



# WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

## **Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes, October 11, 2022**

**Location: Tucker 127A**

**Zoom: <https://cwm.zoom.us/j/9421512462>**

**3:30-5:00 pm**

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

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

*Others in Attendance:* Katherine Rowe (University President), Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), David Armstrong (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors)

Note: This meeting was recorded and has been posted to the Faculty Assembly website: <https://www.wm.edu/sites/facultyassembly/announcements/president-rowes-presentation-to-faculty-assembly.php>

### 1. Call to Order

FA President Gilmour called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

### 2. Approval of the minutes for the September FA meeting.

Armstrong moved to approve the minutes and Forestell seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### 3. Remarks by Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

FA President Gilmour opened the meeting with a few short remarks: Shared governance is an abstract concept given meaning in practice. It is useful to periodically examine these ideas. I'll begin with an example with the personnel review of the Provost. President Rowe felt the old policy had several weaknesses; however, the new policy reduces faculty involvement and relies on an outside consultant. After speaking the President, it was clear she talked to the previous FA President Brush to discuss the changes. Brush briefed the assembly which is stated in the meeting minutes. However, something went wrong in communication. The Faculty Assembly didn't realize the scope of the changes and was concerned with the new process when it became apparent that faculty input was so much lower. We then suggested 25 names which are now all going to be included and a broader survey will be sent to all faculty. It is my hope that after this review additional changes can be discussed.

How can the Faculty Assembly be best involved in representing the faculty and providing useful advice and input to the administration? With that question in mind, I now introduce President Rowe.

#### 4. Remarks by W&M president, Katherine Rowe

President Rowe thanked President Gilmour and stated that she will speak from notes, which will then be forwarded to the assembly for inclusion in the minutes. [Because the meeting was recorded, we did not receive the notes]

President Rowe thanked the assembly for the invitation to speak and noted that the FA is the representative body of the faculty and is the appropriate body for these conversations.

Shared governance is a high strategic priority and President Rowe wants this body to be used by the faculty as the conduit for shared governance. President Rowe noted that she has met regularly with the FA President and Vice President. She stated that we can't go back to some earlier mode of shared governance. We need something stronger and more robust for the university than we had prior to pandemic. I hope this can be a time for FA to express our role as an elected body of the faculty.

President Rowe then turned to discussion of Vision 2026 and strategic planning: It's true that there hasn't been sufficient faculty engagement in strategic planning. I would like more and there is time for more. 2026 is a goal for launching, not the end point. When we launched Vision 2026 we state that it wouldn't look like prior plans. It is a framework in which you the faculty are invited to build and design within. It is not a blueprint.

She outlined the demographic cliff and stated that because of the demographic cliff we cannot stay where we are. President Rowe then showed survey data of prospective student desires and perceptions. Prospective Students seek academic rigor – important to students and it is also a William & Mary perceived strength. The President showed a figure of what is important to incoming students and what is perceived as a strength of our institution. She then showed a table that aligned the areas to increase the perception of strength with the four areas of Vision 2026. We are in a phase of building. The school-based work will continue with planning and program development.

The four areas, data, water democracy, careers, these are umbrellas that are relevant to our students and our world, and we can be the best in the world.

We are at a place of program building and development. It is clear from the Open Letter that many faculty have not heard the invitation to participate in the building and development of the vision.

President Rowe stress that we do know her. She invited us to call her, write her a letter. She wants to open that invitation.

President Rowe then turned to address the Open Letter topics –

Enrollment growth – it is necessary now. We need to be known in more high schools in the country to carry us through the demographic cliff. The game plan comesw from a FA report W&M 2026. If you've not read it, do. We have not matched hiring with growth. We've been challenged with aligning growth with hiring and I'm grateful for the sustainability curriculum committee which will also help us to align hiring with growth. We still have the innovative summer semester in that proposal. And I believe we are poised to scale that up over the next couple of years.

Executive reviews – this is a good example of shared governance. Not a result of lack of intent to communicate but a result of not doing it well enough. It is my goal to work with FA to review administration.

Leadership transition – we are seeing an uptick in faculty staff and admin changing and going to new jobs. I do think we will see a higher degree of turnover like the rest of the world is seeing.

