

Faculty Assembly Meeting

Minutes for January 29, 2013

Members Present: Kathleen Bragdon, Bill Cooke, Tracy Cross, Michael Deschenes, David Dessler, Nancy Gray, Rick Gressard, Susan Grover, Trotter Hardy, Will Hausman, Gina Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Gul Ozyegin, Lily Panoussi, Suzanne Raitt, Jeanne Wilson.

Members Absent: Sarah Day, Emmett Duffy, Carl Hershner, Brent Owens, Jennifer Taylor.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:39pm.

Approval of Minutes: minutes for December 11, 2012, were approved.

Provost's Report

Provost Michael Halleran reported on eight items:

1. Charter Day is on Friday, February 8; we are all encouraged all to attend.
2. Sue Gerdelman has been appointed by the Governor to the Board of Visitors to serve out the term (2010-2014) vacated by Laura Flippin's resignation.
3. We should all have received a copy of the Provost's annual report on the College's Employee Background Checks. Bill Cooke asked about the report's use of the terms "sensitive" and "non-sensitive" positions. The Provost replied that "sensitive positions" refer to those which *must* include background checks; this does not include "routine faculty positions."
4. New data on NTE faculty has just come in; the Provost will report on it at the next Faculty Assembly meeting.
5. Two BOV members met with the Governor right before semester break to apprise him of planned Board actions.
6. The State is in full General Assembly mode; there is no reason to believe anything untoward or unusual will take place.
7. The Governor submitted under his Amendments, to be voted on by the House and Senate, an addition of \$200,000 to help W&M and EVMS pursue inquiries into the possibilities of a joint venture, the nature of which is yet to be determined. Jennifer Mellor, Professor of Economics and Director of the Schroeder Center for Health Policy, has agreed to serve as coordinator for the College's exploration of a possible partnership with EVMS, especially in the area of healthcare delivery science, and will be working closely with faculty across campus as well as with colleagues at EVMS.
8. The BOV will be here the first week in February. As many Faculty Assembly members as can should attend the meetings open to us, and including the Faculty Presentation to the Board.

Suzanne Raitt asked what effect there will be on student enrollment if the Board does approve the step increase in tuition. The Provost said it would mean W&M will take another 200 students over the next four years, and funds will be allocated to cover related costs.

Gul Ozyegin asked for clarification regarding the BOV agenda item on the WM/EVMS issue, in particular regarding "Healthcare Delivery Sciences" as the targeted joint educational model: can the model be changed once faculty gets more involved in the discussion? What is the scope of the exploration? Can its

present boundaries be extended? And is it true, as rumor has it, that Law and Business will be more involved than Arts & Sciences? The Provost replied that there is no predetermined idea of what will come out of the continuing exploration of any WM/EVMS joint program, and that anything is still possible. Gul Ozyegin noted that the wording of the proposed exploration is not defined well enough at present to invite wider and more diverse participation, as it seems narrowly defined as “health sciences.” Will Hausman objected to this characterization, saying that the focus on health sciences “delivery” indicates that all parts of the College can be involved.

Will Hausman asked about this year’s budget, in particular about complaints he has heard about the slowness with which budget accounts are loaded and funds are transferred. The Provost referred him to Kate Conley’s office.

Update on Intellectual Property

Trotter Hardy reported that the work on this issue is still in process. He is looking at three main areas: interpreting the policy in those subject areas not yet interpreted and fleshing out several examples to demonstrate the parameters of the issues involved; writing an argument as to why default ownership of scholarly and educational materials should be with faculty; and looking at copyright. There is some disagreement among College officials as to whether copyright resides with College or with faculty. He will gather policies from other universities to verify what practices are already in place. Another possibility is just to leave the policy as is, if his interpretation of existing policy is correct that copyrights reside with faculty. But that right may be challenged in any case, so his recommendation is that it’s best to go forward with revision and/or clarification of the existing policy. Some discussion ensued in which several Assembly members encouraged proceeding with a revised policy so that it may become more relevant to current work materials and productivity. Bill Cooke asked about procedure: who votes on any resulting revised policy? The Provost said it would depend on whether a new iteration would include something different enough to warrant a procedure other than the one that was followed for adoption of the current policy. Susan Grover spoke in favor of a procedure that includes notification and time for review and comment by all concerned members of the College community.

Report on CAIT

Rick Gressard reminded us that the CAIT policy has been posted on the W&M website by Kiersten Boyce, and that comments are due by February 14. Suzanne Raitt asked why the current policy exempts faculty but not staff from possible referral to a mental health professional. The Provost replied that this is an area where there is no clear consensus on whether the rule applies to all by virtue of being an “employee” or should be differentially applied according to kinds of employment. Bill Cooke requested that a reminder on the commentary deadline be sent to the Digest; the Provost agreed. Trotter Hardy noted that the term “threat” is used in the policy, but the policy does not define what constitutes a “threat.” Rick Gressard asked that any further concerns be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee before its meeting on February 12.

