



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Agenda January 24, 2023

3:30 – 5 pm

Chancellor 217

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

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

Other Members Present: Marc Sher, Cathy Levesque, Ayfer Stump, Erin Henrickson, Chuck Bailey, Cathy Forestell, Anne Rasmussen, Evgenia Smirni, Brett Wilson, Marjy Friedrichs, Denise Johnson, Betsey Talbot, Nick Popper, Mark Brush, Eric Chason

Members Absent: Tonya Boone, Randi Rashkover, Jim Dwyer

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

1. Call to Order

President Gilmour called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm and welcomed the Assembly to the first meeting of 2023.

2. Approval of the minutes for the [December](#) meeting

Sher motioned to approve and Forestell seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Provost's remarks

Provost Agouris welcomed us back to campus and hoped everyone had a good break. The Provost had four announcements:

1. The data page on the Provost's website is up and available for everyone. This is data that has been vetted and discussed with all the schools and A&S. I welcome your thoughts as you have the time to take a look at it. I think it can be a useful tool for individual faculty, departments, and schools.
2. The steering committee on CDS has its first meeting tomorrow. I will be there for the first few minutes to discuss the charge of the committee and then I will leave it in the hands of Suzanne and David. There will be more information on the website as the semester progresses.
3. We are in the process of hiring a new Chief Operating Officer. I am the chair of this committee. This week we will be looking at the candidate pool. I expect the process to take a couple of months at least.
4. The other ongoing search is for the Dean of A&S. I hear this is all going well and includes strong candidates both internal and external.

The Provost then opened the floor to questions.

Armstrong: Can we provide suggestions for other kinds of data to be included on your website?

Provost Agouris: Yes, absolutely.

Armstrong: I suggest measures of scholarly productivity including contracts, grants, publications.

Provost Agouris: This is a good idea. We also received a suggestion to include service courses, COLL courses etc. We are looking into this now. As well as first generation students per discipline.

Gilmour: I'd like to discuss the steering committee. Is their purpose to make a recommendation to you?

Provost Agouris: Last December, we talked about the why, as far as those who are eager to move forward. Now, I think the steering committee is going to examine the how and the implications for William & Mary. I envision there will be recommendations such as here is this type of model and the pros and cons. Here is another type of model and the pros and cons, etc. I will make a final recommendation to the president and the president then to the Board who will ultimately decide. At this point, I really want to know the concerns – what are the concerns that people have and how we can overcome them. I'm looking for an analysis of both the opportunities and the challenges. How can we address the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities.

Wilson: Is it possible that any of these entities on the steering committee will recommend no? Is this a train that is chugging its way out of the station or is there still an option that a new school won't be created?

Provost Agouris: If there is a no from the steering committee, there has to be a significant reason for it. Now is the time to be more specific. If we find through this process that the cons outweigh the pros, I cannot see the benefit with moving it forward. If there are challenges, can we find ways to overcome them? Hopefully it will be a beneficial experience that this is an honest and exciting process to see if there is something here worth pursuing that is exciting and beneficial for our institution.

Gilmour: What opportunities can those who are not on the committee have to provide input?

Provost Agouris: I refer you to Suzanne and David, the co-chairs. I encourage you to have a discussion with them.

Provost Agouris: Are you all aware of ODU's new school? ODU just received an approval from SCHEV for a new school for Data Sciences. I just wanted you to be aware that things are happening fast around us and we need to be more competitive in this.

Smirni: This puts us at W&M under pressure to move forward. Internally, we should try to move forward. I know some are still opposed but this is where everyone is going. I would really love to move fast.

4. Report by Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

Gilmour: In the last meeting, we adopted changes to the faculty handbook regarding faculty titles. I informed President Rowe of that and asked her to put it on the Feb agenda for the Board of Visitors. She told me that she was concerned and wanted to talk further about it. We, me and David Armstrong, will have a meeting with her on Monday to clear up any concerns. I think there will still be time to put it on the February agenda.

Second, I want to alert you to a funding opportunity. William & Mary is part of the Colonial Academic Alliance through our membership in our sports conference. The goal of the CAA is to foster academic collaboration among other institutions in the CAA. There is pilot money or seed money if you collaborate with two other institutions within the alliance. These are the same schools that are in our athletic conference.

Rasmussen: What is the funding for?

Gilmour: I think you would speak with Elle Peterson, who is the leader of the CAA and she will give you more information. There is also information on the CAA website.

Provost Agouris: Elle is the new executive director of the CAA. Visit CAA-academics.org there are grants that are announced. I also want to remind you of the provost's research initiative for the humanities and the arts.

Gilmour: Thank you. With that, I will turn it over to Scott Swan.

5. Discussion of Dependent Tuition plan

Swan: Dependent tuition benefits often rises to the top of surveys as something that faculty want. We sent the Dependent Tuition Priority letter to Jackie Ferree, the interim COO, and she had some questions. In the meantime, we put together a spreadsheet with some different assumptions because some of the questions she asked highlighted some key assumptions that we might want to explore.

