

The College of William and Mary
Minutes of the Faculty Assembly Meeting
January 28, 2003

Faculty Assembly **President Robert Archibald** opened the January meeting of the Faculty Assembly of the 2002-2003 academic year at 3:34 p.m.

Members present: Robert Archibald, Debbie Bebout, Elizabeth Canuel, Robert Diaz, Keith Griffioen, William Hawthorne, Lu Ann Homza, Martha Houle, Colleen Kennedy, Ron Rosenberg, Laurie Sanderson, Larry Ventis, Wanda Wallace, and Ron Wheeler. Members absent: Jonathan Aries, Nancy Gray, John Lee, Scott Nelson, Roger Ries, and Margaret Saha.

The minutes of the December 17, 2002 meeting were approved.

Dean of University Libraries **Connie McCarthy** said that it might take a month to determine the financial consequences of the failure of RoweCom, a subscription service business, to pay for some 2,000-journal subscriptions of the College's libraries. Approximately \$500,000 is owed. Other services may be available to provide access to the journals.

I. Administrative Reports

Provost Cell reported that the College will undergo reaccreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a process that will culminate with the on-site review of the College's programs during Spring, 2006. **Prof. Gary Kreps** followed up with a detailed presentation on SACS accreditation. They pointed out that unlike past SACS reviews that required the College to respond to a multitude of externally-imposed "must" statements, the new guidelines are more institution-centered because they focus on the College's own self-proclaimed standards. Both the Provost and Vice Provost emphasized the importance of having the necessary documentation in place to demonstrate the College has meet its institutional goals and objectives. To guide this process, SACS requires the formation of a "leadership team," comprised of a small group of faculty and administrators, including president. This group will coordinate the College's planning and evaluation processes and oversee the systematic review of programs and services. All of these efforts will be incorporated into a document called the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which will be the primary focus of the SACS on-site review team and contain a fully developed evaluation plan.

Prof. Wanda Wallace pointed out that the continuous monitoring aspect of the SACS accreditation process should imply continuous maintenance of the Annual Report of Scholarly and Creative Activity. However, an announcement from the Grants Office dated today, January 28, indicated that funding for that purpose for the current year was not available.

Prof. Archibald and others expressed concern that the SACS's review process, with its emphasis on documenting student learning outcomes, might detract from the College's

commitment to the total “educational experience” of each student. In response, the Provost said that although such concerns were valid, the College “will have to do some things that it’s not doing now” to be in compliance with SACS’s new requirements. She reiterated the need to demonstrate that we have a QEP in place that is tied to student learning.

Provost Cell said that neither she nor President Sullivan was satisfied with the revised post-tenure review procedures that had been amended by the Faculty Assembly last year and, therefore, they would not send them to the Board of Visitors. There was concern that the proposed procedures would require that too much time and attention be devoted to post-tenure reviews of all eligible faculty members. What is needed instead, the Provost suggested, is a clearly articulated review process for marginal performers. Prof. Lutzer, Chair of the Procedural Review Committee (PRC), explained that another set of procedures will be developed by his committee and a draft of those procedures would be sent to the Faculty Assembly for approval before they were reviewed by departments. After some discussion and clarification, it was agreed that the Personnel Policy Committee was the correct group to start the process and develop some general guidelines for the Faculty Assembly and departments to consider.

Vice President Sam Sadler reported on a feasibility study for new student housing. The plan would move students from remotely located Dillard Complex back to a new dormitory, which would be built on the Barksdale Field site. It was explained that Barksdale Field was the preferred site because it would have minimal negative impact on the natural landscape and would still leave room for the recreational field, albeit reduced in size. The Vice President said that the proposal to build the new dormitory (at a cost of \$20 million) would be recommended by the administration for approval at the up-coming meeting of the Board of Visitors. The report generated considerable discussion and concern. Questions were asked regarding the economic trade-offs: Would this project interfere with the on-going process to build other much-needed facilities? How much will it increase fees? Other questions centered on the lack of faculty input into the decision-making process: Were appropriate faculty committees ignored? Why wasn’t the Faculty Assembly invited to review the plan *before* the decision was made?

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ron Wheeler, Secretary