

Faculty Assembly Meeting
28 November 2006

Present: Kulick, Meese, Canuel, Armstrong, Beers, Brown, Cooke, Diaz, Fuchs, Evans, Kennedy, Lee, Leslie, Linneman, Macdonald, Meyers, Sheriff, Smith, White

Absent: Cate-Arries, Mooradian

Others in Attendance: Provost Feiss, Dean Strikwerda

Opening Remarks (Kulick):

The meeting was called to order at 15:30.

Minutes of 24 October 2006 were approved.

Provost's Report:

The Provost anticipates a short budget session with no significant changes to the biennial budget. On campus, the Priorities Committee will begin discussions about next year's budget.

Space committee will review 6-year capital plan.

An ad hoc committee was established to review the W&M website and has submitted a report to the Provost. The report offers several suggestions for improvement to the website. It was noted that the W&M website was visited 11+ million times last year. Unlike other communication venues, our website is not targeted to a particular audience. This requires setting priorities. Tools are now available to evaluate who is viewing our website.

The Provost indicated that our web presence is critical and has to be evaluated on regular basis. Provost intends to create two committees – (1) web advisory committee (stakeholders and admissions, alumni association, etc.) and (2) web design project team (technical group; to be lead by Susan Evans). The Provost anticipates this will be an 18-month project (expected completion in June 2008).

Phased retirement plan is being reviewed by AG's office.

In response to a question, the Provost noted that the Council of Presidents submitted a proposal to GA that addresses faculty and staff salaries, financial aid, and base adequacy.

Sub-committee Reports

Academic Affairs (Diaz): no current business

COPAR (White): no current business

Faculty Affairs (Armstrong): no business

Liaison Committee (Meese): BOV meeting was short. Faculty did not make a presentation to the BOV.

Meese, Kennedy and Kulick met with Anita Poston and other members of the BOV. Members of the BOV were interested in what is on faculty minds. FA members identified faculty salaries as an important issue. The most recent faculty survey was discussed. BOV members expressed interest and are looking forward to seeing the data.

Assessment. Faculty expressed concern about proposals to add new methods of assessment. There was general consensus that faculty already do considerable assessment. Restructuring requires specific goals and does not seem to make sense to have additional regulation. BOV is interested in this topic and how restructuring will be implemented. FA members discussed the importance of educating the BOV about the current assessment methods being used.

The Academic Affairs sub-committee of the BOV identified three priorities:

1. assessment
2. reviewing and analyzing results of faculty survey
3. internationalization – what does this mean to the university?

Other Items from BOV meeting:

1. President announced gift from anonymous donor to support visual arts
2. President explained decision about placement of cross in Wren Chapel
3. A diversity statement (similar to one that was reviewed by FA last year) was adopted by BOV.
4. A decision has been made to demolish the hospital and build a new building for School of Education.

Meese asked whether FA wants to provide input to BOV on specific issues. He noted that the next BOV meeting will likely focus on the Faculty Survey.

Faculty Handbook Revisions

Kulick began by clarifying process we will follow in revisions to Handbook. Described in Faculty Handbook Section H. According to the Handbook, the process will proceed as follows:

- PPC will prepare a recommendation on the initial proposal
- PPC will forward the proposal, with the PPC recommendation to the President of the FA, with a request that the proposal be brought before the Assembly for a vote
- Members of the FA shall have at least 4 weeks to review the proposal before a vote
- Assembly ratification of proposed changes shall require a two-thirds vote of the full Assembly membership.
- Results of the vote will be reported to PPC by the FA President

- If the proposal is not ratified by the FA, the proposal goes back to the PPC with FA recommendations/concerns, and PPC prepares another proposal
- Second PPC proposal goes to FA (following procedures outlined above)
- If the second proposal is not ratified by the FA, it goes back to PPC for further possible revisions
- A third proposal from PPC does not have to return to the FA for a vote

The process within the FA is similar. Proposal introduced to full FA for general discussion. No votes are taken. Referred to appropriate sub-committee. Recommend approval, no approval, revisions. Presented to whole FA for vote.

As has been the tradition, we will view large document in sections. May take vote on individual pieces but they are provisional. Wait until we have document in entirety before final vote can be taken.

