



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes March 21, 2023

3:30 – 5 pm

Location: Chancellor 322

Zoom: <https://cwm.zoom.us/j/98395748660?from=addon>

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

Other Members Present: Anne Rasmussen, Chuck Bailey, Cathy Forestell, Marjy Friedrichs, Eric Chason, Cathy Levesque, Marc Sher, Erin Henrickson, Ayfer Stump, Randi Rashkover, Nick Popper, Denise Johnson, Evgenia Smirni, Betsey Talbot, Tonya Boone, Brett Wilson, David Armstrong (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors),

Members Absent: Mark Brush

Others in Attendance: Peggy Agouris (Provost), Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Pamela Eddy, David Yalof, Helen Murphy, Jaime Settle

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of the minutes for the February meeting

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

3. Provost's remarks including report from her 360 assessment.

Agouris: Korn-Fairy conducted a 360 process. It was a new process for me as well. This process was selected by President Rowe and has been implemented for several members of her team. This is a process that is supposed to be a developmental tool and not an assessment tool per se. The tool is supposed to go to a small group very familiar with the person's work. In my case, this was extended to include 50 people. There was also a survey of the faculty.

The provost then shared the written results according to a matrix of skills that were arranged into boxes from low, mid, high competency and low, mid, and high importance to the goals of her position. The provost's skills were placed into this matrix highlighting areas that need improvement as well as areas that are current strengths.

Boone: How were the skills identified?

Agouris: The company identified these skills within the tool itself.

Gilmour: I think the ranking of highest to lowest important to your role were determined by the results of the reviewers.

Swan: I would be careful because these are perceptual measures. From a marketing standpoint, when I know I'm doing the right things, part of this could be a communication issue too.

Agouris: I wanted to share the results of this, I was told to be cautious about sharing because it sets a precedent, but I think that this communication is important and valuable. I wish to be direct, open and authentic with you.

Hendrickson: Were these terms defined on the instrument itself? Or was it up to the unique perceptions of the reviewers.

Agouris: It has a quantitative scale.

Gilmour: There were several questions grouped under the different skills, such as "Organizational Savvy." So, the individual didn't have to define each skill themselves.

Armstrong: There might be 5 or so questions related to each category and one explanatory sentence beyond the skill to explain what each skill meant.

Agouris: In my previous institution administrators were assessed annually by the faculty and the results were posted publicly. If you have other ideas on how to do a review of the provost position, please share.

Armstrong: The president has put forth this model for executive positions. Do you feel this tool is informative? Should it be augmented to make it more informative for the people involved?

Agouris: Yes. I think there may be better ways and I want to give an opportunity for the president to see it implemented for others and then we come together after a year to see how it goes. I'm not discounting this tool but maybe there are better ways or additional ways.

Rasmussen: Without a context for these skills, it is difficult to say what it means.

Vice-president Swan stated that he conducts this kind of research. He then gave his personal take on the matrix presented.

Agouris: John and David did a survey of the faculty as well.

The provost then described the summarized results of the faculty survey and President Rowe's thoughts on the results.

Gilmour: Thank you for sharing this with us.

Agouris: Is there a better way to do this?

Talbot: Having participated in it for another person, I found it valuable for someone I work closely with.

Stump: Do we have a sense of the different types of models that other places use?

Agouris: I do not. My previous institution the faculty senate would circulate a survey, results were tabulated and posted. I'm not certain this is the best way.

4. Report by Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

In the interest of time, President Gilmour moved to the next item on the agenda.

5. Interim report from the CDS steering committee, David Yalof

Yalof: I'm co-chair of the committee with Suzanne Raitt, Interim Dean of A&S. There is a long charge and it is available on the website. One main components of the charge one main component of the charge is to look at different models of how one could create a school of computer and data science and to take into account everyone's ideas about this in the community.

We've met with 50 groups of faculty, meet with 100 faculty individually, met with some student groups and more are on the schedule. Met with staff and we have meetings scheduled with alumni.

We are not charged with recommending or not, but rather to lay out options, pros and cons, and then hand that over to the decision makers.

It's been a successful process. The report from the steering committee will be given to the Provost in May.

One of the points from the Town Hall – it is very important that we, those who came to the town hall, feel listened to and heard. It's true that not everyone agrees, but are all views represented and listened to on the committee.

As we said last time, we are willing to continue to come to FA meeting to give updates. We won't be able to give an interim report. We didn't want to start writing a report before we had listened to everyone.

I give the Provost a great deal of credit, within the broad parameters of looking at a school, she has told us to no limit ourselves in any way when considering all models.

Gilmour: Can you begin by talking about the different models?

Yalof: We have examined the different models of schools here and at other universities along with financial structures. We also talked at length with the business school. And have researched big, small, and moderate sized institutions. You could have a graduate school only model, or a direct admit model for undergraduates (we don't have that right now at W&M), or it could be something in between with a school within A&S. Suzanne's subcommittee is focused on the impacts of the different models on Arts & Sciences. Part of the question is how many models should we consider? Right now, we are focusing on how many different models there are.

