

**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**April 11, 2023**  
**3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Washington Hall 201 and Zoom**

**I. Approval of minutes from meetings on February 14, 2023 and March 7, 2023**

February 14 (Special Meeting of the FAS to discuss ToRFF):

<https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20230214.pdf>

March 7: <https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20230307.pdf>

Minutes are approved by unanimous consent

**II. Report from the Dean (Suzanne Raitt)**

- The Dean's end of year reception, including recognition of those who are retiring will be held May 2. It will be directly after the last FAS meeting held outside Ewell Hall, weather permitting or inside if the weather is disagreeable.
- Several award recipients are commended. Sue Peterson (GOVT) has been awarded the Faculty Governance Award. Drew La Mar (BIOL), Iyabo Osiapem (LING) and Kristin Wustholz (CHEM) are recipients of the A&S Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence. Alex Joosse (PUBP) is congratulated for receiving the Graduate Faculty Mentoring Award.
- The Provost is currently giving a presentation on faculty productivity to Faculty Assembly and will repeat it for the BOV soon.
- The BOV is considering a tuition increase. Faculty are encouraged to view BOV meeting agenda on the website and attend meetings in the Business School.
- The A&S hiring initiative was rigorous this year due to the low number of hires last year. Faculty worked hard and made excellent choices in the hires. Requests for next year have been received in both TTE and NTE categories. Hiring is not expected to be as robust next year due to budgetary constraints.
- The Computing, Data Science, and Applied Science Initiative (CDSAS) continues to be of interest to the faculty, who submitted many responses to the latest survey and online feedback forms. While some respondents prefer no new unit at all, the majority endorsed interdisciplinary and collaborative opportunities for faculty, and to make sure the new unit is as open as other departments are to the exchange of ideas. The steering committee is exploring different potential features, including whether it should be a graduate or undergraduate unit, be inside or outside of A&S, should it directly admit undergraduate students, or continue to apply as they do now, undeclared, in Arts & Sciences. To that end, FAS will see another survey tomorrow evening to gauge responses to different models and features. Suzanne encourages FAS to provide feedback.
  - Suzanne Hagedorn asks if the steering committee's path presumes a new unit. The Dean notes the committee's charge, available on the website, is very broad, and is to explore and assess different models, so no particular path is presumed. The committee's report will be delivered to the Provost by May 31. Some faculty have asked if faculty response to the report will be presented to the Provost, but there's no additional information available on the process.

### III. Teaching Faculty Framework (Suzanne Raitt)

- The Teaching or Research Faculty Framework document underwent some edits by the Personnel Policy Committee (PPC) in December, 2022, then back to FAS for approval on 2/14/23. The PPC is advisory to the Provost and President. The Provost, Dean, and President met to discuss the framework. The President affirmed her support for the framework but made additional changes, including details on the process for renewal and promotion. In the original framework, renewal and promotion was spelled out at the departmental and program level. The President asked the document be broken into smaller sections which can be attached to contracts and asked that a standard renewal and promotion process be developed by June 1, 2023. Suzanne will ask for an extension of that date to have deeper conversations with the FAS about developing standards for promotion at the unit level, or whether teaching as a whole is something that has common principles across all units, and as such, one set of standards could be developed at the A&S level for everyone. Suzanne hopes the President will agree to the extension because no one will be getting promotions for the next few years, as they will occur at the time of the implementation of the framework. Everyone who will get a new contract will have contracts of more than one year except for visiting assistant professors, who are here for one year and not eligible for promotion.
- Following the Town Hall on the ToRFF last Monday, the document was tweaked some more with the help from Sherri Powers and Kathy Morgan, to make sure the logistical procedures are doable. It's now being reviewed by Carrie Nee (university counsel) and Human Resources. CCPD has suggested not spending much time on the document because university counsel may change something. There's little new or controversial. Suzanne then walks FAS through the changes made following the Town Hall and currently being examined by university counsel. Suzanne thanks everyone for their patience and hard work and will be able to send out contracts by the end of May or June.
- Suzanne gives a run down on the changes:
  - The amount of time people will have to devote to service has changed. The President felt that asking assistant teaching professors to spend a lot of time on service was too much given how hard it is to get one's teaching off the ground. Assistant teaching professors will devote 5% of their time on service (2 h/week), and notes pre-major and major advising counts as service. Associate teaching professors devote 10% of the time on service or 4 h/week. Full teaching professors devote 20% of their time on service, approximately 8 h/week, and we added a bullet point about teaching overloads and being compensated for that.
  - As before, teaching faculty may not serve on committees overseeing TE personnel issues like retention, promotion, and tenure. Teaching faculty may participate in, but not vote on, searches for the tenure and tenure eligible faculty and they may participate in merit reviews of TTE faculty.
  - Everything about research faculty has been removed from the document, as well as the portions on teaching faculty on external grants requesting lower teaching loads. Determinations like this can be made on a case-by-case basis; there will be very few people who actually need to do that.

