



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Agenda December 13, 2022

3:30 – 5 pm

Chancellor 322

Zoom: <https://cwm.zoom.us/j/96301591784?from=addon>

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

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

Members Absent: Rob Latour, Betsey Talbot, Chuck Bailey

Others in Attendance: Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), David Armstrong (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors), Chon Glover (Chief Diversity Officer), Christy Porter, Suzanne Hagedorn, Jessica Martin, Jen Bestman, Clair Pamment

1. Call to Order

President Gilmour called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

2. Approval of the minutes for the November meeting

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

3. Provost's remarks

Provost Agouris: I want to acknowledge that we've reached the end of another semester. We had a recent tragedy that shook us all and I think this is an important issue we need to address very seriously. Next semester we will have a deeper conversation and get to a point to where what are additional things we can do to protect our community.

It is really great that we are finishing our Plumeri Awards discussions. We had a very deep and wide pool of very strong faculty. This was the biggest pool we've had and we are very excited.

Regarding the upcoming board meeting as we discussed there is an expectation that I present to the board regarding faculty productivity. I want to work with Faculty Assembly to make this presentation effective.

Suzanne Raitt and I are in the process of finalizing the steering committee for the CDS and hope to announce that next week with work to start in early January.

Provost Agouris then opened the floor to questions and there were none.

4. Report by Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

I have nothing to report and want to move to the next item which is revisions to the Faculty Handbook regarding NTE position presented by Marc Sher.

5. Revisions to Faculty Handbook regarding NTE positions

Sher reviewed with us the proposed edits to the handbook. He noted that while these were motivated by the adoption of the ToR faculty framework, these would be good ideas without it. The most important change is that each school *may*, in its bylaws, allow the NTE faculty to participate in establishing procedures. Each school *may* do this. In A&S, we already have this so it would simply go into effect. Sher stated that both University Counsel and PPE have signed off on this. He now brings it to Faculty Assembly.

Gilmour moved that the Faculty Assembly adopt these changes and called for discussion. There was no discussion.

Rasmussen seconded the adoption. The motion passed unanimously.

Sher then stated that the next step was for Gilmour to notify President Rowe that this change has been made. Gilmour replied that he would do so at his upcoming meeting with President Rowe.

6. Report from Chon Glover on Hiring Pilot Plan

Glover: We are going into a second year. One of the things we discussed when we implemented the pilot hiring plan is that at the end of each year we would have a report. We have had:

7 implicit bias workshops

270 faculty who were search committee members

32 faculty trained as search advocates

40% of faculty hires identified as a member of an underrepresented group
100% responded to the two key questions – who is underrepresented in your discipline and what are you doing/have you done to ameliorate this in your discipline?
25 search committee chairs participated in the end of the year assessment.

The departure of Chris Lee in HR limited our ability to do everything we set out to do. The adjustments we made for year 2 were to track our progress and share annually with Assembly, Cabinet, BOV and student assembly.

Continue trainings on Zoom.

Offer more workshops throughout the year.

Provide training for student evaluators.

Clarified who is required to participate in implicit bias training – all search committee members, all search chairs, all people in the department who will evaluate candidates.

Decrease the use of Search Advocates for Year 2, due to training and staffing needs. We plan to bring back the required Search Advocates in year 3. Search Advocates are non-voting members of a search committee. They are there to make sure the process is equitable and transparent.

Talent acquisition manager has been hired.

Faculty recruitment coordinator has been hired.

HR has a subscription to HigherEd jobs to post positions.

Glover then opened the floor to questions.

Rasmussen – I have two questions. First, I wanted to state that I did the training and it was informative and enjoyable. For the two questions – why don't we ask about diversity and inclusion in the workplace rather than in teaching?

Glover: Our goal to hire inclusive teachers.

Rasmussen: Second, we have a search for an open area position. We've often asked for student feedback about the candidates. With such a potentially large pool of students, I am assuming that it won't be prudent for all of them to do the training.

Glover: With the online training, the students can do that and sign and acknowledgement that they have done so. They then they can participate.

Swan: I wasn't aware that students had to have training too.

Glover: Yes. Because students could ask a question that is irrelevant or in some way harmful that could impact the search. So, student training is important.

Boone: So if we put a candidate in front of a 'test class' each student would have to have that training?

Glover: Yes. This is why the online module mode is useful.

Boone: What if they don't assess, but they are simply in the audience?

Glover: Will you know for sure? If yes, then it is fine for them to be in the audience, but not provide assessment of the candidates.

Sher: I had a question about the search advocate. It is difficult to get faculty all together. Trying to schedule with another person it could create a really disastrous delay.

Glover: This is why we are training more advocates. Hopefully out of a list of 50, one would be available. Ideally one person would be assigned to a whole search, but there is the possibility to substitute trained personnel.

Swan: Right now we have 100% of people responding to the two questions. It seems like we could get more information.

Glover: At the school level, there are the required two questions, but you can decide to go deeper as a department.

Swan: Is there any way to capture prior to year 1 how many people identify as URM.

Glover: Yes.

