



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Agenda November 15, 2022

Location: Blow Hall, BOV Board Room

Zoom:

3:30 pm

Officers Present: John Gilmour (Faculty Assembly President), K. Scott Swan (Vice President), Harmony Dalglish (Secretary)

Other Members Present: Cathy Levesque, Marc Sher, Cathy Forestell, Anne Rasmussen, Evgenia Smirni, Betsey Talbot, Jim Dwyer, Erin Henrickson, Marjy Friedrichs, Chuck Bailey, Denise Johnson, Tonya Boone, Ayfer Stump, Brett Wilson, Nick Popper

Members absent: Rob Latour, Randi Rashkover

Others in Attendance: Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), David Armstrong (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors), Chris Abelt, Helen Murphy, Suzanne Hagedorn, SylviaTandeciarz

1. Call to Order

President Gilmour called meeting to order at 3:34 pm.

2. Approval of the minutes for the October meeting

Sher moved to approve the minutes and Baily seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Provost's remarks

Provost Agouris: Based on our Executive committee meeting, I want to update you on a couple of things. First, the faculty productivity study. I was charged by the Board of Visitors to report

back in April and it would be great if we can do this earlier. The productivity question came up as a result of the tuition discussion. The goal is to ensure that the Board sees that we are good stewards, of our resources, that faculty are doing what they are hired to do and that there are processes in place to ensure that if faculty are not productive they can be identified and supported to increase their productivity. What we want to report back is what kind of processes exist to ensure that faculty deliver what their responsibilities are, that a process exists and is followed, that faculty who need more support receive it and improve.

We are not looking for specific criteria – it is assumed that every school and department has those criteria in place. The question that is coming is what do we do when there is a consistent pattern of lack of productivity? How is this identified and how is it remedied? This is where I need your help on input on what processes we have or do we wish to suggest other ideas. I would like to come back with something positive, a supportive process that can change a pattern of low or no productivity. Think about this and we can have a fuller discussion at the next meeting.

It is important to the Board to hear loud and clear that we have those processes in place and that we have faculty who are productive. It is good for the board to hear how many are deemed non-productive out of how many faculty per unit; how many were in a pattern of non-productive but had support and changed that pattern. How long did that take?

Rasmussen: Like with merit is this a position where someone will get a higher score at the expense of someone else getting a lower score – this is not a very motivating incentive. Mentoring and post-tenure review are not always effective either. We don't have accommodations for faculty in the way we have them for students. We don't really have that for faculty.

Dwyer: it would be helpful to clarify. What will the schools be doing? Establish the criteria, evaluate against the criteria? If that is the case you might have everyone meeting the standard. Is this a yes or no in this case we won't have a scale like with merit review? If it is self-reporting, there is no unit who would have the incentive to report underperformance.

Agouris: What you both mention are accurate. The word is out there that tenured faculty don't 'have any reason to be productive.' This is of course not true. I don't have to tell you that. But this impacts funding decisions, public mandates, opinions, etc. I think that we need to present to the Board, who are right now agnostic and coming to us with good intentions, that we have processes in place to address the issue of nonproductivity. You're right that if our processes work, we should not have nonproductive faculty.

This is not for us to start doing things differently right now. We need to convince the board that we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. There is no environment, public or private, where everyone is equally productive. I want this to be a conversation about how good we are at keeping track of our resources so that we can support the tuition increases.

Swan: I'm concerned about a goal of 100% productivity. Not everything can be measured and holding a goal of 100% on a fewer number of things leaves lower energy for those items that

aren't measured. If you want to create an environment that students actually like, those things suffer when the effort is put on the productivity measures only.

Fredricks: In VIMS, we set a goal in the three different areas and if someone is not doing well in research we can adjust from year to year in percent effort in different areas. Sometimes those who struggle in research, are amazing teachers.

Agouris: In my opinion, you want to have people do what they are best at in the positions they are enthusiastic about. Ultimately, I think the goal for a successful academic environment, we would have people doing what they do best. Not at the expense of the department, but as a way to enhance everyone's productivity. For the Board, this is tied to tuition and finances.

Gilmour: In the Executive Committee meeting last week, you stated that you would be taking on this charge. Do we need to communicate to the Board that you are doing this in conjunction with us?

Agouris: I've asked the deans to communicate to me what their processes are. I think these are things we can share through Faculty Assembly as well. I don't know how explicit these plans are throughout the schools, I do not have the information yet. The Faculty Assembly can assist in summarizing these data.

Gilmour: What I would suggest is that if you would submit a report to the Board for the February meeting. We have two remaining Faculty Assembly meetings. Perhaps we could have a discussion at each of those of where you are going with this report, what information you need, and how we can help.

Agouris: I asked each academic unit what is your process, what are your outcomes for the last 5 years, and how were these corrected.

Gilmour: I think a shorter report will be best in this case, too.

Rasmussen: Are we aware if there is any accommodation for this last era of COVID and the belt-tightening? We are at 50% capacity in our department, offering 50% of the normal course loads. There are only 5 people to do all department service. Is there a mechanism to give context?

Agouris: I think there is a tremendous amount of service at this university. I've never seen so much. And it might be good to ask ourselves, why do we have this? I think at some point for us to consider why this might be and if there are better ways to do this. How can we improve perceptions about our work, what we do, at W&M and perceptions of how happy (or not) we are as faculty and workers at W&M.

