



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2022
3:30 pm
BOV Board room and via zoom**

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

Other Members Present: K. Scott Swan, Nicole Santiago, Christy Porter, Rebecca Green, Marc Sher, Adam Gershowitz, Josh Burk, Michelle Lelièvre, Evgenia Smirni, Marjy Friedrichs, Brett Wilson

Incoming Members Present: Betsey Talbot, Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, Randi Rashkover, Nick Popper

Members Absent: Tom Ward (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors), Lindy Johnson, Denise Johnson, Lisa Landino, Anne Rasmussen, Tonya Boone, John Eisele

Others in Attendance: Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Chris Lee

1. Call to Order

President Brush called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm with a firm crack of the coveted gavel. He warmly welcomed the incoming members and asked to begin the meeting by having all members briefly introduce themselves.

2. Approval of the minutes for the April meeting.

Dalglish amended the date listed on the April minutes. Swan moved to approve the amended minutes. Gilmour seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Provost's remarks

Provost Agouris presented a report on the specified term faculty.

Swan: Does it concern you that the number of tenure track faculty has declined.

Provost: I don't see it as a trend. But a reflection of where we've been in pandemic. Percentage wise, there are similar numbers across the last two years in all groups.

The Provost presented data on course sections offered by faculty status: NTE-offered sections grew in 2020 some decline in 2021. All faculty did more in 2020. Total course sections was ~2400. Over the last 10 years we have gone from 17% to 27% of our sections offered by NTE.

Average course sections per faculty has remained somewhat stable around 3. Except that NTE course sections per faculty has risen from 3.5 to 4 over the last 10 years.

Porter: How do these trends fit into sustainability of curriculum and increases in student enrollment?

Provost: I do think that we should figure out what student growth means for the faculty. I'm not seeing huge concerns in terms in the overall numbers, but I know if we dig deeper there are areas of more concern, areas where we are not comfortable with the student:faculty ratio; these are areas that need more resources. We need these data to make these kinds of decisions. Our goal is to ensure that faculty remain enthusiastic and energized about what they do, and that the student experience stays strong.

Porter: Does the office also do an analysis of where the growth comes from?

Provost: Yes, and we expect to have more data to share in the next year. Growth in terms of positions and growth in terms of programs and opportunities. These data would be available to everyone to use to support requests and planning.

Lelièvre: Do we know about variations between schools and units in the trends you present of increasing NTE effort? Is the increase in hours due to overload (more course sections) or is it more NTE teaching early in major/program courses?

Provost: We do. My goal is to make these data sets available so anyone can look at that as part of the sustainable curriculum.

The Provost then displayed data for each department and program.

Swan: In the business school, we use NTEs substantially for new programs.

Brush: This is a report that the Provost sends every April and I'll make a note for the new faculty to send it on to you.

President Brush then moved on to other questions for the Provost.

Brush: Earlier in the year Lindy Johnson asked a question about looking into data on grade inflation.

Provost: I've asked the deans about this.

Lelièvre: President Rowe asked for names for Henry Braddous' replacement. Can you update us on who is on the committee and the job description. Part of Henry's job was to increase diversity on campus. Many of us are keen to ensure that the committee be a strong voice to keep this an important goal of this position.

Provost: The committee hasn't yet been finalized. I think the idea is that this is becoming a strategy position; this will likely be developed with the committee once the committee is finalized. This is evolving.

4. Report from Faculty Assembly president, Mark Brush

President Brush spoke with President Rowe to schedule the retreat. It is looking like it will be in August. Stay tuned.

He then gave a brief report on the status of Handbook revisions, which continue.

5. Election of Officers, Committee Chairs, and Committee Members for 2022-2023

President Brush noted that we do have a quorum present. As the Vice-President, John Gilmour will automatically transfer to the role of President.

First position that we will vote on is for Vice President –

Scott Swan has put his name forward. Are there any others?

Hearing none, President Brush called for a vote. Scott Swan was elected unanimously.

Second position is for Secretary.

Harmony Dalglish has put her name forward. Are there any others?

Hearing none, President Brush called for a vote. Harmony Dalglish was elected unanimously.

Gilmour:

Thanks to both of you.

Scott you've been a valuable member of Faculty Assembly and I am looking forward to working with you. Harmony, you've taken accurate and detailed minutes which is what they should be.

A number of you received emails from me regarding committee chairs.

Anne Rasmussen agreed to be the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Catherine Levesque agreed to be the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.

I'm still looking for a chair of COPAR.

President Brush interjected that the COPAR chair is in transition. Gilmour then called for a vote to instate the committee chairs for Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs. There was unanimous support for Anne and Catherine.

Gilmour moved that we firm up the rest of the committee membership at the first meeting in the fall.

6. Committee Reports

a. Academic Affairs – no report.

b. Faculty Affairs

i. Discussion of 1 page position papers of recent Faculty Assembly Reports

Swan: First, I want to say thank you to the committee who put a great deal of work on these documents this year and note that if there are any mistakes I will claim sole responsibility for those.

Let's first look at the SSRL document. We felt like this was a very good summary of this.

