



# WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

## **Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes April 26, 2022 3:30 pm**

*Officers Present:* Mark Brush (President), John Gilmour (Vice President), Harmony Dalgleish (Secretary)

*Other Members Present:* Lisa Landino, Anne Rasmussen, Josh Burk, Tonya Boone, Marc Sher, Michelle Lelièvre, John Eisele, Marjy Friedrichs, Adam Gershowitz, Rebecca Green, Evgenia Smirni, K. Scott Swan, Brett Wilson, Christy Porter

*Members Absent:* Nicole Santiago, Tom Ward (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors), Lindy Johnson, Denise Johnson

*Others in Attendance:* Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Jacob Long, Amy Sebring, David Armstrong, Suzanne Hagedorn, Christopher Lee, Lisa Nickel

1. Call to Order –  
President Brush called the meeting to order at 3:32.
2. Approval of the minutes for the February and March meetings.  
Sher moved to approve the minutes and Gilmour seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Provost's remarks  
Provost Agouris noted that she attended a reception for those with endowed professorship, which was wonderful and the first of its kind.

The Provost also commented on early drafts of the four white papers that Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Assembly has produced. She thinks they are very useful for internal discussion. The SSRL one brought up many points that were discussed when the report came out but then everyone was derailed by COVID. The Provost expects that the new Vice-Provost will be a very strong link to work with the Faculty Assembly on these topics. She expressed her appreciation for the work that goes into these documents.

The Provost then opened the floor to questions.

President Brush: The phased transition program has been widely distributed now. Have you had anyone asking about it yet?

Provost Agouris: Not yet, but we pointed everyone to their respective Dean's office.

Rasmussen: I was curious about the reception you mention, how many donors were there?

Provost Agouris: I do not have an exact number, University Advancement keeps track of these numbers, but there were not as many donors as there were faculty. The donors that were there were very excited and impressed. I think we have a lot more to learn from these interactions.

Swan and Rasmussen agreed with the Provost's description and concurred it was a very nice event.

Lelièvre: We're coming to the hiring season. And we've discussed in this meeting before about collecting data on our process. Do we have any numbers on how many faculty of color we have hired this season?

Provost Agouris: I don't have data yet. But I've heard anecdotally that we have had some successes. I will be back in the fall when we have things more solidified to share this information with you.

Gilmour: I'm happy with the phased retirement plan, but I'm not pleased with how the Faculty Assembly was consulted in this process. The executive committee received the *final* draft. This isn't keeping in the spirit of the degree of consultation that is supposed to occur with Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly is supposed to provide advice to the Provost and the President. But we cannot do that if we are not included until the tail end of the process.

Provost Agouris: This is something we have discussed before and I understand where you are coming from. There are complicating factors in this particular case. There simply wasn't enough time to create this opportunity for this year. It started off not as a shared governance issue. In this sense it would be a simple thing to do. It presented difficulties in terms of compensation and benefits. It took a significant effort to create this. There will still be plenty of time for change and adjustments. If this was a mandatory program, I would agree with you that that should not be done without consultation. But it is not mandatory.

Gilmour: I think it would have been possible to include the Faculty Assembly earlier. But you chose to wait to include us at the end.

Provost Agouris: What do you object to in the policy?

Gilmour: I am not objecting to the policy but to the process.

Provost Agouris: I understand. But if the policy has nothing to object to why be concerned about the process?

Lelièvre: The concern is that it sets a precedent. You mention that this was crucial to get it done. Why did it have to get done this year?

Provost Agouris: People were asking for the policy and there were several complications to create the process. The approach was to put something out there for those who were asking for this.

Swan: I'd like to offer an analogous process. The Faculty Affairs Committee was putting together these position papers and we wanted to get them out as soon as possible. We wanted to get them out there and we felt like the outcomes were truthful. The Administration seemed unhappy about the process.

Provost Agouris: Please think of us as individuals doing our jobs, not just a monolithic Administration. I think I speak for myself and not for everyone. The reaction you received to these reports was not the process but because we started getting questions from the Board of Visitors about faculty performance metrics, post-tenure review, etc. That was not a complaint about the process. Getting back to the Phased Retirement Program: it is not mandatory so we went with the simpler route to get them out.

President Brush: I, myself, was not upset about the resolution [to task the President and Provost with creating a phased retirement program] going to the Board. It seemed like a good thing. I've tried to be supportive. But I think that there are some points about process that we are not agreeing upon and we seem to be talking past each other. I think the opportunity to comment on drafts earlier is all that is being asked.

There was some continued back and forth about this topic.