Report on EVMS Resolution

Rick Gressard and Suzanne Raitt sent out the following resolution to all Faculty Assembly members:

Be it resolved by the Faculty Assembly that: in order to ensure faculty input into the health service delivery science pilot project with Eastern Virginia Medical

School, responsibility for the development of project-related academic programs will lie with the faculty, and the Faculty Assembly will be provided with regular updates on the development of such programs.

Suzanne Raitt moved we approve the resolution; Gina Hoatson seconded the motion. Discussion: Gul Ozyegin asked if this is actually two motions in one. Parliamentarian Terry Meyers affirmed that it is one motion. Several members voiced concern that the motion offers no clarity on who will provide the “regular updates” to the faculty. Suzanne Raitt said the person providing updates would be Jen Mellor. Susan Grover suggested we specify that the “Chair of the EVMS Committee” will report to Faculty Assembly. Will Hausman suggested that it simply be a Provost’s report. Bill Cooke spoke against the resolution’s suggestion that there’s a person developing the project rather than the College, asking that the current passive sentence construction be replaced by stronger language. He went on to propose that the Provost be asked to respond to specific questions raised by the faculty, that these questions be either a part of the resolution or sent as a letter to the Provost and President for response, to ensure that Faculty Assembly be directly involved in oversight of the process. He read a proposed letter with the questions into the record, as follows:

In view of the President’s recent announcement that we should “develop a pilot program between W&M and EVMS,” the Faculty Assembly is concerned that such a pilot program should proceed under the normal rules for new programs. Consequently, we respectfully request your response to the following questions:

- (1) If the pilot program has any academic component, then the Faculty Assembly believes that it is crucial for it to be approved by the faculty in any affected school before the pilot program is implemented. Will this pilot program be vetted by the faculty in any such affected schools, and will it be vetted before implementation begins?
- (2) If the pilot program uses any significant resources, then will it be discussed at the FUPC as are all other PBRs? Since this program seems to be part of a strategic move, will it also be discussed by the PSC as part of the strategic planning process, before any such pilot program is implemented?
- (3) Good project management procedures dictate that a pilot program should operate for a fixed time and have clear minimum standards that must be met at the end of that time in order for the program to be continued or upgraded to a permanent program. Will these practices be followed for the proposed pilot project?

The Provost agreed to give a written response to these and any new questions. He also assured the Faculty Assembly that any development of academic programs must involve the faculty. Will Hausman asserted that there is no need for a Faculty Assembly resolution, since the fact that this discussion will be part of the minutes should suffice. Susan Grover suggested that we may need the issue to be more visible to the faculty as a whole. After some discussion, the original motion was withdrawn. Bill Cooke moved that Faculty Assembly submit to the Provost the proposed letter requesting responses to its stated questions. Susan Grover seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Report on Progress of the Faculty Survey

Rick Gressard reported that the initial draft has been entered into Qualtrix, final edits are being done, a trial run will go forward to Faculty Assembly members to make sure all

aspects of the Survey function well, and once corrections have been made the Survey will be sent to the faculty as a whole. Gul Ozyegin asked how long the faculty will have to return survey responses. Rick Gressard responded that the faculty will have one and a half weeks to respond after receiving the Survey, and that we should have it back by spring break.

Legislative Update

Rick Gressard reported that early in January he attended Legislative Day in Richmond and, along with other representatives from Virginia universities, spoke to legislators about issues of concern to faculty: the bill on faculty voting representation on Boards of Visitors (which subsequently did not pass), including issues of how Board appointments are made and non-voting faculty members on Boards; faculty members' ability to switch to VRS (Virginia Retirement System) if desired; advocacy for a 50% tuition waiver for faculty members' dependents. Some discussion by the Faculty Assembly ensued regarding the last item, with various members voicing their concerns about the benefits and/or costs of such a measure, and its focus on faculty rather than faculty and staff.

Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs:

Tracy Cross reported that work continues on the Faculty Survey. This committee is also working on a recommendation for a new retirement policy, and is currently gathering information from other schools. He will report on the data when he has it, and the Committee will draft a recommendation.

B. Academic Affairs:

No report.

C. COPAR:

Bill Cooke reported that COPAR/FUPC is just beginning its work for the semester. At COPAR's next meeting, Sam Jones will give a report on the breakdown of all funding sources and allocations.

D. Executive/Liaison:

BOV Presentation:

Suzanne Raitt and Sharon Zuber will present to Board on "Teaching Writing at William and Mary." There will be a run-through after meeting; please stay if you can and offer feedback.

Old Business

None.

New Business

Update: Annual Reports to Faculty Assembly from Governing and College Committees

Rick Gressard, Suzanne Raitt, and Nancy Gray will meet this Thursday (January 31) to discuss the best way to gather and schedule these reports. This action is based on Suzanne Raitt's research of Faculty Assembly policy on annual reporting from College committees, and the need to ensure that such reporting takes place.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02pm.