

Faculty Assembly Meeting
March 23, 2010
Approved April 27, 2010

Present: Debbie Bebout, Katie Bragdon, Bruce Campbell, Alan Fuchs, Will Hausman, Steve Kuehl, Lisa Landino, John Lee, Rick Gressard, Alan Meese, Leisa Meyer, Terry Meyers, Todd Mooradian, Adam Potkay, Kate Slevin, Barbette Spaeth, Gene Tracy, Tom White

Absent: Todd Averett, Mike Di Paola, Carl Hershner, Katherine Kulick,
Others in Attendance: Provost Halleran,

Gene Tracy called the meeting to order at 15:30

President Gene Tracy reminded the Assembly of a special meeting next Tuesday, March 30 at 3:30 in the York Room of the Sadler Center.

Minutes of February 23 were approved as corrected.

Provost Report

The discussion on the initial draft of the “White Paper” has begun. The budget has turned out better than expected. A furlough day still exists and may be accommodated by paying the equivalent amount to Richmond to cover that day. Neither additional cuts to base budget occurred nor language limiting tuition increases are a part of the budget. There is a 10 million dollar cut out there for FY12 from higher Ed statewide. A required 8.5% from 10.4% and required contribution toward retirement of 5% for new employees hired effective July 1, 2010. He also reported that the incoming class would remain at 1400 for the upcoming year.

Faculty Affairs Committee

Leisa reported that a handbook language change on the issue on another category of non-tenure eligible faculty would be considered during the next committee meeting. This issue was raised initially raised by the Law School faculty. The Business School faculty wants the current language in the faculty handbook to remain in place and be enforced, since the current practice is appointing individuals to non-tenure eligible positions without consulting with the faculty. Concerns over the ratio of non-tenure eligible to tenure eligible faculty persist. A discussion about the current Business School practice of not seeking faculty approval for non-tenure eligible positions ensued. If a third category is created, all units will have the option to access such positions if they are appropriate to meet the unit’s needs.

The issue of anti-discrimination language was discussed. Leisa reminded the Assembly that this issue has been on the table since last year. Our work with the President to incorporate suggested language to include gender, gender identity, sex, and sexual orientation as protected categories. The state attorney general issued a position that would prohibit the President from issuing a broad interpretation to include those additional categories of individuals being protected. The President has communicated a long-term plan to attack the attorney general’s position and find a solution that would protect all members of the William & Mary community. Leisa expressed concern that absent an interpretation by President Reveley, individuals in those categories continue not to be protected. She urged the president to issue an interpretation sooner rather than later. Gene Tracy informed the Assembly that over spring break the Executive Committee of the Assembly drafted, approved the following resolution, and sent it to the president on this issue.

The Faculty Assembly of the College of William and Mary wishes to express its strong endorsement of the statement by President Reveley,

released on Tuesday, March 9, concerning the College's non-discrimination policies. We are deeply troubled by the recent attempt of the Attorney General to weaken these policies, particularly with regard to sexual orientation. As they relate to the work of the faculty, non-discrimination policies flow from the fundamental principle of merit-based judgment that informs everything we do. This principle governs how we teach, how we hire and promote, how we conduct our research and scholarship, and how we evaluate one another's contributions to the College and the wider community. We are committed to the ideal that these judgments must always be based upon the merits of the case, and they must reflect our integrity as a community of teachers and scholars. We applaud Governor McDonnell's recent Executive Directive, which we understand, commits his Administration to safeguarding similar merit-based principles in the Commonwealth's policies.

Without a clear commitment to non-discrimination, and a merit-based ethos where individuals are evaluated on their work and accomplishments but no other personal characteristics, the College has no plausible claim to being a leader among American institutions of higher education. It would erode our ability to attract the very best faculty, staff and students. We call upon the Attorney General to reconsider his opinion, and to demonstrate the leadership needed to ensure Virginia's institutions of higher education remain among the best in the nation.

