the new January admissions cycle. While adjunct faculty teaching at Wheaton are normally of excellent quality and enrich the College community in numerous ways, the hiring, mentoring, and evaluation of adjunct faculty all impose a burden on existing faculty, particularly but not exclusively on department chairs.

This year the faculty members of BAC would like to recognize the Provost's actions to reduce our reliance on part time adjunct faculty. The number of FTE part time faculty has been reduced to 12 while the number of FTE full time faculty has increased to 137. For every 100 credits offered by Wheaton faculty, 91 are offered by full time faculty while only 9 are offered by part time faculty. We are also pleased that the compensation for contingent faculty teaching 1, 2, and 3 courses has now been standardized to a \$5,000 per course rate. While we appreciate these significant improvements, we understand that the use of part time faculty varies from year to year and we strongly encourage the Provost to maintain a very limited reliance on the use of part time faculty.

## **3. Staff Support.**

As expressed in the section on Faculty Research, faculty are grateful for the work of the faculty grants officer. We wish to note, however, that other kinds of support remain critical. The college should recognize that increased numbers of faculty members results in a need for more secretarial support; this lack of support means a shift of much secretarial work to the faculty members themselves. Examples of the type of work might seem trivial, such as the printing, addressing, and mailing of recommendations, or the checking of the availability of teaching texts. In total, these activities add up to a significant amount of time each semester. This year we are pleased that assistants were added for Education and in Global Education.

Equally important is the extensive and generous support given by LIS staff. Faculty's ability to use technology efficiently and in ways that maximize its value for the College is compromised by the failure of Wheaton to increase the numbers of support staff in these areas adequate to the rise in faculty numbers. The LIS staff liaison who is responsible not only for supporting the use of GIS in teaching but also for processing of student evaluations faces an enormous task each fall when departments prepare cases for the tenure process. In our previous report, we expressed great concern about the lack of support for this position, but we are delighted to learn that huge progress has been made since that report. We also expressed concern about the "...increased demands on the Wheaton Archives and Special Collections as a result of both the needs of the development staff in relation to the capital campaign and of increasing faculty interest in using the materials in the collection. We're pleased that progress has been made in this area, although funding is needed for a half-time support person.

We also wish to reiterate from previous years our continuing desire to reinstate the staff position of Science Center Liaison, to coordinate building activities, maintain our web presence, help the admissions office to attract more science students, and work with communications to highlight the work of students and faculty in the sciences. The need for building-wide coordination, student recruitment, and good PR is especially important as we raise money and embark on building the new Center for Scientific Inquiry and Innovation.

There is a critical need for a Science Center machinist. The machine shop is in constant use by Physics faculty and students, and to a lesser degree by other departments. We cannot emphasize strongly enough how important this position is in providing adequate instruction for faculty and students, and, most critically of all, in ensuring the safety of the machine shop. The cost of supporting a part-time machinist is negligible in comparison to the benefits gained.

#### **4. Technology.**

Technology renewal is a perennial budget problem that needs to be addressed. At issue is the backlog of faculty, classroom, and laboratory computers that are increasingly obsolete, and also technical equipment used for teaching and research in the sciences. We must commit to funding a regular replacement schedule for computer technology, and for a regular maintenance schedule of scientific equipment. Some of this equipment has been purchased with outside grants, and funding agencies have an expectation that the college will maintain equipment and replace obsolete computers. Fortunately, there have been several areas of progress this past year: approximately one third of faculty saw new computers; Ellison Lecture is being upgraded; ICUC is being upgraded with new computers and cameras.

#### **5. Untenured Faculty.**

The issues covered above are concerns for all members of faculty, but they have particular importance for the retention and development of untenured faculty. Last year, BAC faculty members reported that untenured faculty experienced the Wheaton's service demands as heavy. They advocated for advising norms that allowed for three years in which to learn the institutional structure of the College, and for monetary compensation or reduced course loads for all faculty

who advise students. These continuing concerns and proposals point to the need to examine the way in which responsibilities are shared amongst the faculty, and to establish reasonable expectations for untenured professors, which would entail equivalent benchmarks for associate, full, and adjunct professors. It is in the interests of the College to ensure that untenured faculty workload is carefully and systematically managed to allow them to develop their teaching and standings in their professions.

## **6. The CSII Project**

The goal of this exciting project the most ambitious in the history of the College is to give us facilities that will transform the education of our students for decades. It should be understood, however, that the project has required, and will continue to require, a significant investment of faculty time.

The project has its origins in the summer of 1999 when President Marshall realized the importance of updating our facilities. Since that time, faculty have attended many national workshops, visited other campuses, hosted consulting groups, held on-campus workshops, and engaged in numerous planning meetings with EYP. The last six months alone required an estimated 1500 hours of faculty time, projecting to a total of 3,000 over the past year. Some years have involved less time than this, but some much more, and a conservative estimate is that faculty have invested an average of 1600 hours per year, leading to a total of more than 12,000 hours since the summer of 1999.

In conclusion, there are direct ways in which the College can and should address faculty workload issues as they connect to priorities in the Strategic Plan, such as the enhancement of Wheaton's reach and reputation; the enhancement of intellectual excitement through scholarship; the creation of cutting edge programs in the natural sciences, mathematics, and computing; to make technology competitive, ubiquitous and flexible for teaching and learning throughout the college. In view of the budget pressures facing the College, our emphasis this year is on the ways in which our workload is distributed both in terms of the balance between the activities that make up our professional lives, and in terms of the balance across the campus.