

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
October 4, 2022
3:30 – 5:00 pm
Minutes

- I. Discussion with Provost Peggy Agouris
 - A. Peter McHenry (Chair of FAS) welcomes Provost Agouris to discuss with faculty on the recent computing and data science initiative. Peter asks questions sent to FAC by faculty before the meeting to make good use of time.
 1. Peter asks why exploration on this initiative presented to the BOV and in a 9/22/2022 W&M news story before the faculty and academic Deans were informed?
 - a. Provost thanks FAS for opportunity to answer questions. She feels it's been an open process, and W&M has been looking for way to support computing, data science, and engineering for some time. Students are interested and the relevant programs and departments have been included.
 - b. During a September meeting, the BOV was provided the opportunity to begin a conversation about a possible multi-year timeline and the viability or such a plan.
 - c. W&M doesn't currently have a process but is currently establishing the correct process to consider this initiative.
 2. Peter asks how and when was it decided that engineering would no longer be part of William and Mary's plans? And why or when was it decided to pursue computing and data?
 - a. Provost explains there are many external resources available to many institutions to secure funding for these fields. One example is the Commonwealth's \$2 billion Tech Talent Fund. Smaller institutions (Radford, ODU, CNU) have been able to secure this type of funding and W&M has been less able to take advantage of the opportunities available.
 - b. Engineering isn't being included because W&M doesn't have the same expertise, core competencies or resources for engineering as other Virginia institutions. This avoid burdening resources from other areas.
 - c. W&M does have core competencies in computing and data sciences. Conversations to include engineering may be had in the future, but she feels it best to leave engineering out so as not to burden other University areas
 3. Peter asks about market research for a computing and data science entity, what evidence is there for the demand for this type of entity? Was there any consulting has been done to assess this proposal?
 - a. Provost answers that students, other state institutions, and national trends all show computing and data science interest and growth. We need to be part of this trend.
 - b. The usual consulting partners have assessed before she arrived and in the last year to determine the appetite for these programs at W&M. Their analysis confirms the trends.
 4. Peter asks how decisions will be made regarding which faculty would populate the computing and data, science entity, and which wouldn't.

- a. Provost says we are just at the beginning of this conversation and she doesn't want to be the person to dictate how the process will develop.
 - b. She agrees this it is critical to develop something that will lift everyone, not just certain faculty from certain areas. This is why all five Deans have been included in discussions as this continues to unfold.
 - c. The deans are enthusiastically participating understanding that we are at the beginning and we don't even know whether it's going to be a separate thing. We know is that there is need, demand, and opportunity, and that would affect multiple areas of our university with a business school being enthusiastic.
 5. Peter asks what the timeline is for faculty to have an opportunity to see more of the details of this plan so they can provide feedback to the decision makers.
 - a. Provost explains there are currently three programs already discussing this with the leaders of their departments to think of how this could make sense for them and how they envision this.
 - b. That information will be passed to Deans, the Vice Provost for Research and Registrar, who will consider the initiative.
 - c. At that point, discussion will move to Faculty Assembly.
 6. Peter asks which 3 core departments are currently involved.
 - a. Provost notes data, computer and applied science, which has a PhD program, critical to focusing on graduate education.
- B. Peter moves to content questions
1. Peter asks how a new school entity would advance the W&M mission of comprehensive, integrated liberal arts & sciences education for all undergraduates, and if students working with data science across A&S would be disadvantaged by siloing of computer and data science in one entity.
 - a. Provost says it will not be a disadvantage because W&M already has degrees in place and more seats will be available for classes in computer and data courses, as well as science and other courses.
 2. She expects to see much more growth in both undergraduate and graduate education.
 3. Peter asks what can be accomplished with a new school that isn't currently being accomplished.
 - a. Provost says one of the biggest things will be putting W&M on the map as a significant producer of graduates with knowledge in those areas.
 - b. W&M was denied support from Tech Talent because we are viewed as an undergraduate institution, not one with traditional strength in data and computing.
 - c. The program could change how W&M is viewed in relation to those areas of study. She boils her thoughts down to the analogy of growing the pie, not making the slices of the pie smaller.
 4. Peter asks about the consequences of pulling out some of the most productive research departments from A&S.
 - a. The Provost hopes this will initiate new lines of research and scholarship production that will enable growth