Popper: Two questions – One is about the students. I'm wondering about this where we hear from both grad and undergrads. The training could be a disincentive or having to put their name on the feedback could also do this. Secondly, have you thought about tinkering with things like the ranked candidate list?

Glover: Each year we are trying new things. One of the three years we could try adjustments to the unranked list to see what differences are. We've found, however, that it hasn't been a barrier. You can have an unranked list, but the search chair can share a narrative of why each candidate was on the list or not.

Popper: I was a search committee chair and didn't find it helpful.

Armstrong: I think that everyone should take the implicit bias training. In our department there is a committee who presents the interview information to the departments who vote. Do they all have to take the training?

Glover: Yes. A vote is an evaluation.

Armstrong: How do we know who is trained?

Glover: I have a list of everyone who has completed it and it can be shared that with the departments.

Swan: I don't see the value of the unranked list. We are simply throwing away information. If we have all the training, what value is the unranked list?

Rasmussen: Were there any cases where the dean got it wrong?

Smirni: For us it was very clear and there was no dispute.

Stump: Greetings from Istanbul, Turkey! I agree with the concerns with the unranked list. My question is about international faculty. Do we consider them under the rubric as underrepresented?

Glover: I'm going to refer you to Emily Avesian, who deals with this directly in her training.

Forestell: How do you define underrepresented? Race only? Gender?

Glover: Both – anything that is reportable. This is why we say underrepresented because you can be URM in one discipline but not in another.

Popper: I want to continue my comments on the unranked list. It is good to know that it is possible. But as a policy it is irrelevant. Because it empowers the dean to ignore the faculty ranking. The unranked list strikes me as something as playing with more fire than it needs to be for benefits I just don't see.

Glover: Duly noted and thank you.

Swan: I have one more question. One problem we have is that there is a lot of demand for underrepresented faculty – with increased demand to attract and retain those candidates, we should have some money available to do that. In the dashboard it would be good to see how much money we have raised to attract and retain underrepresented faculty. Where is the money? When you have high demand, it is very competitive!

Agouris: As you well know, the issue of salaries is critical. Attracting these candidates boils down to whether we can make them the best offer. I hear this and understand it and hopefully we can adjust and improve.

Swan: It is depressing that all the activities we are doing will end in lower numbers, but the dominant issue is resources.

Glover: Thank you for the opportunity to present to you here and please share the information.

7. CDS school discussion led by Evgenia Smirni

Smirni: Two questions I often hear are 1) Why does CS want to split from A&S? and 2) Why can't you do this in A&S? CS split from Mathematics in 1985 and there was a national trend to split departments then and also there is a trend to split CS into their own schools now. We currently have 19 research faculty. With a growth plan we have multiple positions going forward funded by TTIP and on track to have 129 BS degrees by 2029.

CS has excellence in research – it is, effectively, an R1 department. We have excellence in teaching advising and mentorship. Computer science is the highest ranked department in the

sciences in A&S. In comparing with other similarly ranked computer science schools, only 1 of the 9 presented are in Arts and Sciences – the rest are in schools of engineering or computing. Across the 102 top ranked schools, most computer science departments are NOT in Arts and Sciences. Most are in schools of computing or engineering or computer and data sciences. Some of our biggest challenges is faculty retention and hiring. At the national landscape there are more positions than applications. Many institutions are hiring 10 or 20 positions. Very aggressive hiring. This is very different from A&S! Additionally, we have increasing student demands. Adjunct hiring is important and A&S doesn't pay the market value for adjuncts. TA number has remained the same since 2010 – which has a negative impact on our program.

Benefits of a new school include: Follow national trends. Have institutional commitment to faculty hiring and retention. Have better response to market dynamics, graduate student recruiting, and undergraduate student recruiting. In addition, it will increase collaboration ability. We will have the ability to apply to programs like ExLENT. There will be inter-school collaborations. We can create a new center with a liberal arts focus. These last things, in particular, require growth. Professional MS program in computer science.

Smirni then opened the floor for questions.

Sher: I will be there on Thursday. I hope that on Thursday you will be say something about data science and applied science.

Rasmussen: What are the resources required? Where will they come from? How do you envision your curriculum and it's integration with "old" A&S curriculum?

Smirni: The answer for Computer Science is that we will have a liberal arts education. We want our students to continue taking the liberal arts classes. I love the Coll curriculum it is what makes our students different. But I cannot offer things to A&S because we don't have the faculty.

Wilson: Can you say something about what would be the scale of this? The peer institutions you're talking about have 20+ more faculty. What is your estimate for how many faculty you'd like to have? What is the aspiration?

Smirni: We cannot grow very fast because this is a recipe for disaster. We need to find the right people and that takes time.

Armstrong: Just a comment - don't be defensive about what you're saying. Saying something about a model of the size you'd like to have in terms of faculty, grad and undergrad students. It would be helpful to have a picture of what you're aiming for and what it would look like.

Swan: if we are worried about a cliff, the way we counteract that is to differentiate. In the Business school we love for our students to have that Liberal Arts training.

8. Discussion of Dependent Tuition plan

Due to the late hour, this topic was differed to the January meeting.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn

Boone moved to adjourn the meeting and Wilson seconded. President Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 5 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dagleish