

## **Faculty Assembly Meeting**

Approved Minutes for February 22, 2011

*Present Members:* Todd Averett, Debbie Bebout, Bruce Campbell, Tracy Cross, Michael Deschenes, Jim Dwyer, Rick Gressard, Will Hausman, Lisa Landino, John Lee, Alan Meese, Leisa Meyer, Terry Meyers, Scott McCoy, Todd Mooradian, J.C. Poutsma, Lily Panoussi, Ron Rapoport & Jennifer Taylor

*Absent Members:* Alan Fuchs, Carl Hershner & Steve Kuehl

*Others in Attendance:* Clay Clemens, Susan T. Evans, Michael Halleran, Jacob Lassin, Gabby Litzinger, Dennis Manos, Suzanne Seurattan, Kate Slevin & Brian Whitson

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm by Will Hausman

### **1. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the November 22, 2010 meeting were approved.

### **2. Provost Report**

The Provost reported BOV presentations regarding the curriculum review and Student Body Size Committee deliberations by JC Poutsma and Todd Mooradian, respectively, led to active conversations.

The budget outlook for next year is anticipated to be somewhat clearer following the end of the General Assembly session on Saturday. The administration is cautiously optimistic that forthcoming legislation will lack transparent malice, such as further cuts or a total cap on tuition raises. Explicit recognition of the special nature of The College of William and Mary in the Virginia Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2011, as well as inclusion of new funds for the College in the proposed budgets of both the Senate and House, are encouraging. However, uncertainties regarding implementation of the new legislation and the existence of \$10 million in unallocated cuts will complicate the budget process.

### **3. Visual Identity Committee – Susan Evans**

Susan Evans presented an overview of the progress and plans of the Visual Identity Committee. In January the Committee completed a research and assessment phase, finding multiple coats of arms, ciphers, word marks and athletic symbols in use by individual campus units and departments. The Committee is working with a budget of \$0 to develop a more cohesive and organized visual identity. Over the next year the Committee will be making presentations across campus, consulting with small focus groups to identify the controversial issues and developing a web site that offers downloads of recommended logos. Challenges for the Committee include keeping the brand and identity of schools consistent with identity of the whole and facilities signage. The Faculty Assembly will be asked to recommend some faculty participants. Implementation and dissemination is scheduled to be completed by July 2012. The Committee welcomes suggestions and comments via their feedback form or blog <http://visualidentity.blogs.wm.edu>.

#### **4. Honor Code Review Committee**

Clay Clemens reported on the progress and plans of the committee of faculty, students and administrators set up by President Reveley to review the Honor Code policy and procedures. The Committee has discussed issues including differences between the last review in 1997 and now, the scope of the Honor Code, the standards for sanctions, and the appeals process. The Committee has been soliciting input from whole sets of campus constituencies and subsets of participants. Findings regarding the major issues are likely after spring break. Recommendations will be produced based on feedback regarding findings. An ensuing discussion touched on themes including the onerous faculty work load, futility- and severity-associated equivocations, faculty autonomy and discretion, inconsistencies in enforcement, and ambiguity in the Code. Members of the Faculty Assembly also expressed concern about instilling and maintaining familiarity with the Honor Code throughout the academic community. Clay thanked the Assembly for reinforcing themes that have been prevalent in the review and providing new food for thought.

#### **5. University Relations Faculty Media Experts page**

Brian Whitson and Suzanne Seurattan summarized the structure and mission of University Relations, which operates as W&M's primary link to the press. The various departments and schools are covered by an individual staff member. Staff members spend 50-80% of their time on baseline press releases, press queries, breaking news, maintaining web site and social media. The remaining time is spent producing *Ideation* magazine and new content for the website such as faculty features.

University Relations launched a William and Mary Experts web page last year to facilitate placing faculty in the national press. Phase II, offering more extensive browsing options and expert profiles, will be launched in March. Anticipate doubling the list of participants in Phase II. University Relations also provides media training and press management counseling.

The presentation led to an inquiry regarding studio resources. Local studios operated by Colonial Williamsburg and National Public Radio are difficult to secure on the short time scale often imposed. Skype has been used for local television shows, but national networks require broadcast quality. A television studio on campus would simplify scheduling and reduce the time demands on faculty. A baseline studio would require an initial investment of approximately \$80,000 and \$350/month for access to National Lambda Rail. Studio access serves as a competitive advantage in securing media exposure.

#### **4. Standing Committee Reports**

##### ***A. Faculty Affairs Committee***

Leisa Meyer and Will Hausman met with Chairs of Arts and Sciences at a Dean's Advisory Committee meeting to discuss proposed new Faculty Handbook language regarding specified term appointments. The proposed changes were designed to allow each school to craft policies tailored to their unique structure and mission with greater faculty oversight and enhanced job security for non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty. The proposed policy allows schools to retain or modify the existing policy and is compatible with the definition of Professional Faculty in the draft Professionals and Professional Faculty Handbook. Faculty were especially concerned about coincidental facilitation of dropping/shifting tenure lines and a burgeoning two-

tier faculty. Leisa and Will are scheduled to discuss the proposed language at the March A&S meeting.

***B. Academic Affairs***

The Academic Affairs Committee agreed to monitor the curriculum review process.

***C. COPAR***

COPAR has received two reports on the decisions of the legislation. They expect to begin formally reviewing the 2011-2012 institutional budget shortly after the conclusion of the current session of the state legislature.

***D. Executive Committee***

The shorter, more interactive faculty presentations to the Board of Visitors were well received in February. BOV members appear to be engaged allies in addressing the acute budget problems facing the College. In that context, they are keenly interested in an efficacious faculty-driven curriculum review that considers ways to be more productive. Provost Halleran clarified that saving money is an anticipated but collateral issue in the curriculum review process. A highly interactive, educational format was suggested for the next faculty presentation to the BOV.

**5. Old business**

None.

**6. Old business**

None.

**7. Announcements**

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah C. Bebout  
Secretary of the Faculty Assembly