

Faculty Assembly Meeting

Minutes for April 24, 2012

Present: Todd Averett, Debbie Bebout, Tracy L. Cross, Kathleen Bragdon, Michael Deschenes, Emmett Duffy, Nancy Gray, Rick Gressard, Susan Grover, Trotter Hardy, Will Hausman, Carl Hershner, Gina L. Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Alan Meese, Terry Meyers, Todd Mooradian, Gul Ozyegin, J.C. Poutsma, Suzanne Raitt, Jenny Taylor

Others in Attendance: Jennifer Bateman, Clay Clemens, Earl Granger, Michael Halleran, Dennis Manos, Sean Pieri, Renell Wynn

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm by Todd Mooradian.

1. Approval of the March 27, 2012 minutes. The draft minutes were approved.

2. Update on development (Sean Pieri, Vice President for University Development). Vice President Pieri opened by introducing members of his team who were in attendance (Jennifer Bateman, Earl Granger, Renell Wynn) and stressed how committed Development staff are to working closely with faculty. One of his main aims is to continue to improve communication between his staff and faculty, and past collaborations and encounters have shaped development strategy in very useful ways.

He noted that the campaign completed a feasibility study and identified priorities and messaging by July 2011, and subsequently moved into the leadership phase. One priority is strengthening ties with alumni groups and Development staff have been travelling across the country, setting up and attending events. The campaign steering committee will hold its first meeting within a week.

The current year is shaping up to be one of William & Mary's best fundraising years ever, including money for programs, centers, facilities, faculty support and facilities renovation (the Brafferton renovation, for example, will be funded through a public/private partnership with the state committing matching funds). Other gifts include targeted funds and estate gifts to support a number of endowed professorships and a major gift to the Mason School of Business and to Kinesiology, including some money for altitude research. Faculty have played a major role in securing many of these gifts.

Vice President Pieri emphasized that the campaign now has considerable momentum and asked faculty to share the good news and to continue to keep Development updated with names of prospects, contacts, and events. Specifically, when faculty are on professional trips, Development is eager to know where they are going, so that they can either come along or can set up development visits for faculty.

Vice President Pieri stressed that he is eager to send his staff into individual departments to meet faculty and learn more about what they do. Gina Hoatson asked for clarification about the categories of scholarship that have been identified as development priorities. These include need-based scholarships; merit-based scholarships (for example the Murray Scholars program, now

known as the 1693 Scholars, which is slated for expansion); graduate stipends; and athletic scholarships.

J.C Poutsma asked how best we can communicate with potential donors that we continue to strengthen our commitment to research: we are no longer the teaching college some alumni might remember. Vice President Pieri noted that William & Mary alumni strongly value the liberal arts, engaged learning, preparation to become leaders, and most of all their relationships with their individual professors. The notion of a “culture of inquiry” at William & Mary has been tested with alumni focus groups and there is general understanding that the intellectual environment at William & Mary is dynamic and forward-looking – as it needs to be in order for the college to remain competitive and attract the best faculty.

J.C Poutsma noted that the proposed new curriculum depends in large part on the establishment of a new teaching center and asked if that is a specific priority for Development. Vice President Pieri answered that although it is not a specific focus, there is a great deal of flexibility in the campaign goals to make sure that particular needs can be accommodated as they evolve. Todd Mooradian thanked Vice President Pieri for all his hard work and especially for his visits to Faculty Assembly this year and his continued efforts to reach out to faculty.

3. Discussion of report from the Presidential Honor System Advisory Committee [attached] (Clay Clemens). The committee was convened in Fall 2010 and proceeded with a very thorough and substantial investigation of the Honors code. Committee members spent a year soliciting feedback from stakeholders across campus, and came to the conclusion that a major restructuring of the code is needed. If their report is adopted, this would occur next year. The committee found that while the code is generally perceived as serving its purpose, there is ambivalence and confusion, and some objections to specific provisions and procedures.

