



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes Sept 13, 2022

BOV Board Room and via Zoom <https://cwm.zoom.us/j/9421512462>
3:30 pm

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

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

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

1. Call to Order

President Gilmour called the meeting to order at 3:52 pm after the fire alarm stopped.

2. Approval of the minutes for the May and June meetings.

Smirni move to approve the minutes from May and June.

Baily seconded.

Approved by unanimous vote.

3. Provost's remarks

The Provost was unable to join us for this meeting.

4. Report from Faculty Assembly president, John Gilmour

President Gilmour welcomed the assembly to a new academic year.

5. Election of Committee Chairs for 2022-2023

Rasmussen: can you remind us of the committees?

Gilmour: COPAR and the Executive committee both have to be balanced so that there is one member per school on those committee. Academic Affairs and Faculty affairs are the other two committees. I sent assignments via email and these can be adjusted if someone wishes.

COPAR’s mission is spelled out in the bylaws. It is to monitor university budget and receive briefings on the university budget.

Anne Rasmussen was elected to chair the Faculty Affairs committee last May.
 Betsey Talbot has agreed to run for Academic Affairs.
 Cathy Forestell has agreed to run for chair of COPAR.

Sher moved to vote on Talbot as chair of Academic Affairs committee and Forestell as chair of COPAR.

Evgenia seconded.

The motions passed unanimously.

6. Appointment of Committees

Committee membership is as follows:

COPAR	Academic Affairs	Faculty Affairs	Executive Committee
Cathy Forestell, Chair	Betsy Talbott, Chair	Anne Rasmussen, Chair	John Gilmour, Chair
Ayfer Stump	Marc Sher	Marc Sher	Scot Swan
Evgenia Smirni	James Dwyer	Erin Hendrickson	Cathy Forestell
Cathy Levesque	Cathy Levesque	Randi Rashkover	Anne Rasmussen
Chuck Bailey	Randi Rashkover	Evgenia Smirni	Betsy Talbott
Marjy Friedrichs	Tonya Boone	Nick Popper	Marjy Friedrichs
Tonya Boone	Mark Brush/Rob Latour	Marjy Friedrichs	James Dwyer
Erin Hendrickson	Nick Popper	Scot Swan	Brett Wilson
Denise Johnson	Denise Johnson	Ayfer Stump	Harmony Dalglish
Brett Wilson	Harmony Dalglish	Mark Brush/Rob Latour	Chuck Bailey

7. New review process for senior administrators

Gilmour - A number of people have expressed concern that there was no third year review of the Provost. I have found out that there is a review underway, with a new process that would involve a consultant company and more limited faculty involvement. Last April this new process was adopted. I spoke with President Rowe about this at length last Friday.

I can provide an overview of the previous process as I served on one such review committee for a previous Provost. The old process centered on an advisory committee of faculty appointed by the president, surveys and interviews. President Rowe was unhappy with this process; she thought it didn’t do a good job and it was overly ad hoc. The ad hoc criticism rings true, our committee had zero guidance. We followed the Dean’s advice who had been on a previous committee. Second, in the case of one review, there was concern that the committee didn’t obtain candid feedback and that the committee missed things. Perhaps because there was fear of repercussion and remarks not being kept confidential.

This concern led to a new process centered on a private consultant company, Korn Ferry. They use a tool, something like a rubric, for reviewing. This instrument will be sent to 30 people, 10 whom are faculty. Past Faculty Assembly Presidents have been included who have worked with the Provost.

Armstrong – So there will be not broad data collection?

Gilmour – No it doesn't seem so. The president seemed surprised that there was a survey last time. This is troubling on many levels.

Levesque - Who appointed Korn Ferry?

Gilmour – The President did.

Armstrong – Do we know who chose the 10 faculty? This is one way the Faculty Assembly could have input is to either suggest who the ten faculty should be or to request that the number be larger than 10.

Dagleish then asked for clarity on the number of people surveyed; 30 or 10?

Gilmour – 30 people total; 10 faculty

Evgenia – What process was used with Provost Hallaran?

Gilmour – Hallaran was reviewed under the past policy. There are a number of issues: first what do we think of the process?

Swan – the instrument itself has a lot of good dimensions. You mentioned that when you participated it would be helpful to have a detailed instrument so this seems an improvement.

Levesque – I'm concerned with the low number of faculty involved - 10; how many representatives would A&S have; 2? Is that representative?

Talbot – This is why a faculty survey is so important.

Swan – Why couldn't everyone on faculty assembly complete a survey.

Talbot – Is the survey out the question?

Gilmour – We can ask. Talking to the Faculty Assembly President is not the same as talking to the Assembly.

Armstrong – Especially after the decision has already been made.

Gilmour – There are advantages to this approach as the advisory committee is time consuming. So this will save faculty time. It costs \$10,000 for the company to review 3 administrators. Rowe's view is that this more than compensates for faculty time.