Fuchs presented a motion that we endorse the procedures President Kulick outlined. According to these procedures we will refer all matters to sub-committee for their review. Diaz seconded. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Discussion of Section III by Full Faculty Assembly

Colleen Kennedy noted a few places where changes had been made that were not recorded on document FA had before them.

Page 1, line 22: "in their designated fields" was added
line 27: "their subjects" was changed to "course content"

Page 2: line 17: PRC added "when representing that institution"
line 18: PRC added "endeavor to"

Page 3: lines 14-20: this slightly more detailed list of titles was requested by PPC
lines 31-35: the addition of the first sentence was requested by Geoff, following practice; the second sentence was added by PPC

Page 4: line 12 and line 24: both references should be to **III.B.1.b.**

Discussion of proposed changes to Handbook:

Page 1

Line 22. Comment about wording "in their designated fields". Why is "designated" here? Provost responded that institution makes hire in specific area with teaching responsibilities in this area. The Provost stated that faculty are expected to have a conversation with the institution if they decide to have a major shift in fields. Dean Strikwerda noted that we hire people to teach specific areas but research area could change. This is OK unless expertise in designated field becomes out of date and compromises teaching.

A question was asked whether this language was necessary given that its application would be rare. Another member noted that if such a case did arise, this document would provide a guiding principal. The issue of what does it mean to be “designated” was passed along to the Faculty Affairs sub-committee for further discussion.

Line 24. Question about whether “freedom to conduct research” is contingent on “compliance with College policies”?

Line 27. Shift between “course content” and “subject”.

Page 2

Line 9. “evaluation of student’s

Lines 12-13. Does this belong in paragraph about academic freedom? Seems more related to Lines 36-39. Could violate professional ethics in ways that do not relate to academic freedom.

Meese clarified that section relates to “academic freedom and professional ethics”.

Suggested that this sentence be in separate paragraph.

Lines 37-38. Equal opportunity is broader issue and not specific to faculty appointment categories. Prohibitions to discrimination are specified in other sections of Handbook.

Page 5, Line 34. Question about “at least ten years of service”. Provost agreed that this was current policy.

Line 24, II.B.1c should be changed to “III. B. 1b”

Page 3

Last sentence in section “a” is new.

Macdonald recommended that the following be referred to committee:

- (1) It is a common practice when someone is leaving or considering leaving the college? Can resign position here and take leave or take visiting position at other institution.
- 2) Why does Provost have decision making in some cases and FA has input to the decision at others?
- 3) Footnote 6. Only Provost can modify a specific term appointment having title Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor (e.g. “visiting”). Suggest that some information be added to provide clarity about situations when this could occur.

Page 4.

Section beginning Line 12. A question was asked about whether this material was new. It is not new.

Line 21. "Critical" should be moved to earlier in section.

Specified Term Appointments. External supported appointments must be reported? Should clarify whether postdocs and other asterisked are included?

Lines 34-35. Waiver of search process would cover this. Links to III.b.1 allows for waiver in special circumstances.

Extend specified term appointments. 14 calendar dates may not be feasible. Provost has 30 days.

"Unusual circumstances" does this refer to anyone who goes past 5-years or specific conditions of unusual circumstances (marked by asterisks).

Page 6

Line 6. What does "incorporated" mean?

Part-time faculty under phased retirement should be clarified. Should have separate wording for "phased retirement" vs. "part-time faculty".

Emeriti faculty. Will rights and privileges be covered somewhere? Not in Handbook at present. Arts& Sciences By-laws cover this. Also covered in new clearance policy. Will be covered in evaluation of faculty because it is considered a promotion.

Page 7. Lines 16-18. Academic freedom is not U.S. citizen right. Suggest change to "or rights of U.S. citizens"?

Organization Suggestion. A suggestion was made to add a footer so that reader can know where they are in document.

It was noted that indenting does not help the document's readability.

David Armstrong suggested that other points about the sections discussed at the meeting be forwarded to him, chair of Faculty Affairs.

New Business:

Kulick noted December 12th meeting of Faculty Assembly. Armstrong has asked to use this time for Faculty Affairs committee.

Provost noted that another section(s) (3c) may be ready to move to FA by December meeting. This would mean that it could not be moved to committee until January.

EC meeting this Friday will decide timing of next FA meeting.

Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn at 5:05.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth A. Canuel, Secretary