Meyers via chat: Among the duties of the new Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs is that "They will also serve as a liaison to the Faculty Assembly"; does that mean you will no longer meet with the Faculty Assembly or its executive committee?

Provost Agouris: No, it doesn't mean that. I still plan to attend.

President Brush: One of their duties would be to resolve faculty grievances. Can remind us how you view that relationship moving forward?

Provost Agouris: The intent isn't to change the process but to have another person to assist me. If there will be changes, you will be the first to know, but I do not foresee any.

#### 4. Report from Faculty Assembly President, Mark Brush

We've had a couple meetings with President Rowe and we've responded to her request to nominate people for the search committee for the VP for Strategy. We haven't had a chance to meet with her this year, we had the idea that maybe we should do a late May or June retreat, before leadership changes. One benefit of this is to have a chance to connect with the President. We could talk with her about the one-page position papers. President Rowe also wants to talk to us about the 360 review of herself and her desire to implement that process as the new standard of review for administrative positions. Presumably this would be in place of the late summer retreat.

Porter: I like the idea of a late May because if you're rotating off it would provide some continuity.

President Brush: If you have any strong feedback please send it via email. I'll move forward with planning that retreat.

The other main thing from my report is that we have elections coming up on May 10. John Gilmour will become president. We need to elect a new Vice President and a Secretary. Swan has agreed to put his name in for Vice President. Dalglish has agreed to run again for Secretary. Nominations are accepted up until the meeting. We also need to vote to elect the new chairs of the committees, COPAR, Faculty Affairs, and Academic Affairs, and to elect the committee membership.

5. Amy Sebring presentation of budget update

Unfortunately, I don't have much of an update. The regular session of the legislature was supposed to end March 12, but they didn't pass a budget. A special session was called to review budget on April 4. It now may be late May before they take any action. BOV deferred action until May, hoping we would have a state budget in time.

We are going to recommend a budget and a tuition action regardless of whether we have a state budget. A reason for the delay is that tuition continues to be a hot topic in Richmond. Any questions on the state process before I move on?

Sher: Is there a difference between the House and the Senate budgets?

Sebring: Yes – they are about 3 billion dollars apart. Higher Education is not an area in which they are dramatically different, so that is good news for us.

We built the FY22 budget assuming an increase in tuition. The BOV did not act on that increase at that time. But we had some one-time money that allowed us to offset that. First priority on FY23 is getting back into balance in terms of our base budget. We had a number of requests related to outperforming on our enrollment growth. We will allocate funds to continue to support those needs caused by additional growth.

Compensation is also a component. We are assuming there will be a merit pool as both House and Senate include increases for compensation. We've been looking to increase minimum wage. Currently it is \$12, but the market has moved faster than we have here.

Academic and student services are the final components. All predicated on a 3% tuition increase for in-state and out-of-state students.

She then opened the floor for additional questions

Sher: Doesn't the budget depend on the size of the entering class?

Sebring: We will get our first look on May 1 when deposits are due.

Burk: I want to ask about ISC 4 and where do we see that in the budget?

Sebring: ISC4 Planning money was allocated in the 2016 legislative session. Between that planning and when we went to get money for construction additional funds were required. In 2021, we put in for the additional money needed to fund and build ISC4, but then costs escalated. This year, we lobbied to make sure that ISC4 is on the radar and part of the process. But we will know more in the next couple of weeks.

Gilmour: What's been the impact of inflation on the budget so far.

Sebring: So far, I think we are ok. Construction has been the major area. Not inflation per se but wage escalation in terms of vendors, in particular.

Rasmussen: Any news on the Arts building?

Sebring: We are moving along pretty quickly – some delays due to supply chains however. We thought we would open Dec 31, 2022, but the supply issues have pushed us into spring 2023 for a soft opening. And the following academic year for full opening for classes and performances.

Porter: Dining is going to get revamped over the next 10 years. What can you tell us about this?

Sebring: At the board meeting last week, we presented a 10-year plan for dining and housing. We hired a consultant to study the issue. The consultant recommended that 70% of our beds needed to be replaced or renovated. Our plan takes 80% of our beds and replaces or renovates them. There is significant facilities work to be done there. The average age of our dorms is 54 years. Only 42% of our beds are fully air conditioned and ventilated. We have just under 5000 beds now and at the end we will have nearly the same number. This isn't a plan to expand facilities, but to replace and renovate. Some of you may know that Sodexo was really challenged over the last couple years, as have many dining establishments over the pandemic. They have also struggled with quality. They had a surprise inspection that had a number of troubling findings. My team has been meeting with them routinely. The CEO of their university accounts came on campus to review the program. There has been lots of attention from them at the highest

levels. They share our concerns about quality, and they are working to turn this around. We had already planned to bring in a dining consultant. He is now on campus actively.