Bailey – My sense has been is that as we've hired additional administrators over the last few years we've reduced the number of pathways for faculty involvement. This seems to go hand in glove with this attrition against shared governance and community. On balance, I don't have a problem with a consulting firm doing this I think the President has a point on saving faculty time. But it's removing faculty voices from the process almost entirely.

Forestell - There is nothing stopping us from doing our own survey and submitting the results to the President.

Gilmour – There are things that we can do about it now. We can ask for a survey to be done and we can ask for increased faculty involvement beyond 10.

Dwyer – I would go this route first, rather than expending energy on doing the survey ourselves.

Armstrong – I'm concerned that if we ask them to look at a lot more survey data, the company will say it is outside the scope of the contract.

Gilmour – But we can ask for broader participation by the faculty.

Levesque - Who is participating now?

Armstrong – Deans, direct reports of the Provost, past presidents of Faculty Assembly and 10 faculty total.

Sher – Perhaps we say that we want broader input from the faculty and we're willing to submit names, if asked.

Gilmour – That's what I am going to do.

Armstrong – Another suggestion – can you ask how the 10 faculty were selected? And in the future, FA would like input on these selections.

8. Planning for the seven priority letters

Gilmour – Last year FA adopted 6 of 7 priority letters. Sher, can you give us an update on the remaining priority letter concerning dual careers?

Sher – Yes. Burke has taken over in the Provost office. We're putting together a meeting in the next month for 8 or 9 HR directors across institutions on the peninsula. The basic idea is that every job advertisement will include, "William & Mary is a member of the Tidewater Dual Career Consortium" and a website. We're hoping to get as many as 10 schools involved. And if

someone getting an offer wishes to, their partner's CV could be circulated among the consortium.

Gilmour - Is there a motion to accept the priority letter on Dual Careers?

Evgenia moved to accept the priority letter.

Levesque seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Gilmour – Excellent. Now, what shall we do with them?

Swan – Yes, all this information and work has been done. Let's be consistent on what we've been working on and communicating this and push these ideas towards action. I view these as working documents.

Gilmour – We need to think of achievable outcomes. What do we want to have happen and how do we move it forward. In my meeting with President Rowe, regarding the tuition benefit, she told me that we should bring her a business plan.

Armstrong – Re the SSRL. Two years ago Peggy was discussing making changes. We put together the report in response to this. I think it is important to get it into every one of the Academic Dean's hands and to Peggy and the new dean of A&S. It was a defensive statement. To make the argument in favor of our SSRL program in case they want to make changes.

Rasmussen – We want the faculty to know that these are the priorities of the Assembly and to know about the work that we've done. Perhaps the next thing is to ask for some time at the FAS or Faculty meeting to communicate that these documents exist.

Stump – as a new member of FA how can I communicate these priorities to my department?

Gilmour – One strategy would be to ask for time at the FAS meeting and at other faculties as well. In addition, there's nothing from stopping individual members from talking directly to your faculties as well.

9. What should we do this year?

Smirni – A topic I would like to discuss is that W&M slipped in ranking to 41. A second is the report for Phi Beta Kappa – there are pages of people who meet the grade bar for PBK. To me it seems like proof of grade inflation. I'm not sure this is the right body but I'm expressing my concern. Lastly, our webpages at W&M are terrible. I cannot do a good PR of what my faculty is doing because I'm forced into the specific format that actually hides our excellent achievements. OK that is my laundry list.

Swan – I would agree especially on the first one. One issue is that our faculty:student ratio is now 1:13 from 1:12.

Stump – I am getting more and more transfer students and see a huge disparity in terms of their preparation. Is this an issue that should be discussed further?

Bailey – I agree I is an issue but where to discuss these issues?

Gilmour – I'm going to send out a survey to everyone and ask everyone to rank 1-7 and I will organize task forces using those preferences.

Dwyer – I suggest a survey for new issues as well. Where people can alert us to new priorities.

Bailey – I would throw out there that our ability to work with auxiliary services has become more difficult: things like HR, procurement, has gotten more difficult for faculty. There are more steps that take more and more time for a lower quality result.

Gilmour – let's think about this issue and think about what we want to ask. The more specific areas we can be the better.

Swan – I'd like to raise the issue about our assumptions about shared governance.

Smirni – In all fairness can we acknowledge that shared governance can slow things down. We risk always being seen as constant complainers. Not everything can come from shared governance – it will be death by committee.

There was continued discussion about the role of shared governance and concern of when and how to best use it.

Gilmour - I'll be meeting with Peggy this week and am going to ask her to begin each meeting with a short briefing of goings on around campus. I am hopeful she will be receptive to this.

10. Other Business

Swan passed out a proposal for how we might want to think about project management on these priorities.

11. Adjourn

Sher moved to adjourn the meeting.

Smirni seconded.

Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 5:01 pm

Prepared by Harmony Dalglish