

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes for January 28, 2014 3:30 – 5:00pm Blow Hall Board Room

Members Present: Berhanu Abegaz, Jim Barber, Eric Chason, Bill Cooke, David Dessler, John Eisele, Nancy Gray, Susan Grover (Vice-President), Courtney Harris, Will Hausman, Gina Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Brent Owens, Gul Ozyegin, Lily Panoussi, J.C. Poutsma, Suzanne Raitt (President), Brad Weiss, Jeanne Wilson.

Members Absent: Carl Hershner.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Christy Porter.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35pm.

1. The President welcomed the two new members, Berhanu Abergaz and J.C. Poutsma.
2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the December 10, 2013 meeting were approved unanimously.
3. Election of Secretary
Lea Theodore is on leave this semester, leaving the position of Secretary vacant. Bill Cooke was nominated by Suzanne Raitt, and with no other nominations, Mr. Cooke was elected by acclamation.
4. Provost's Report: Michael Halleran
 - a) The General Assembly is discussing a budget. If it does not change the budget proposed by ex-Governor McDonnell then the combination of additional money into higher education plus additional increases in the university's contribution to employee benefits will mean a net decrease in the financial support to the College. In addition, there are two bills proposed in the General Assembly which would have a major impact on the College. One would increase the in-state/out-of-state student ratio, but it does not appear to have much support as yet. The other would allow students to have legal representation during disputes, such as at the Honor Council. This could be expensive if it resulted in telescoping requirements for legal counsel (such as faculty also requesting legal representation at said Honor Council sessions).
 - b) The Procedural Review/Personnel Policy Committee (PPC) met to discuss five items. Three will be coming to the Faculty Assembly for consideration soon. One other is being edited but is likely to come forward, and the final one is being discussed with the originators for further clarifications.
 - c) Censeo has been hired as the Business Improvement consultants, and have already started work. They will speak with over 200 people as they collect an overview of our business practices. This review is expected to result in recommendations by the April BOV meeting, although the College will determine which, if any, of these recommendations to act upon.
 - d) Snow has again closed the College, at almost the identical time as last week. The Provost asked that the faculty be understanding if students do not make it to class for safety reasons.

Questions:

J.C. Poutsma asked if there were plans for when classes might be made up. The Provost responded that if there were many more snow days, we would consider

plans to make-up classes. Will Hausman stated that the weekend classes after the hurricane did not work in his opinion.

5. Draft Report on the Faculty Survey (Susan Grover)

Suzanne Raitt introduced this discussion by pointing out that Susan Grover had volunteered to take this over by extending Rick Gressard's preliminary report from last year. Susan has spent the last month putting together a 75 page summary of many of the faculty survey results. Suzanne also noted that an *ad hoc* group, consisting of Ron Rapoport, J.C. Poutsma, Inga Carboni, and Jim Barber, is meeting to re-conceptualize the survey to make it shorter.

Susan Grover had circulated her draft report of the faculty survey, which included a significant analysis of many, but not all, of the survey questions. Susan stated that the main question she had for the Faculty Assembly was when and how to distribute the report to the College. After much discussion of specific issues, Suzanne Raitt asked for approval of the Faculty Assembly for a small *ad hoc* group to review the survey instrument and to select which other questions should be included in the report. This group, consisting of Suzanne Raitt, Jeanne Wilson, and Gul Ozyegin, will also oversee the analysis for those questions, and write an executive summary for the entire report. The Faculty Assembly approved this plan without objection.

6. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs: Jeanne Wilson

No report.

B. Faculty Affairs: David Dessler

David Dessler made a presentation which explored the plan proposed by the Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE) Faculty Association that they have representatives serve on the Faculty Assembly. He suggested that the argument in favor of such representation is that NTE are faculty, and should therefore have the same rights to representation as other faculty on campus. He said that he knew of three arguments against representation: (1) That it would dilute T/TE representation, (2) that it would cause an erosion of tenure; and (3) that it would be a "risky experiment." Much discussion ensued.

Some highlights are: Eric Chason stated that the schools were the units that provided representatives to the Faculty Assembly, and so each school should decide how to incorporate NTE faculty representation, so that one response of the Faculty Assembly might be to lift the restriction that prohibits NTE faculty members from serving on the Faculty Assembly. Will Hausman questioned why the NTE faculty members were put into one group, when they had sub-divisions that had more differences than similarities. He said that Adjuncts, who teach an occasional class, should not be incorporated into the Faculty Assembly. Suzanne Raitt asked if the proposal might be better called a proposal for representation for *full time* continuing NTE faculty. Bill Cooke asked whether a fixed-term NTE, who was planning to eventually obtain a tenure track position elsewhere, might not be better represented by the T/TE faculty already on the Faculty Assembly. Nancy Gray stated that although she is elected from the Humanities area in Arts and Sciences, she has represented *all* faculty, once elected. Many people asked how many continuing, long time NTE faculty members there are. The Provost promised to get an approximate answer for this, although it might be hard to disentangle long term. David Dessler answered that once the numbers are

known, he believes that it is unlikely to change the essential argument that NTE faculty deserve representation. He also presented an overview of the steps necessary to change the Faculty Assembly constitution and bylaws, all of which appear daunting. John Eisele noted that creating a separate category for NTE representation on the Assembly seemed segregationist, and that having Senior Lecturers run for Assembly from Arts and Sciences, for example, would be a better solution. Gina Hoatson asked what do the NTE Association members want. Christy Porter, representing the NTE Faculty Association, says that she believes that representation through the larger pool in the schools would undermine NTE visibility, and that it would not be useful if it is unlikely to result in an NTE member serving.

C. COPAR: Scott McCoy

COPAR will hear Sam Jones report on the historical budgets of the units of the college at the February 14, 22014 meeting of FYPC/COPAR. Will Hausman requested that COPAR examine the financial implications of the new Arts and Sciences curriculum.

D. Executive Committee: Suzanne Raitt

- a. Suzanne represented the William and Mary Faculty Assembly at the joint Faculty Senate of Virginia (FSVA) and American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Higher Education Advocacy Day in Richmond. There were two main bills of interest to the organization: one that would allow partial tuition remission for children of faculty of state institutions, and one that would require faculty representation on the Higher Education Commission of Virginia, the body which advises the Governor on membership on Boards of Visitors. .
- b. Suzanne announced that the April meeting of the FSVA will be at William and Mary.
- c. The Intellectual Property issue is being discussed by an *ad hoc* committee in an attempt to get agreement between the Faculty Assembly and the Administration.
- d. Kiersten Boyce will attend the next Executive Committee to discuss compliance issues and differences between complaint policies in the faculty, staff and student handbooks.

E. Liaison Committee: Susan Grover

- a. Susan announced that the faculty presentation to the BOV will highlight the Marine Science program. Heather Macdonald and Jonathan Allen will preview this presentation immediately after the Faculty Assembly meeting ends.
- b. Susan reported two items from discussion with the Rector: The Rector approves having the Faculty Assembly President and Vice President act as non-voting faculty representatives on all the BOV committees, but he wants to discuss this with the BOV Executive Committee. The Rector believes that the BOV should limit itself to its two major responsibilities: (1) Hiring, evaluating, and reappointing the President; and (2) exercising fiduciary responsibility for the University.

The President adjourned the meeting with her typical precision at 5:00 pm.