Faculty hiring pilot – Hiring processes do continue to include search committees with the schools. Nothing has changed with that. However, if the University is underperforming, it is my job as president to make changes to improve performance. From 2010 to 2018 faculty of color increased by 2.8%. from 2018 to 2021, faculty of color increased by 3.6%. Is there anyone here who thinks that is adequate? I do not. As of today, we are in year 2 of a 3-year pilot. Our goal is to gather best practices form each committee and then roll the best practices forward into the next year. This is a major way that faculty across campus have input into governance. Last year 40% of TTE hires identify as underrepresented. And all have demonstrated expertise in enhancing inclusiveness.

## 5. Q&A with President Rowe

Questions from Faculty Assembly members

Gilmour: You mention how shared governance has to change. Let me present a metaphor of baking a cake. How can we make FA a partner in the pre-baking stage rather than the post-icing phase.

Rowe: My preference is to go even further back and say, what kind of dessert do we need to make? I think we need to make it, but you should be telling me what kind and how. My job is to say - here is the challenge and here are the strengths.

Gilmour: There's been a lot of discussion about data science. How can FA be involved in that process?

Rowe: We've had the desire to elevate STEM for several years. Data Science came from the faculty. It is an area where we are underinvested. We are thinking about elevating a school - computer science, data science, applied science, engineering if we want to go that direction.

I think FA should go to that second order work – with the Provost, with the departments who are bringing the proposal. I don't believe we have built a new division of any scale since the 1960s. but we have done this throughout our history – law school, normal school which became our education school, VIMS.

Scott Swan: My view of shared governance isn't that we should be setting strategy. Is there any place for faculty to give feedback on the strategy?

Rowe: To me that was the first two stages of strategic planning. Look at the set of assumptions that came out of the process. When I said second order, I meant the second piece of the constitution of the FA about oversight. We have to revisit what that would be if we create a new school. It would involve outreach.

Armstrong: Coming back to the hiring plan and where I view there was a disconnect. We first learned about a fully formed draft at the Board of Visitors meeting. I would have preferred if you or the Provost came to FA and said there is this issue and this problem and asked for input before going to the BoV. How can we identify those things where we can bring faculty ideas to the table earlier – how can we help provide solutions to problems?

Rowe: I hope we are open to problem statements and ideas coming from a variety of areas. The BoV was pushing for enrollment growth for years. Faculty pushed back and then FA stepped in to produce the report of how that would and could look at W&M. I'm comfortable with an iterative, data driven process.

Questions from the audience

Iyabo Obasanjo: Part of the demographic cliff issue is that the composition of the study body is going to change in terms of race and ethnicity. My issue with this is, apart from the pandemic, the other thing that happened was the killing of so many black men. What those diverse students are looking for are institutions that emphasize social justice. They're not going to come here because of water, democracy, or anything. They will go to institutions that emphasize social justice. What is the institution doing to link up with minority groups within the state that are not doing well? Finally, what are you doing about equity in terms of faculty of color that are already here who are lacking a sense of belonging?

Rowe: Everything in the DEI process is baked into every section of the strategic plan. We didn't change those core goals in DEI in the strategic plan but included them everywhere. I would say that those who work in all four of the areas of the strategic plan would say they have a strong social justice connection and environmental justice connection. You could build out important areas of focus around social justice for any of those umbrellas. Partnerships with our community – under pandemic, we are doing a really good job, particularly with research. I think that my aspiration is that that grows.

Shantá Hinton: Let's hypothetically assume everyone agrees with the vision. There is a disconnect and miscommunication where what you say and practice. You want more internships – we agree with you. But the intuition decided that summer research is not supported. Just today, there is a town hall advertised on Friday for hiring the new Dean. But where is the expertise on undergraduate education? Lastly, we are talking about research, but here I am in Biology and I cannot even order anything even though I have grant money to spend! You say we have this vision, but the actions are not supporting that vision.

Rowe: I wish I could work as fast as you want me to work. This is the first semester that we've been able to think of something other than public health as the first issue. I think you should talk to the Provost about the composition of the hiring committee for the new Dean. Focusing on internships means that we can provide summer housing. If we run a summer semester we certainly can. We have a path to fund back summer housing. If we do the summer semester we need those beds for students who are here.

Suzanne Hagedorn: I have a problem that the Provost presented a proposal for a new school to the BoV and we found out about it via a press release. I know the planning has been going on for a while, but it floored me that we weren't told. Apparently there is already a plan that this will go to SHEV – when were we going to be consulted? When is the faculty salary equity study going to happen?