President Reveley responded with an outline of his plan of action, which included: (1) finish a legal memorandum that deals systematically with all the issues raised by the Attorney General, thus ensuring that our understanding of the law, when it differs from his (as it does in material respects), is well supported and easily explained; (2) identify all the "anti discrimination" provisions in various documents at W&M (there are several, with no apparent coordination among them); (3) draft a proposed anti-discrimination policy that, in one place, sets out W&M's position in all its facets (including gender writ large), with a view towards having one definitive statement on the matter; (4) consult the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee about this proposed policy; and (5) take the resulting product to the BOV for its consideration and approval.

The assembly certainly can urge the President to expedite his actions in this case. A question was raised whether the full Assembly should adopt and endorse the Executive Committee's resolution. Such an action may encourage the President to take more immediate action. A discussion ensued about the merits of such an action. A motion was made that the Assembly welcome and embrace the President's five- point plan to include all members of our community and we look forward to working with you to expedite this process. The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Committee

The new international advisory committee membership is almost in place. Each unit was given the option of selecting its representative. A&S elections ended in a tie for one position. A runoff election will occur in the near future.

Challenge Four sub-committee is currently discussing the appropriate peer group for the purpose for determining appropriate compensation. We should keep this on our radar

End of career bump has been tabled upon the President's advice. VRS has requested information from the College concerning those who have retired in the past five years.

Campus Assessment Intervention Team is required by statute. Committee membership was specified in the statute. Due process is a real concern. Concerns were raised about the process itself and its implications for violations of our handbook protections. The team has been meeting and we have a faculty rep on it. The President promised that the Assembly would have the ability to review the committee's procedures once established.

The issue of the President's contract was also raised in the meeting. He expressed interest in a five-year extension. A&S has arranged a conversation with representative BOV members this Thursday evening. A question was raised as to why A&S has arranged for a meeting. Should each unit arrange for its own meeting? It was explained that it is open to all faculty, but being hosted by A&S. Topics that will be addressed include the renewal of the President's contract and the non-discrimination language.

Liaison Committee

The BOV has requested a conversation about the Faculty Survey during the BOV meeting in April. Kate Slevin distributed her best attempt to outline five areas of the survey. In each section she attempted to synthesize the faculty's input of each section. She then suggested that Assembly members who summarized each section be the "experts" in each section. Kate aligned each of the grand challenges of the Strategic Plan with each section of the survey. She intends to provide an overview and remind the BOV of the faculty participation as well as priorities for the future.

There was a suggestion that there may be too much detail concerning the dissatisfaction section, particularly comparing male and female dissatisfaction levels. Perhaps the gender disparity issues could be grouped and summarized. Is there a gender "problem"? Perhaps these are area issues and not gender issues. For example, the Business school faculty expressed greater dissatisfaction than other units. It was agreed that Kate and Todd would condense this section and highlight the critical points in this area. We should define the collective story (message) we want the BOV to take away from the "conversation". Faculty priorities for the future should be a powerful component of our message and may need more elaboration.

FUCP

There has been ongoing discussion about the respective roles of FUPC and COPAR and the apparent overlaps. Discussions will ensue to explore combining COPAR and FUPC into one committee.

We have been informed by the Provost of the decision to keep the incoming freshman class at 1400. However, a sub-committee of the FUPC, along with several administrators, has been formed to study the impact of increasing the size of future classes by 50 students. This group will become a Presidential Task Force and has until October to report findings to the president.

The proposal to tying the athletic fee to financial aid has been discussed. Essentially, it was a plan to reduce the athletic fee. In discussions with President Reveley, he noted a campaign to raise 100 million dollar endowment to fund athletic scholarship, thus reducing the need for a fee.

Strategic Planning

Gene Tracy distributed relevant Challenge One documents. The BOV will be asked to endorse the action steps bulleted. The framing document attempts to explain the action steps.

New Business

The Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration brought two resolutions proposed by American Studies to the Assembly. The resolutions refer to complicated issues concerning salaries. The appropriate action may be to refer this to COPAR since it involves compensation. A motion to refer these to COPAR passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 17:20

Respectfully submitted,

Mike DiPaola
Secretary, Faculty Assembly