Agouris: We need to know the advantages and disadvantages is in relation to what we do here. How can we identify advantages and disadvantages if we are not clear on what we already do here. We need to use the current situation as the guidance of whether there are advantages and disadvantages of the various models.

Yalof: That guides almost everything we do. This would be different if we were at any other institution. And this is why this is important to have members on the committee with years of experience at W&M.

Gilmour: Have you worked on deciding what constitutes 'data science' in this new model?

Yalof: There is a data science unit in computer science. We also met with other people who describe themselves as data scientists and they have a different vision than those within the unit. We've also spoken with people within CAMS who again have a different view of data science. Part of what we are trying to do is to no pre-judge but to let all the views in.

Agouris: Since data science is part of computer science what difference does it make?

Yalof: It may not be a difference.

Agouris: We tend to focus on a small part of this, data science. Here we are talking about beyond data science, like computer science and other departments. How do we empower computer science and other departments with similar emphasis on graduate education?

Gilmour: Am I correct that data science is a tiny part of the overall enterprise?

Agouris: Yes.

Gilmour: I have to say that I disagree that the data science is a tiny part of this. The data science program is an interdisciplinary program that serves teaching and research interests across A&S. Many are concerned about what happens to this interdisciplinary program if it is not longer in A&S.

Agouris: We have decided that this is part of computer science. What will be the big change?

Gilmour: One example: in the proposal, it indicated that faculty within the school would have sole voting rights. Others with joint appointments wouldn't have voting rights. That means that other people will be running this and interest of other areas will be neglected.

Agouris: Data science as a program has the right to determine what they are going to be. I know that there are departments, such as government, that care very much about how data science works.

Stump: Whenever we talk about expressing our opinions, I appreciate that you are so willing to listen. I feel like I will have a better sense of what to say when I have a model to respond to. When will the faculty be presented with a model or models in order to respond to them?

Yalof: A steering committee is trying to frame the issues and make it something that is constructive.

Levesque: Surely you could have archetypes. When will we see that?

Yalof: We haven't started writing it yet because we are still listening. We have to digest all of this feedback. May 31st is our deadline. We want to digest every comment. We have started thinking about outlines, we haven't started writing.

Wilson: To go back to the point about the discord about data science. I think part of what keeps happening in this discussion, as I see it, there are at least three different ways the phrase data science keeps getting used. One is the field, one is the current program, and one is a heading for a potential new entity. It has become shorthand for the new thing. I think that has caused us to have the same discussions in multiple different ways. We're not always talking about the same thing.

Talbot: Given that all these other universities (ODU, UVA, etc) have schools of data science. How does that position us regarding SCHEV?

Yalof: SCHEV I thought was interesting in that they have a focus on the students. They'll be looking for a carefully designed proposal, not our steering committee report.

Chason: When you're thinking of models to discuss. Is one model whatever we are doing right now?

Yalof: I think the position taken by the committee is that we are discussing models for schools. There are some models that change things not that much and some that change things a lot.

Chason: All models have a school then.

Yalof: We didn't want to go down a rabbit hole of institutes, centers, etc. but to specifically use a school model.

Chason: When you're evaluating advantages and disadvantages of different models, it supposes that there is some overriding goal. Is there some overriding goal?

Yalof: W&M has a mission and that is obviously a strong goal and I don't think our goals are different from those of the institution.

Agouris: This was brought forward by the concerns and needs of certain members of our faculty. The goal is to address their concerns.

Gilmour: I want to have a discussion as to what we should do as a group. Should we, as Faculty Assembly, be trying to make a statement on the idea of a new entity and new school?

Agouris: We need to be careful about setting a precedent on how new things happen at W&M. What is the role of Faculty Assembly as we grow and change?

Chason: I think it is fruitful for Faculty Assembly to consider our role here. But I would be cautious about making a statement before the committee is done with its work. It is hard to do a significant lift like that in half a semester.

Sher: I want to agree. I don't see what the value would be in coming up with a statement or something.

Yalof: We would be happy to have a listening session with the Faculty Assembly specifically. That is what we invite everyone to do to provide input.

Meyers: It states in the Faculty Assembly Constitution that the Faculty Assembly shall assess the impact of proposed programs and changes in existing programs on existing programs.

Gilmour: We should wait for the steering committee report to come out and then have a meeting to discuss next steps for Faculty Assembly involvement.

Yalof: The report will not have a proposal.

Agouris: But I think it would be beneficial.

Gilmour: Our job is to advise the president and the provost on matters that impact the entire university. This is clearly one such matter.

Chesson: This seems to be squarely within the purview of the FA.

6. Other Business

None.

7. Adjourn

Sher moved to adjourn the meeting and Dalglish seconded. President Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 5:04 pm.

Prepared by Harmony Dalglish