Porter: How do we control numbers for housing?

Sebring: This year, we did have a waitlist of Jr-Sr lottery of about 400 students. A couple of things caused this. First, we did used to always have a waitlist but that hasn't occurred recently. The study abroad isn't fully ramped up either so more students are on campus. In addition, Junior and Seniors want to have that college experience they felt they missed during the first couple of years of the pandemic. The supply of rental properties has shrunk as well because there are more non-students renting in the area. As of earlier this week we have less than 20 students on the waitlist.

President Brush: That's great Amy, thank you very much for meeting with us. Perhaps, once we have a budget, you could return.

Sebring: I'm happy to pass along more information when we have more or to return in late May or early June.

6. Discussion of Revisions to Faculty Handbook on Leave Policies

President Brush: We've been discussing this leave policy throughout this academic year. The handbook is still with HR, so unfortunately it will likely have to be carried over until next year.

7. Discussion of the HR Faculty Position Description

President Brush: I sent this to HR last month and they have told me just today that they do not think it will work. I have emailed back asking for clarification.

Rasmussen: I'm curious to know why HR thinks it won't work. Regarding the description in particular, when you ask percentage for teaching etc. does that mean in general in the department or tailor made for a particular faculty.

President Brush: It would be for the individual faculty.

Rasmussen: Does this include mental health?

President Brush: As far as I know it does.

Rasmussen: So why won't it work?

President Brush: Lee is here so he could jump in on this.

Lee: Anne's question really speaks to the issue. By law, we are required to accommodate a person within a reasonable span. It is specific to an individual and what they do. Can we draft something that is general enough to start with and then negotiate. Mark's noble

effort moved things to the macro level, and we need it at the micro level: this particular condition needs this accommodation for this particular task.

Gilmour: You said that you start with a general job description and then move to the more specific. How general? Could you start with, “Faculty engage in teaching, research and service”?

Lee: But what is teaching?

President Brush: I started this process by trying to expand the template. And I quickly discovered that it is impossible to describe all the various activities in detail enough to cover everyone.

Gershowitz: What is the next step?

Lee: One thing I considered, is should we create a 1 pager that is generic but lists all the things you just described. Kind of like a checklist, 50 different kinds of teaching, research, service, and the individual could check off all the things that could apply that could get us closer to a universal starting point.

President Brush: We will have to reevaluate, I guess. I’m not sure what can be done at this point given that we are at the end of the year.

#### 8. Committee Reports

- a. Academic Affairs – None.
- b. Faculty Affairs – Discussion of 1 page position papers of recent Faculty Assembly Reports

Rasmussen: How far have these been circulated?

President Brush: The one on faculty salaries has gone to the BOV, President, Provost, and the Rector. I received a call from the Provost the next day, concerned that they could help us.

Swan: I will take the responsibility for where they were sent. The one was broadly circulated. The other three were circulated to the Faculty Assembly. These letters address the issues that have been identified in the Faculty Surveys over the last several years. Pay and tuition remission have been a concern for many years. We wanted to highlight these issues singularly in a very compact way. We’ve been working very hard on these issues and I don’t think that we’ve gotten the feedback or responses that we should have.

Sher: I want to comment on the dual career piece I wrote. There are meetings and discussions that may have been touched off by these these.

Wilson: was the Exec committee members that wrote the documents?

President Brush: It was members of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Provost Agouris: Don't hesitate to send us something, even if it is not yet fully formed. Anything that occurs between us is 'in the family' and we want the same thing. Although I know they are still drafts, it reminded me of a number of things that we need to address coming out of pandemic.

Swan: This is exactly why I shared them when I did. If we're going to move these forward we need to have people see things in draft form so that it gets done and there is input along the way.

President Brush: How much longer for the remaining ones?

Swan: We are aiming for the next week or two.

President Brush: If we can get them circulated, we could vote on them at the May 10 meeting.

Swan: That is our hope and that is what we will work towards.

- c. COPAR – No report. I think we need to revisit what COPAR is supposed to do. I've communicated with John Gilmour to discuss this further and how to move forward.

## 9. Other Business

Porter: At the spring meeting of the VA Faculty Senate, I was elected Secretary. I'm hoping to increase W&M presence in this group.

President Brush: There is also national organization of this body if anyone is interested in getting involved in that let me know.

## 10. Adjourn

Swan moved to adjourn the meeting and Lelièvre seconded. President Brush adjourned the meeting at 5:04 pm.

Next meeting: May 10, 2022, in person in the BOV Board Room of Blow Hall

Prepared by Harmony Dalgleish