

Members present: Christopher Abelt, David Armstrong, Deborah Bebout James Beers, Elizabeth Canuel, Clay Clemens, Robert Diaz, Alan Fuchs, Beatrice Guenther, Nancy Gray, Lu Ann Homza, Katherine Kulick, David Leslie, Tom Linneman, Alan Meese. Robert Orwoll, Ann Reed, Ron Rosenberg, Wanda Wallace.

Ex-officio member present: Robert Archibald

Members absent: Chandos Brown, Thomas White

Others: Geoff Feiss, Carl Strikwerda, David Aday

I. Call to order. President Abelt called the meeting to order at 3:32 P.M.

II. Approval of Minutes. The minutes for the meeting of 22 March 2005 were approved unanimously following a minor change.

III. Announcements. Abelt announced that Assembly members who are continuing should notify Jim Beers of their sub-committee preferences before May 6th. Elections for the officers of the Assembly will be held at the May meeting. A reception will follow the May meeting

IV. Provost's Report.

Budget Updates

Provost Feiss announced that the BOV approved the College's budget at its April meeting. This budget includes salary increases of 6% for faculty and 4% for administrative faculty. Overall, tuition and fees will rise by 9.6% for in-state and 3.7% for out-of-state students. The fee increases address costs associated with debt service to the food service, recreation center, and the Equipment Trust Fund.

Salary letters will be mailed to faculty on May 10th. A new policy was established last year whereby salary letters, but not contract letters, will be distributed. The letters will inform faculty/administrators of their salaries effective November 25th.

Plans for the restructuring are moving forward. The restructuring plans give new responsibilities to SCHEV and IPAC has held four meetings in recent weeks. The Provost is optimistic that things are moving in right direction.

The Provost noted that Jim Beers, incoming FA President, will be included in discussions related to the restructuring effort this summer. Beers and members of the Executive Committee will meet with Provost as needed throughout the summer. A full report of these discussions will be made to the Assembly at its first meeting of the Fall semester.

Updates on Searches:

The search for new Registrar has slowed. With the departure of Karen Cottrell (Associate Provost for Admission and Enrollment Management), and the new reporting requirements added as part of the restructuring effort, the Provost wishes to restructure how the Registrar reports and wants s/he to report directly to him. The Provost is interviewing finalists for the position this week.

There will also be a search for the Director of the Reeves Center in the Fall semester. An interim director will be named in July but a full search will begin in the Fall. The search will be an internal search.

A search to replace Karen Cottrell (Associate Provost for Admission and Enrollment Management) will begin in the Fall. This will be an important position under the new restructuring. An advertisement has been prepared. The Provost will consult with the EC prior to beginning the search.

Upcoming Issues:

The Provost would like the Assembly to review the Faculty Handbook in the upcoming year. New policies, and amendments to existing policies, have been made in recent years. Revisions to the Handbook should incorporate these changes, remove redundancies, repaginate the document, and improve its organization. The Provost noted that the Handbook on record is currently posted on the Provost's website.

Bebout noted that there may be other issues to address in the revisions to the Handbook (e.g., how leave is handled in promotion decisions).

Clemens noted that other documents (e.g., catalog) may also need updating.

Clemens asked the Provost to clarify the role of transfer students in the restructuring plan. The Provost responded that The College must have a plan for ways in which we are handling transfer students. He noted that transfer students are likely to be more successful if we improve the ways in which they are recruited and advised. To improve their success rate, transfer students should be treated as first-year students rather than juniors. The Provost will be examining issues related to transfer students carefully in upcoming months.

Archibald noted the BOV passed the amendments to the Assembly's By-laws at its April meeting.

V. Report on SACS Re-accreditation (Aday).

Aday opened his presentation by noting that there is a link to the SACS review on the W&M Website.

Aday outlined the committees and their responsibilities during the re-accreditation process. The goal was not to create new committees but to use existing committees when possible. As a result, a minimal number of operating committees have been created with members that can cover various constituencies.

Compliance Team. The re-accreditation process has been changed and no longer requires a self-study. Instead, the goal is to use standards of practice. The College will attest to the things that it does and will provide evidence that supports that it is in compliance.

Institutional Effectiveness Team. This committee must provide evidence we can do integrated planning, evaluation and implementation. SACS wants us to operate in a way that will lead to continuous improvement. This team will reconnect with strategic plans of the past.

Student Learning. This is usually assessed through program reviews, etc. Generally, the focus has been on curriculum and faculty. SACS now wants us to exam student learning beyond grading. This will encourage an examination of student work outside specific course offerings/grading.

SACS is encouraging institutions to push beyond their present levels. This will involve more individual testing, competency, etc.

Aday has visited other sites, participating in their reviews, in order to gain insights valuable to The College's re-accreditation.

Components to the Review Process:

1. Compliance Review – twelve core requirements, 60 standards, 6 federal mandates

Failure of any core requirement results in no re-accreditation.

Standards are best practice statements.

