



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes June 28, 2022 3:30 pm via zoom

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

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

Incoming Members Present: Betsy Talbot, Chuck Bailey, Rob Latour, Catherine Forestell, Nick Popper

Others in Attendance: Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian)

1. Call to Order – Vice President John Gilmour called the meeting to order at 3:49 pm.
2. Discussion of 1 page position papers of recent Faculty Assembly Reports.

Scott Swan started the meeting by considering the Priority letter recommendations for the 2022-2023 A&S NTE Faculty Framework.

Gilmour: There was concern that this new framework didn't fit well with the other schools.

Freidrich: Most of my concerns are that this statement specifies A&S to be clear that it is from A&S faculty to A&S faculty.

As we hear Peggy say multiple times, NTE is a terribly name. I suggest we always state NTE Faculty. We have many positions (post docs, grad students, etc) that are also NTE positions. So, we should specify faculty each time.

Who initiated this shift? Was it the faculty? Was it the administration?

Forestell: It was the administration

Porter: I agree that it was the administration. They brought it to the A&S faculty for a vote. What I thought was great about it was it really put NTE faculty on the map, so to speak. Right now,

there is a small group working on updating these policies but what this document could do is to call on this to not just stay with that small group but to include all faculty.

Gilmour: I think that the new version does call for the framework to be distributed widely and discussed widely.

Porter: There was a date in one of these versions.

Swan: It still says August 1. I'm not sure if that is still appropriate. Our goal with these is to get engagement on these ideas.

Gilmour: Are we asking that they simply share what they have right now or does some work need to be done yet before they can share the current framework?

Porter: To the best of my knowledge it is not in final state but is close to a final state. It would be shared in the fall with the whole of the A&S faculty. But this doesn't give the whole of the Faculty the opportunity to ask questions. NTE faculty assembly has had a chance to have questions. But that's not the same as the whole faculty having this opportunity.

Gilmour: We had that same type of issue with the phased retirement program. It wasn't shared until it was complete. I think it makes sense to ask for it to be shared with us at an early date so that we can have meaningful input.

Friedrich: The title says Framework while the text says policy. We should make this consistent.

Porter: The dean's office uses framework.

Some further minor wordsmithing ensued.

Gilmour called for a vote on the revised document. Forestall asked for clarification that those faculty rotating on do not vote, which is correct.

Fourteen in favor.

None opposed.

The motion to support the NTE framework paper passes.

Swan then introduced the dual-career faculty hiring document that had minor changes. He noted that Marc Sher should have credit for driving this. He is really the expert on this as he's been working on this issue for 30 years. One of the benefits is that W&M has been open to this in the past. It allows us to have an additional reach to people for recruitment and retention.

Sher: We're not asking for much, but a way to communicate among closer institutions. One place may not have two positions but across all of these institutions there could be opportunities.

Forestall: Can we link the pdf that is referred to in the document.

Swan: I will put that in there.

Talbot: Is this a policy? Can we call for a policy?

Dagleish: Part of what causes additional problems in different departments is that there is no clear policy. Can we call for the Dean's office to create clear policy?

Talbot agreed and Sher noted that there was no current policy.

Forestell: I love the idea of and ADVANCE grant, we've had them here before and it is a great idea.

Sher: ADVANCE is often science slanted, and we want it to be broader.

Wilson: I suggest that we note to expand the consortium to non-profits, industry, policy etc.

Sher: I agree.

Gilmour: I want to raise the issue about how this would work in practice. Bringing this up earlier in the process might help but could be problematic or candidates may not wish to do that.

Sher: What typically happens with a consortium is that there is someone they tell confidentially so that there is someone who can begin looking for opportunities without the home department knowing.

Additional wordsmithing occurred on this policy, though there was broad agreement that the ideas and content were supported.

Bailey: I was chair of a search in geology and we were invited to a very nice brunch with the dean where we were told that there would be an ombudsperson who would do this, but we found out that that person quit. We were worried that this would be very off-putting to candidates. It needs better branding if it's going to work here or otherwise. It really needs to be more clearly defined.

Wilson: I pulled up what looks like the VA Tech office that are indicated in the document. I want to suggest that this could be used as template to state in this document.

Rasmussen: I'm wondering if we want to reorient this as a resource for faculty families.

Swan: Let us put together another version of this document. What should be done with the other five? What is the process - who should we put these off to? Should we send them individual or as a package?

Gilmour: I know there is some real history with FA here – do you have any idea of the correct process?

Forestall: In the past, we've worked with the Provost. Have you communicated with Peggy?

Swan: Yes, she's seen at least a draft of all of these. The first I circulated much more broadly. Copying the Rector was the main problem.

Rasmussen: Perhaps we should send them all to the new vice-provost for faculty affairs. Send them this summer and then come fall just bring up which we shall tackle first.

Gilmour: I'll consult with Brush who is still the president at this point. But after that I suggest that we move forward with sending these to Peggy and the Deans. I will keep you apprised of the process.

5. Other Business

None.

6. Adjourn

Swan motioned to adjourn.

Wilson seconded.

Vice President Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 4:44 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dalglish