- II. Approval of minutes from meeting on September 6, 2022.
 - 1. JC Poutsma motions to approve the minutes from the September FAS meeting. Motion is seconded by Dean Donoghue Velleca.
 - 2. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.
- III. A&S Bylaws Amendment (to allow online meetings, explicitly)
 - 1. The current by-laws do not permit meetings to be held via Zoom or teleconference. FAC moves to allow FAS meetings to be held in-person, virtually, or a hybrid of both.
 - 2. There are no objections, and it is so moved by unanimous consent.
- IV. Nominations & Elections (Pieter Peers)
 - 1. Committee on Faculty Awards, Professorships, and Prizes (CFAPP) – Area II – 1 year replacement. Nominees are
 - a. Charles McGovern, American Studies
 - b. Sarah Stafford, Economics
 - 2. There are no new nominations from the floor.
- V. Discussion of Arts & Sciences Teaching or Research Faculty Framework
 - A. Maria asks what the faculty thinks of the plan and timeline and asks what should still be considered.
 - 1. Christy Porter asks about the timing of this, and the speed at which it was released. Maria explains she started working on this in her first year and has continued to work on it since.
 - a. Her motivation in moving this to a vote and working to implement in Fall, 2023 is due to her decision to leave W&M and interest in seeing it implemented at the end of her time here. She recognizes it is a heavy lift and but says if there is objection to the timing, she is happy to turn it over to the new Dean.
 - b. Silvia Tandeciarz acknowledges the time crunch if it's to be implemented before Maria's departure. It is ultimately up to the faculty to decide when this should be implemented.
 - c. Silvia discusses some of the feedback received around language referring to lecturers and senior lecturers, and their dislike of being referred to as "term faculty". As a result, the committee changed the name of the framework.
 - 2. Leah Shaw asks about the 15-20% of time for visiting professors' service requirement. She asks if this is too onerous given they are also applying for permanent employment throughout their time here.
 - a. Mara says NTE run the full spectrum of involvement, with some fully engaging with their students by advising and mentoring, as well as serving on committees. Others, however, who don't and who basically come in, teach their class, and leave. They decided on 15-20% as the maximum to impose, and this would only act as a guideline as it really should be evaluated on an individual basis.
 - b. Silvia adds it is important to recognize faculty who are here on a promotional track and are committed in a different way than TTE faculty, and to allow for a commitment to those who are here as a steppingstone to tenure track positions elsewhere.
 - 3. Paul Manna says the implementation plan looks more like an adoption plan. He suggests the next round of thinking might be how to discern how well this is going as it is being implemented. Maria agrees, and there will be an assessment built in to gage how well it is working.

4. Tuska Benes asks if it's possible to have a phased implementation of the service expectation rather than jump right into the full service load the framework envisions. The Dean likes this idea and feels individual faculty could be given that choice.
 5. Arthur Knight echoes Tuska's thoughts about the service component and adds that some NTE faculty may decide to forego the service component because they "aren't being paid enough". He also agrees with Paul Manna's assessment, and that hard work will need to be put in to set up parameters and contracts. Maria notes there are several avenues for NTE faculty to discuss issues, including their Vice/Assistant Dean, Ombuds, and the TOR Faculty Committee.
 6. Leslie Cochrane adds she is in full support of this draft and notes a tremendous amount of work has gone into it. She also lets the faculty know that the results of a recent survey show the majority of NTE faculty support the service requirements. Leslie then asks where people of different NTE ranks will fit into the new scope.
 - a. Silvia says current senior lecturers will be grandfathered in at the title of Associate Teaching Professor or Full Teaching Professor depending on how recently they were promoted to Sr. Lecturer. Lecturers would come in as an Assistant Teaching Professor.
 - b. Senior Lecturers would not in any case come in as Assistant Teaching Professors, but Associate or Full Professors. Maria adds that compensation increases between NTE and TTE faculty will be similarly proportioned.
 7. Mike Tierney asks what the percentage breakdown of research faculty is, and what is the vision behind creating research faculty positions.
 - a. Maria notes there are only a small percentage of research faculty; they are largely in departments with a lot of grant funding.
 - b. She says it is her intention, as well as that of the President and Provost, to have much more TOR research faculty who are externally focused.
 - c. She notes there has also been a hybrid version included, so that anyone who can buy themselves out of teaching so they can focus on research may do so.
 8. Jim Deverick shares his concerns about the possibility of someone on a 3-5 year contract who gets renewed for a 2 year contract that no longer rolls over.
 - a. Silvia feels this was an unintentional oversight, and she and the committee will go back and look at the language.
 - b. She confirms the 3-5 year contract is intended to roll over.
- B. Maria describes next steps for Teaching and Research Faculty Framework.
1. At the conclusion of this meeting, she will revisit the document with Silvia and her team and send a poll to lecturers and senior lecturers to gauge support for the framework.
 2. If support is in the majority, it will move to a vote in the November FAS meeting.
 3. If it passes, Maria will work with PPC and the FAC to make sure the language amending current titles is entered into the A&S manual and Faculty Handbook.
 4. In February or March, a consultative process with an ad hoc committee with the TOR committee would begin.
- VI. Maria calls for a motion to adjourn. David Armstrong makes the motion, seconded by JC Poutsma. The October FAS meeting is adjourned by unanimous consent.