Written narratives to document compliance on 11/12 requirements, 40/60 standards, mandates are redundant with standards,

Aday recommends FA members go to SACS website to review documentation. Formatting and editing are not needed at this time.

The College's Compliance Review is due on September 14th. The deliverable will be a set of compact disks that are self-contained as well as hard-copy.

External Review: November 7-11th: External Review. Committee may write recommendations. Once we get their comments, we can write focused responses. Responses due March 14th.

2. *Quality Enhancement Plan*. Due in March 14th. Must identify plan for something we want to do that will improve learning on the campus. White paper has been developed and is posted at SACS website. Comments are invited. Aday noted that it is important that there is engagement/involvement in this effort across the campus.

3. *On-site Visit (April 2006)*. 2-day visit.

Day-1 Review any concerns raised by the external reviewing team.

Day-2. QEP will be considered. Team will meet with faculty, students, administrators, etc about proposed QEP. Need active student engagement.

Discussion

Diaz asked a question about the implications for graduate education? Aday responded that the re-accreditation is a work in progress. All grad programs have PIES that include student learning.

Meese asked whether the QEP needs to be something new we develop for this effort. Aday responded that it is key that we demonstrate that the idea grew out of a self-evaluation process. We should work on something that is sufficiently generic that it cuts across several areas. Aday noted the role of integrity in the process. The review is no longer an audit process. If university states it is in compliance, SACS will trust their assessment. It was noted that one university was not re-accredited because they plagiarized another university's QEP.

Rosenberg asked whether SACS will look at what we said we would do in our last review. Aday gave the example of a situation in which points were lost for institutional effectiveness in a previous review. If there was a problem with institutional effectiveness in a prior review, SACS will look at how the institution proposed to address the issue in its last review and whether the strategy has been effective.

Dean Strickwerda asked whether the evaluators assume a certain level of performance. Aday responded that SACS will ask the institution for examples of ways in which the institution has changed something to make it better than it was before.

V. University Book Store Committee (Linneman). A document was distributed to Assembly members outlining the Committee's concerns about the Bookstore.

1. Textbook Ordering – There is a conflict between faculty wanting to place orders as late as possible and the students/bookstore that want to know well in-advance so that used books can be obtained. A copy of the bookstore's idealized schedule was included on document distributed by Linneman. Suggested improvements were also included on the document.

Discussion

Guenther noted that problems with Spring semester ordering are greater than for Fall semester.

Orwoll asked whether the orders match requests. Homza responded that orders are based on past sales, not an order for a specific semester.

Gray mentioned the need for better communication between faculty and bookstore.

The Provost agreed that dialogue is essential. Legislation in General Assembly will be implemented on July 1st. Need to be attentive to addressing this in the future. Otherwise, we could end up with mandates.

2. Other concerns of committee (Linneman) – store is overwhelmed with merchandise.

Armstrong noted that textbooks are difficult to find. Faculty may want to browse textbooks. The Bookstore should consider ways of making the textbooks more accessible.

VI. Faculty Affairs Sub-committee (Bebout).

The Committee presented the process it went through in their consideration of the issue of faculty requiring their books in courses they teach. A draft resolution was presented to the Assembly for discussion.

Discussion

Orwoll noted that the focus has been on textbooks and questioned whether the resolution be expanded to other scholarly materials that produce royalties. Armstrong responded that different procedures are in-place for equipment purchases, etc. These involve purchases that institution makes, rather than purchases made by students. The Provost added that if equipment is purchased by sole source, it needs to go through procedures that ultimately require BOV approval.

Homza suggested that the wording be change to “charities”.

Bebout emphasized the community awareness measures. The College wants to avoid mandates

A vote was called and the following amended resolution, incorporating the wording change suggested by Homza, was approved.

The Faculty Assembly applauds the scholarly endeavors of the Faculty, including the publication of books and other materials suitable for use in the classroom.

The Assembly expects that faculty will assign texts and other classroom materials that are, within their professional judgment, pedagogically sound and relevant to the course.

The Assembly encourages faculty to be alert to the potential for conflict of interest when assigning class materials from which a faculty member derives royalties.

In light of these principles, faculty who choose to assign materials from which they incidentally derive royalties should:

- Consider directing the proceeds of such assignments to William and Mary students to the College’s annual fund, to support student financial aid or to other non-controversial charities;
- Consider obtaining objective assurance that the assignment of the material in question is pedagogically sound. Such assurance can include peer reviews concluding that the material is suitable for classroom use and/or assignment of the material in comparable courses at other colleges or universities. It is appropriate for these types of assurances to be obtained when textbook practices are questioned.

The Provost noted that one of the benefits of this resolution is that if there is abuse, this document gives leverage to the administration (Chairs/Deans).

VII. Academic Affairs (Reed). Reed noted that the Committee’s report is interim and that the Committee does not feel it has a clear charge. Materials were distributed for review and will be discussed at the May meeting.

VIII. New Business

Beers reminded FA members who are continuing in their terms to get back to him about preferences for committee assignments.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by E.A. Canuel, Faculty Assembly Secretary.