Recommended changes are described in detail in the report. Clay Clemens mentioned a few specifically, including breaking out categories of infraction to make them more precise; changing the Honor code to include only academic infractions for undergraduates (other types would be covered by the Student Code of Conduct); spelling out the fact that faculty can take pre-emptive measures to minimize infractions (for example, proctoring exams, asking students to submit work to plagiarism websites, restricting internet access during exams, etc). The major recommended change to enforcement practices is allowing minor infractions to be resolved expeditiously through mutual consent by grade sanctions and probation without a full Council hearing. The proposed overhaul of the code would include a determination of what sanctions are suitable for different kinds of infractions. The committee understands that currently, to avoid lengthy proceedings, faculty do in practice handle infractions without reporting them to the Honor Council. The recommended change is an attempt to retain this flexibility but to ensure that such cases are handled in a consistent way, while taking advantage of the educational possibilities offered to the student by an investigation and sanction. Cases that are handled in this way would be reported to the Honor Council and the Student Affairs Office but would not require a hearing. Terry Meyers asked if a violation handled in this way would appear on the student’s transcript and Clay Clemens said how that will be done is still to be determined. He noted that a second offense would automatically trigger a full hearing and would be subject to a more severe sentence. This modified procedure is intended to encourage faculty to make use of the Honor Code even for minor infractions, without having to face (or put the student through) a

lengthy hearing at which the option of suspension for the College is a possibility. The committee felt that the severity of this sanction might be discouraging some faculty from reporting minor infractions. Overall, the aim was to codify infractions more clearly (including protections for reporting faculty, and giving faculty the right to know the outcome of an accusation), and to standardize sanctions to ensure that they were commensurate with the infraction and more consistent from case to case.

Clay Clemens reported that the expedited resolution option was not popular with some members of the Undergraduate Honor Council, but the Council also recognizes that it is often difficult to put together panels for long hearings. The committee also recommended the institution of a permanent oversight committee for the Honor system so that review could be ongoing and procedural changes could be made quickly and easily. Undergraduates disagree over the designation of a student governing body for their Honor Council: the committee recommended that undergraduate members of the Student Assembly Senate should be the governing body of the Undergraduate Council (with jurisdiction over elections to the Council and amendments).

Gina Hoatson asked if the committee had determined a template for infractions and penalties, and Clay Clemens said that would be done by the oversight committee next year, if the report is approved. There will be an open forum for faculty and student input. Dennis Manos pointed out that for graduate (and some undergraduate students) some areas of research ethics are federally regulated, and any recommendations will need to take account of that.

Clay Clemens explained that currently the governing body of each Council (undergraduate and graduate) has to approve any amendment to the Code before it can be adopted. An undergraduate referendum is mandated in the Honor Council bylaws, although these have not been very successful in the past. Whether that process will be followed for the content of this report remains to be seen. As an alternative, the President and Board of Visitors could approve the report without going through student governing bodies. Gul Ozyegin asked about student reaction to the report and Clay Clemens reported that there has not been much reaction. Interest in the issue was higher a few years ago. Debbie Bebout noted that she was impressed with the report and its recommendations and hoped that the changes will encourage faculty to embrace the Honor Code more thoroughly as an important aspect of campus culture.

Alan Meese asked why the committee recommended restricting Honor Council jurisdiction to academic infractions only for undergraduates and not for graduate students, noting that the development of the revised Code in 1997 was intended to integrate research operations across the campus student community. Clay Clemens said that the graduate students on the committee did not support distinguishing between academic and non-academic infractions, which is why two distinct systems are recommended – common practice at other universities. Susan Grover thanked Clay Clemens and his committee for their work and said she would send Clemens a list of detailed comments. It was noted that although eighty percent of students claim to support the Honor system, they are very reluctant to turn one another in.

Gina Hoatson asked if there is anywhere currently where cases and outcomes are documented. Clay Clemens said that the annual report is posted on the Honor Council website, but it is brief and his committee is recommending that a much more detailed annual report be posted so that faculty and students have a clearer idea of past procedures and outcomes. Dennis Manos asked if

there were concerns about loss of anonymity and Clemens said steps would be taken to ensure total confidentiality, and that the University of Virginia, which publishes detailed reports, has had no problem. In any case, cases would in many cases be reported on close to a year after they occurred. Todd Mooradian thanked Clemens for his hard work and for making the time to visit the Assembly. Clemens invited feedback on the report from all members of Assembly.

4. Provost's Report. The Provost opened by reminding members of the Assembly about the first William & Mary Lecture, to be given that evening by John Swaddle. He reported that the final version of the new handbook language governing non-tenure-eligible faculty had been forwarded to the Board of Visitors for their approval at the upcoming meeting. The State Assembly has approved a budget which is currently under review by the Governor. There is good news for William & Mary on the capital side: funds are included for the Tyler renovation, and ISC 3. The new Arts Complex is the next priority. There is a state-mandated bonus of 3% for all state employees (assuming enough surplus revenue) and funds for a 2% base salary increase for faculty and 1% for staff for FY13. In the final version of the budget – unlike in previous versions – there are no restrictions on the use of tuition money for financial aid. Mandated additional costs for the College include an increase in the employer's contribution to the Virginia Retirement System, the loss of the Eminent Scholars Fund, an increase in the employer's contribution to the cost of health insurance. These additional costs mitigate the effects of the Governor's reinvestment in higher education. It was noted that the Governor recently sent a letter to state university presidents urging them to hold tuition raises to inflation.