Rowe: I've heard these accusations and I've talked about them. The Faculty salary equity I hope will be something we address this year. The BoV has charged FA with creating a model on how to quantify faculty productivity.

Smirni: Suzanne, it is a mistake to call it the School of Data, it is the School of Computer and Data science. I have been part of the committee that has been working on this since May 24<sup>th</sup>. This is a committee across campus from several schools around campus including A&S. There have been several meetings where several people from A&S have been involved. It makes sense to me that we go to an exploratory committee.

Rowe: There are a lot of go or no-go moments before something like a new school would go to SHEV. What is not in question is student demand. If you have a better suggestion to meet student demand, bring it to the committee. We are not as far along nor are they as far along as everyone wishes was the case.

Swan: Lisa Meier in the chat is asking are we still open to interdisciplinary aspects in the umbrellas of the vision 2026?

Rowe: yes, we would love that.

Swan: Is there a place where you are announcing the committees?

Rowe: The website.

Swan: From the chat – Why are there more grants available if there is a School of Computer and Data Science?

Rowe: The higher our profile the more likely places are to fund us.

Rasmussen: Thank you for being here today. We learned that searches are supposed to be identical from candidate to candidates. We are not supposed to convey personal information about climate, or living in Williamsburg. My question is how do we not address the fact that there has been quite a bit of turbulence in your administration? My second question is the idea that we receive decisions as a fait accompli – I experience that on the level of the dean frequently. What is your role in this? We presented all kinds of ideas to the Provost about the Arts Quarter – can you talk about this more specifically? Whatever happens we feel like we will be told and not consulted.

Rowe: I tend to work in empirical ways and iterative process. I told the faculty that we needed to change our hiring practices. And I hope you will see that the faculty have control over how that goes moving forward. Regarding the Arts Quarter: I'm going to be working in piloting mode in something as important as the Arts Program. We've had so many delays it didn't seem like a good use of time to involve more people planning when we were delayed so long. What I think we so badly need is programming for a year. If you all want to renew and refocus with new building this is a great opportunity. Bring that to the Provost and the Dean. Regarding the dean, I try to stay in my lane

Arthur Knight – I'd like to go back to the Computation and Data Science topic. It felt to me like one of those instances that it would have been great to have more information earlier. Second, I think it is imperative to do cost-benefit analysis of a new school vs. staying within A&S. Why isn't a school like to lead to silo-ing problems? We have, clearly, effective faculty in computational and data sciences distributed around the campus. Separating them out into another school it is not likely to foster connections.

Swan: From the chat - can you talk about that question in the context of the whole university?

Rowe: Thinking of water – what will it take for W&M to be known as the premier institution to study the environmental, economic, social justice aspects of water which is going to be a major challenge for the world in the next 50 years. It needs to be the people who do the work who build that. I don't want to lock us in by designing it. The questions need to be answered by those who know. I'm open to doing things differently.

Swan: Jennifer Stevens on the chat has question. About the current structure of faculty assembly. Usually there isn't a large group of people who are vying to be on FA. What is the charge given

to the FA to deliver information and messaging. What is your vision for the faculty to remain informed and responsive and heard?

Rowe: How do we connect to not be surprised? I feel like I've been talking about these things for four years. Regular communication out to the faculty. Invitation to structure conversations with representatives. What I value is that I am hearing from all the schools. That is what I need. We have to figure out communication solutions that work at scale. When I bring something forward I need to know that it has landed. It really just takes a phone call.

Liz: one of the issues with a data driven society is that it isn't always one that is committed to equity and justice. In addition to the silo problem, computer science has a tradition of not being the most inclusive discipline. What needs to happen for there to be more leadership level movement? I worry about internal contradictions for some things in the strategic plan.

Rowe: Not having internal push and pull is not a design criteria for me. I would challenge the notion that our computer science program isn't thinking of equity and justice. I think that if we have a new school that we could build that from the beginning. To start with curiosity and openness to design in a way that is inclusive rather than assume that it will be siloed from the start.

Smirni – DEI issues in computer science are very important. One of things we are striving for is to increase women in stem. The national average is 21% of women in computer science. W&M we have 35% women. Virginia Tech 15%. For students we have the national average for Hispanic students. We have double the national average of black students. We are training the next generation of designers to remove these biases.

Rowe: Was that [our discussion] helpful? It is my intention to use Faculty Assembly for these types of discussions.

## 6. Adjourn

President Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 5:06 pm

Prepared by Harmony Dalglish