Swan then walked the Assembly through the spreadsheet.

Armstrong – this assumes that every student is a full tuition student but many students don't pay full cost due to financial aid.

Swan: Yes, this doesn't include financial aid dollars. This is a worst-case scenario of all tuitions being full tuitions.

Gilmour: another option for a phased in approach, is to give to the same number of people a reduction in tuition, but only 20%, then 40% etc, rather than having few people receive a full reduction in tuition.

Swan: Right, so split the pie among the number of students. That would be another option for a phased approach.

Rasmussen: This is amazing thank you for putting this together. It occurred to me with the first letter that this is only a benefit for those who have children. It doesn't benefit people without children. Also, this is more of a benefit for lower paid employees, for whom the cost of tuition is a larger percentage of their income.

Swan: That is true and I also want to point out that this characteristic is not unique to this particular benefit. This the same as many benefits; not all employees use all benefits equally.

Gilmour: My colleague in the Econ department argues vigorously against this because it is a benefit that is for only a small number, that money can be spent in a better way.

Swan: I see it a different way. Dependent tuition benefit is something that is important to a significant portion of faculty according to our surveys. In addition, it can be a recruitment and retention tool.

Armstrong: If you take the same \$2 million and give it as salary, are you more likely to stay if your salary is a bit higher each year or if you have the chance to have a full tuition benefit?

Chasson: As a past president of FA, I remember discussing this with two prior provosts and one was receptive, and one was not.

Provost Agouris: This something that comes up frequently. People who are considering other offers or are considering coming here ask this frequently. It is more complicated at W&M because the state doesn't allow it so it leaves us, as W&M, to implement it on our own. Ideally it would be a benefit at no cost to us. I'm open to it – if this is something a majority of faculty feel this is something that is important to have, I am very open to it. At this point I want to see what a majority of faculty want to do.

Swan: The research we did showed that 40% of faculty named it as first or second most important thing to them.

Provost Agouris: If this is something you want to investigate I'm happy to take it further.

Gilmour: Let's take a straw poll – how many here think this is a good idea. (A majority of people present in person and on zoom raised their hands).

Chasson: With the caveat that where the money comes from is an important consideration.

Swan: The COO had 5 questions.

1. “This is clearly modeled for undergraduate only, would there be a benefit to extend to other opportunities, such as certificates, microcredentials, etc?”
There seemed to be consensus on our subcommittee to start with Undergraduate only.

Hendrickson – We had broad consensus to keep it simple first as a good place to start.

Chesson: There's a Faculty Senate of Virginia – it was my understanding that there was someone on this group who would lobby for this but the institutions were resistant.

Armstrong – 2/3 of the benefit would likely go to staff, just given the numbers of employees. Is there a benefit for staff turnover with this.

Brush – perhaps engaging with staff assembly is a good idea.

Provost Agouris: Do other institutions involve staff too?

Swan: yes.

Gilmour: legislation was passed in the 80s stating that if you do it for faculty you have to do it for everyone.

2. “Would the proposal be additive to current enrollment levels?”
Additive would increase class size but be less costly.

Gilmour: The base assumptions seems to not be additive.

Chesson: Does the institution know how many faculty/staff children actually enroll now? It might be a starting point to know.

Levesque: it could be a real benefit particularly for staff and that would be a benefit for everyone.

Brush: The staff point – this would be just W&M staff, so would that create greater inequities with Sodexo staff for example? Also, I think it should be enrollment neutral, not additive.

3. “Would there be a cap on the number that could participate?”

Swan: This might come, once we know what the initial investment is.

Chesson: Again, this might get back to where the funds come from and how they’re raised and used.

Hendrickson: I want to be careful how I word this – I was first gen low income student. I probably wouldn’t have applied to W&M – in terms of how this is implemented what percentage of faculty children vs. staff children would apply and be accepted?

Swan: We’re running low on time. Please, take a look at the answers I’ve written on the handout, do these seem reasonable?

Gilmour: Regarding Question 2: I think it could go additive or neutral

Brush: I think it should be neutral.

Bailey: We’ve seen 13% growth in the 10 years, but we don’t know what the increase is?

Hendrickson: regarding 4: I took this a bit differently, I think. The answer to 4 is that we don’t think most students pay full price.

Armstrong: We believe the foregone tuition cost would be substantially less because most students do not pay the full tuition.

Dagleish: The answer to question four should be reworded to more fully address the question.

Swan: Yes, I’ll adjust the answer to question 4. We, the committee, are asking for support from assembly to move this forward.

Gilmour: I think there is broad support within this group for this. Kathrine Rowe wanted us to give her a business plan and this is pretty much it.

6. Adjourn

Rasmussen move to adjourn and Wilson seconded. All approved and President Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 4:56 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dagleish