Feiss presiding.

I. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the meeting of December 2, 1997 were approved as submitted.

II. Reports of Administrative Officers

Provost Cell reported that President Sullivan is in Richmond testifying before the legislature. The provost summarized the information available on the biennial budget, but stressed that we know virtually nothing final about the budget at this point. Governor Gilmore has put performance measure rewards on hold pending the report of a new blue ribbon commission on higher education. This means there is effectively no new money for higher education. The makeup of the new blue ribbon commission is unknown, but will apparently include business people and perhaps representation from higher education. The governor's charge to the committee stresses reconciling high quality and low cost. He emphasizes broad access to higher education and seeks advice on improved funding methods. The governor notes the need to find more consistent and predictable funding. The governor calls for fiscal responsibility and accountability on the part of higher education, but emphasizes that the focus should be on the outcome, the quality of our graduates. Universities are portrayed as incubators of both the new technology and the workforce that the commonwealth needs. The recent emphasis by the governor and others on the connection between economic development and higher education recognizes the university's duty to serve the commonwealth. The college is especially concerned to ensure that our efforts in the realm of economic development be consistent with our academic mission. Gary Krepps chairs a group overseeing the college's economic development efforts.

Gary Krepps reported that the group is currently working in three areas:

1. Developing strategies for multidisciplinary research in materials science on the main campus.
2. Working with the School of Marine Science to support their work in aquaculture genetics and other projects.
3. Integrating the above two activities with the resources of the School of Business and the Bureau of Business Research.

Related proposals to NSF and to the Center for Innovative Technology will be submitted over the next few weeks. These efforts are designed to increase
sponsored research and overhead recoveries in order to support both the graduate and undergraduate programs.

Don Baxter reported on behalf of the Faculty Assembly that at its most recent meeting the assembly heard a report on the Williamsburg at the Crossroads project concerning the use of college-owned land behind the Rec Center. An advisory committee is being formed to address this issue, and will include faculty representation. The assembly approved the proposed language for the college's post-tenure review policy for incorporation into the Faculty Handbook. The proposal will now go to the Board of Visitors.

III. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Jack Willis tantalized the faculty with promises of upcoming revisions to the Faculty Manual. He also announced that Martha Houle has been appointed to replace Katherine Preston on the Nominations and Elections Committee during Preston's leave this semester. At FAC's request, Associate Provost Cottrell reported to the committee concerning her position and issues facing the college in the area of enrollment. The position of Associate Provost for Enrollment was created in response to the report of a task force examining a decline in the college's out-of-state applications and in the diversity of our applicant pool. The new associate provost supervises the offices of Admissions and Financial Aid and the Registrar's Office. The associate provost will also head a task force charged with implementing the recommendations of the task force that created the position. Thus far several "client-centered" changes have been made in admissions and financial aid procedures. Cottrell outlined trends in the college's enrollment patterns. Since 1994 applications to William and Mary have declined, while applications to many "overlap" schools (other schools to which our applicants apply) have increased. Our yield (percentage of accepted students who enroll) is below that of many overlap schools. We have also seen a significant decline in our retention rate. Number of applications, yield, retention, and diversity all need improvement. Associate Provost Cottrell solicited faculty members' suggestions as she and the soon-to-be appointed task force pursue these goals.

Discussion focused on the problem of perception, specifically the perception of William and Mary as a school where students are overworked and overstressed.

IV. Nominations and Elections

Steve Knudson presented the following slate of nominees for election to the Faculty Assembly:

Area I

 X George Greenia (MLL)
  Adam Potkay (Eng)

Area II
No nominations being made from the floor, nominations were closed. Nominees whose names are marked "X" were elected.

V. Annual Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies

Franz Gross summarized the CoGS report, the full text of which was distributed to chairs and is on the Web. Over the past year the committee has focused on four issues:

1. The program for training and evaluating teaching fellows was developed. Over the past year an average of ten teaching fellows per semester were employed. Six programs used teaching fellows.
2. A survey of the learning climate for female graduate students was conducted last spring. The results are available in the full report. This survey will serve as a baseline; another will be conducted in two or three years.
3. The possibility of moving toward electronic theses was discussed.
4. Two Ph.D.-granting programs, Computer Science and History, are currently being reviewed; the reports will be available in the fall.

Discussion focused on problems with the wording of the report and on the problem of sexual harassment brought to light by the report. The report notes that 52% of female graduate students had experienced some form of harassment from a male faculty member. Of this 52%, "only" 28% said they were discriminated against on the basis of gender and "only" 30% perceived harassment to be a problem. Why are these percentages being trivialized? Why is the only response to wait until the next survey?

Answer: The qualifier "only" should have been removed; its presence in the report is an error. Gross commented that he is very concerned by the results of the survey, though precisely what to do is unclear. Provost Cell responded that she had not seen the report, but that we clearly do need a plan.

Further discussion clarified that the 52% figure reflects the number of respondents who reported having had an experience that is defined as harassment regardless of how the respondent perceived the experience. Of this 52%, 30% defined their own experiences as harassment. Dorothy Coleman moved that Gross distill the results of the survey, specifying the range of behaviors reflected in the survey, and that he distribute this to the faculty before the next meeting. After further discussion the motion was amended to stipulate that Gross, advised by CoGS, should also
bring "talking points" to the March faculty meeting in order to facilitate a discussion of possible solutions. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

VI. New Business

No new business was brought to the faculty, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Galambush
Assistant Professor of Religion