Will Hausman voiced concern that Sam Jones's letter to the BOV included in the agenda for the upcoming meeting included information about the bonus but said nothing about salary raises, and the Provost confirmed that salary letters will be sent out soon with no increases. A final decision on faculty salaries will likely be postponed until June. Members of the Assembly expressed frustration that the Assembly spent the year working on efficiencies and reallocation on the understanding that the salary raises included in the Six Year Plan would come to fruition, and it now seems that in spite of our efforts, the raises may not be forthcoming. The Provost noted that it is possible the BOV will postpone setting a budget as other Boards have around the state, but said that if they pass the budget as proposed all employees will receive the 3% bonus this year (funded 30% by the state and 70% by the College), and that reallocation and other savings will release enough money for the equivalent of an additional 2% raise in base salaries for faculty, and 1% for staff. The state budget for FY14 includes a 2% base increase for state employees. Reallocation will yield enough money to annualize the 3% bonus to base in FY14. J.C Poutsma noted that the Six Year Plan included a 5% increase in base faculty salaries for FY13 and asked what had changed. The Provost explained that in fact, with the bonus and an additional 2% increase, faculty would see a 5% increase in FY13. But since the College has (unexpectedly) to fund most of the bonus, there will be no money for all the increase to be added to base salaries in that year. The political climate has shifted since the BOV endorsed the expenditure side of the Six Year Plan in September 2011 and aggressive tuition raises are now much more controversial. But the Provost assured the Assembly that the Six Year Plan has not been abandoned, and that the work faculty has done in realizing cost savings will release funds for raises in both FY13 and FY14. In addition, the BOV would see that faculty are serious about innovation. Todd Averett noted that faculty morale is slipping lower and lower and that feeling that our efforts have not yielded what we were promised this year is going to make the problem worse. The Provost advised members of the Assembly to be honest with the BOV about their disappointment and

frustration at the upcoming meeting since there is a range of opinion on the BOV about how to proceed. Will Hausman noted that each year our salaries fall further and further behind our peer group and asked how this will affect our plan to raise salaries to the sixtieth percentile of our peer group. Increasing faculty pay was the top priority in the Six Year Plan and now others seem to have overtaken it. The Provost disputed this, noting that the single largest item in the budget is compensation, including annualizing last year's raises. J.C. Poutsma asked what we will be asked to do next year to realize even more cost savings and the Provost said he did not anticipate another year like this one, although there could be up to five new members appointed to the BOV this summer and they will affect the tenor of the Board.

Todd Mooradian thanked members of the Assembly for their help in crafting a statement about our work for the year to be passed out to the BOV on Thursday as part of the faculty presentation, and said he was still taking suggestions.

5. New business: Proposal for Part-Time Employee Tuition Waiver (from the Professionals and Professional Faculty Assembly) [circulated before the meeting; attached] Todd Mooradian noted that we had already seen this proposal but had not discussed it in detail. During a brief discussion, Scott McCoy asked why the spousal benefit includes only the option of auditing. It was explained that tuition waivers for dependents have to be fully funded, and no funds are available. The Provost assured J.C. Poutsma that the proposal has no financial implications: the additional students will simply be absorbed into courses, and that they would enroll after full-time students. The Assembly voted unanimously to support the proposal.

6. Old Business: No old business.

7. Date of next meeting: the next meeting is on Tuesday 8 May, 3.30-5. Todd Mooradian noted that this is the annual meeting to which new members who are joining the Assembly in the fall are invited. At this meeting, standing committees and officers are elected. There is one nomination on the floor for Vice-President, and Todd Mooradian called for additional nominations for that position and for Secretary. He will contact members of the Assembly to give him their preferences for standing committees and the proposed slate will be brought to the annual meeting. It was asked whether continuing members have precedence in getting their first choices, and it was noted that this is the decision of the President and Vice-President. The agenda for the annual meeting will include elections, and a report from the Athletic Policy Advisory Committee. The recent report received by the Assembly from the Faculty Compensation Board has been referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Assembly and will be considered in the fall. Todd Mooradian closed the meeting by exhorting members of the Assembly to attend the upcoming BOV meeting so that we have representation at every session.

8. The meeting adjourned at 5.30.