Dalgleish: As the chair of the committee that wrote the report, I was impressed with this document.

Brush: the only tiny addition I would add that stimulating research brings undergraduates into the research process.

Lelièvre: Is there a difference between the first two versions in the pdf?

Swan: no.

Provost - These are very good starting points for my office. I have established a provost faculty fellow to work on specific projects, just like these. Burk is the first fellow. His experience and connections make him an excellent inaugural fellow.

Swan moved to accept the SSRL document with Brush's minor amendment.

Gilmour seconded.

Hearing no other discussion, the vote was called.

There was unanimous support to accept the SSRL document.

Swan: The next to consider is the Dual Career Hiring Practices.

Sher: Let me give you a brief summary. The dual career issue is one of the hardest to deal with hiring faculty. The HERC that is referenced in the current document – I've heard this is not quite as useful as hoped. The second proposal is to create a Tidewater Dual Career Consortium. We will be applying with the ADVANCE grant at NSF in the next year. Chris Lee and I will be contacting institutions on the peninsula over the summer. And the Grant LOI is due next April.

Swan: this document became more of an update of what is happening because it has already spurred this action.

Gilmour: I spoke with President Rowe and she said she would like to see FA continue to work on this over the next year. Can we see the final document and adopt it via zoom meeting when it is ready?

The document was tabled for discussion at a future meeting.

Swan: Next, we have three related to NTEs.

Porter: There is currently a committee working on drafting the framework. The process and the established mechanisms for harmonizing policies across the schools isn't clear or consistent. This will require handbook changes.

Brush: My only minor point would be to remove 'radical' from the phrase "radical changes".

Wilson: I feel reading this there is some backstory that I'm missing. I felt like I was walking into a conversation mid-way.

Dalgleish: I concur with that feeling; very well said.

Brush: From my understanding, this was a small advisory committee that created this framework. It is a little opaque as it's not been broadly released yet.

Porter: Yes. Dean Maria's advisory committee on their own wrote a framework, but Maria correctly noted that this really should come from the Dean's office. And then it was worked on.

Friedrichs: I'm reading this as a VIMS NTE. They would be upset by the title – VIMS NTE faculty are very happy and would not be interested in changing what they have. Can we add A&S in the title?

Agouris: I've heard from other schools that they are not interested in changing their NTE policy either. VIMS, Business, Law. My suggestion is that perhaps this should be an opt-in situation for the different schools. Certainly, this is important in A&S.

Swan: There are differences, and some description of these differences would be good to have.

Gilmour: What kind of consultation has happened so far on this document?

Swan: Just the committee and a few people.

Lelièvre: This was also opaque to me. The document isn't calling for the creation of the framework, but a process about creating the framework?

Porter: There is already a process. It is simply calling us to use the processes that are already in place.

Swan: I move that we vote to approve this with the amendments of removing radical and adding A&S.

Green: Can we clarify the language?

Smirni: I think it is premature and creates unnecessary noise. I would be in favor to put this on the back burner until we have more information.

Swan: Timing is important

Lelièvre: I am very unclear about the goals of this document.

Porter: I would move to table this document.

Smirni seconded.

Vote passed unanimously.

Brush: While this has been tabled, there have been some suggestions for improvement so we could take a second look in June at a revised version.

Swan: The next document is the TE/NTE ratio. The concern is to create some general guidelines to keep this ratio

Friedrichs: 10 years ago VIMS was 15% and now it is 30%. We've doubled in 10 years.

Swan: We are at a point where we'd be happy with steady state, but there is no official statement of policy of what our goal or intention is vs. just letting it happen.

Brush: Ben Boone asked if it should be clarified whether the proposed ratio would apply within the individual school or across the whole campus.

Swan: The more detail we add the more controversy. It does say a number – 40%.

Gilmour: This is a very good time to adopt it with the increasing enrollment we're at the point where drift could go higher.

Swan: I move to accept this document.

Lelièvre seconded

Brush called a vote and it was unanimously accepted.

Swan: The last of these documents concerns NTE being able to vote.

Gershowitz: I agree with this. I'm not sure that the first two points listed are in the Law School bylaws. I recommend we delete that sentence.

Swan: I move to accept this document.

Gilmour second.

Brush called a vote and it was unanimously accepted.

Swan: Next is the document on tuition benefits. This has been a high priority for the faculty for a long time and we have gotten no formal response, ever. The psychological benefit is huge, the nominal cost is low. It's not that much money.

Green: Do we have a sense in peer institutions how much it costs them?

Swan: The majority have it but we don't know the individual cost to schools.

Gershowitz: Since we have Chris [Lee] in the room – how many benefits eligible employees to we have?

Lee: 2,500.

Gershowitz: We should amend the document to reflect this.

Swan: I move we accept this document with that amendment.

Porter second.

Brush called a vote and it was unanimously accepted.

Brush: Let's plan to reconsider the two that were tabled and the faculty salary document in June.

c. COPAR – budget is on hold still. No report.

7. Other Business

None.

8. Adjourn

President Brush adjourned the meeting at 5:13 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dagleish