Gilmour: Along those lines, it is very helpful for faculty to show up at Board of Visitors meetings and to talk to and get to know Board Members.

Stump: I would like to get a sense of the scope of this nonproductive faculty issue. On the one hand I feel like the Board of Visitors wants to admit more and more students, so put more

teaching burden on us and at the same time more pressure to do research. These are contradictory pressures. Are we expected to teach more or do more research? What is the goal?

Agouris: You're asking the wrong person because the productivity assessment is done by the Dean's office. What you explain to me makes very good sense, which is why we are not going into the criteria. At this point no one is questioning the process of how productivity is determined by the academic units.

Tandeciarz: From the Deans' office perspective, we do in fact have COVID impacted faculty. I like how you articulate this, Peggy, in terms of faulty engagement. When faulty have checked out from any of those areas in which we hired them. We want to support them to re-engage. The last thing I will say is that the numbers are small when faulty have disengaged at least from the perspective of A&S.

4. Report by Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

Gilmour: Faculty Assembly was asked to supply names for the working groups for the four pillars of the Strategic Plan. I only received 2 names for the Careers pillar – does anyone have a name.

Bailey: I'm email some now.

Gilmour: Our next meeting is Dec 13 and then we will have a special meeting on Dec 15 to hear from the committee working on the Computer and Data Science initiative. Chon Glover would like to come to give us an update on the Faculty Hiring Plan and I will invite her to come on Dec 13. Who else should we hear from as a group this academic year? Email me if you have suggestions.

I have an idea which I am promoting. When we met with the Rector last month, there is a lack of understanding between faculty and the Board. I would like to enhance the interaction between the faculty and the board at the board meetings. One thing would be for our committee members to attend their committee meeting.

Swan: Your idea of lunch is a good idea.

Gilmour: President Rowe had some reservations about that; should we invite just Faculty Assembly members or faculty? My inclination is broaden it.

Popper: When new board members come on is there an orientation? This could be a good venue especially with junior faculty.

Smirni: I think it is a good idea for those who have college-aged children. I really appreciated what we have here when I realized what my children experienced at other institutions.

Armstrong: The tradition for the academic affairs committee of the board is that we invite a faculty speaker to talk to them for 5 – 10 minutes. So, if you think of someone you want to invite

to talk about their research that would be a great thing. Secondly, I would like to suggest that we invite Jeremy Martin to discuss our ranking and why our ranking may be changing.

5. Committee Reports

- a. Faculty Affairs – Sher: as many of you know the ToR faculty framework was passed with strong support. This will require some small changes to the Faculty Handbook. He presented the suggested changes.

Gilmour: is it a problem that A&S doesn't use NTE faculty anymore?

Sher: There is an addition to be made in the A&S handbook to address this. PPC will get this and then it will come back to us for a vote, potentially in December.

Armstrong: this was changed in Faculty Assembly over a decade ago. Postdocs are full-fledged NTE faculty according to the Faculty Handbook.

- b. Academic Affairs – None.

- c. COPAR - Forestell: We had a meeting with various administrators who to give us an overview of expectations for the year. I'd like to get folks together with Jacob Long for a primer on university spending on where money comes from and where it goes. Gilmour suggested that we invite him to a future faculty assembly. Forestell offered to contact him to set this up.

Agouris: Do you have a good understanding of how decisions are made within academic units?

Forestell: This discussion could also be very instructive.

- d. SSRL priority letter committee –

Popper: We were happy with the letter and appreciated that it had recommendations. Defending and enhancing the SSRL as a major instrument to support faculty productivity. First, we recommend that the Provost and upper administration read the full report. Second, that we recommend that we develop a stable source of income to support SSRLs. Third, we have the Provost's office work with the communications group at W&M to communicate the products and results of the SSRL program.

Gilmour: It just came to my attention that the Dean's office is working on a document codifying the SSRL program in A&S.

Forestell: it seems like we should connect with Sylvia so that we make sure we are all on the same page.

Rasmussen: one of the things in addition to trumpeting the successes of SSRL programs and that departments should revisit what 'research active' means and to make this broader.

Swan: For us it was required for accreditation. They didn't like the loose definition of research active so we had to tighten it up.

e. Tuition remission priority letter –

Henrickson: As requested, Swan put together a spreadsheet, which will be distributed via email.

Dwyer: Have you accounted for the desire for offspring of W&M would not want to attend relative to outside applicants?

Swan: Yes. There are lots of different assumptions in here that can be changed.

Gilmour: Have you looked at what UVA has done?

Swan: Yes. They use a lot of private money for this.

f. Dual Career plans –

Sher: Eight now eight institutions have been contacted. And they all seem to be interested. We are discussing MOUs. And are hoping that within a few months something is established and we can apply for an NSF grant.

6. Other Business

Dagleish: Members of the Biology and Geology departments are concerned about proposed development in the College Woods. We have put together a letter for the Williamsburg City Planning Commission. Please let me know if you'd like to read it and consider signing it.

Bailey: The letter is getting some traction. Helen Murphy and I have a zoom meeting with the head of the Williamsburg City Planning Commission tomorrow.

7. Adjourn

Fredricks moved to adjourn. Sher seconded. President Gilmour adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dagleish