- For teaching faculty on two-year renewable contracts, notification of non-renewal, or the issuance of a new contract will occur no later than the fifteenth day of December in the second year of that 2 year contract. For teaching faculty on renewable contracts of 3 or more years in length, notification of non renewal, or the issuance of a new legally binding contract will occur no later than June 30 of the penultimate year of the contract, so they will know a year in advance if their contract is not going to be renewed beyond the end of that next year. Or they will have in hand a contract that will take them for the full extent of your next contract.
- The rolling nature of the contract is not in the document anymore. The advantage of that is that ToR will still have a year's notice of what's going on, and won't lose a year of the contract
- There is also a new list of promotional processes and criteria for renewal
- Christy Porter comments on the change made to the current document prohibiting ToR faculty to vote on tenure hires. Although ToR faculty voting on TTE hires is currently against the Faculty Handbook, the Handbook can be changed. Suzanne suggests that requests for changes to the Handbook be proposed to Assembly.
- Leslie Cochrane asks about an appendix formally approved by FAS with 95% of the vote, and at the Town Hall on Monday, it was suggested that the appendix be placed in a visible website as guidance on what counts as service. Suzanne agrees that it will be helpful on a website.
- Pieter Piers asks if the research faculty policies have been removed and expresses concern that they no longer have a community. Suzanne confirms that research faculty have been removed from this document but will get a separate document.
- Mike Jabbur asks for updates on promoting NTE faculty before the framework goes into effect as discussed at CCPD. Suzanne asked university counsel if promotions for NTE faculty could be considered a reclassification rather than a promotion, and if so, could the promotion process be avoided? Carrie Nee is out and has not given direction on that. Emily Wilcox notes that some units were told to continue the current promotions for their NTEs, but Suzanne says they should hold off, especially if they haven't started so Carrie can confirm.
- Suzanne Hagedorn asks if the Dean's office has heard anything about the report from Huron Consulting? Suzanne says it hasn't been finalized but she has been in meetings about it. Suzanne Hagedorn asks whether the BOV is expected to raise tuition. The Dean notes that we don't have a state budget yet, so what the BOV does is set a budget pending adjustment for management.
- The Dean ends her report by saying in all of the competing state budgets there are raises for State employees. We are operating on the assumption that there'll be a 7% average pool. It's up to the University to decide how that core is divided up: a percentage across the board, cost of living, percentage for merit, a percentage for equity and market adjustments. She is 90% certain by the end of next year. The bad news is that there is a very lean budget next year, for other reasons.

#### **IV. Report from the International Studies Advisory Committee (Victoria Costa)**

- Victoria announces the names of new faculty taking part in the International Studies Advisory Committee and the ex officio partners, and reiterates ISAC's mission, to provide guidance to FAS initiatives in International Studies. She lays out the four main functions of the ISAC: supporting internationalization of the curriculum, promoting liability and risk management practices in international faculty student initiatives, oversight of undergraduate study abroad programs administered by the Reeves Center, and advising the Dean and the faculty on international priorities in A&S.
- After a 2 year hiatus, faculty-led study abroad programs resumed in January, 2022, with 680 undergraduate participants. In fall, 2021, Beijing Normal University semester program was made available to students unable to return to the US. The role of the Project Global Officer is a federally funded ROTC program for critical language immersion. The Chinese program held in Taiwan and the Russian program originally slated to be held in Lithuania had to be pivoted to campus due to conflict in the Ukraine.
- Pilot program approvals: the Muscat and Oman (winter) and the La Plata Argentina field research in human rights programs (winter) were successfully renewed, and new approvals for 2022 and 2023 include Ecuador (summer), Germany (winter), the Netherlands (summer), as well as Brussels, Belgium and Paris (embedded).

**V. Report from the Committee on Academic Status (Doug Young)**

- The CAS committee reviewed 809 CAS petitions in the 2021-22 school year. CAS petitions included requests for an appeal of a previous CAS decision, a late add, late drop and late withdrawal, medical underload, over and underloads, and a reinstatement to good standing.
- Doug Young asks the faculty to promptly fill out requests for faculty statements with as much information as can be provided. He also asked faculty to encourage students to continue attending class when petitioning for a withdrawal or a drop. Some changes coming to CAS and the faculty should prepare for some adjustments and transitions.

**VI. Nominations & Elections (Pieter Peers)**

Pieter announces the slates of nominees for positions. There are no nominees from the floor.

- Committee on Nominations and Elections- Area I
  - Erin Webster (English)
  - Sibel Zandi-Sayek (Art & Art History)
- Committee on Nominations and Elections – Area II
  - Maria Galmarini (History)
  - Nate Throckmorton (Economics)
- Committee on Nominations and Elections– Area III
  - Michael Kordosky (Physics)
  - Helen Murphy (Biology)
- Committee on Degrees (COD) – Any Area
  - Catherine Levesque (Art History)
  - Len Neighbors (TSD)
- Faculty Hearing Committee (FHC) – Area II
  - Dan Maliniak (Government)

- Nate Throckmorton (Economics)
- f. Faculty Compensation Board (FCB) – Any Area
  - Andrew Tobolowsky (Religious Studies)
  - Anh Ninh (Mathematics)

**VII. Discussion on annual merit guidelines (Peter McHenry)**

- After the last discussion on merit guidelines in March’s FAS meeting, edits were made in a new version. Peter distributed this via e-mail and welcomes concerns or suggestions.
- Departments will set their own merit review standards. FAS is developing guidelines within which departments or programs will follow, hoping to encourage best practices, such as:
  - Including participation of multiple faculty members in the merit review with program directors and department chairs leading the process.
  - To avoid unattributed scoring, participation should not be anonymous.
  - Annual reporting to the department or program faculty on aggregate evaluation results is important, as are transparency mechanisms and feedback to faculty on their evaluations and avenues for improvement.
  - The consensus is that there should be a timely appeal process, and clear guidelines for evaluation of performance when a faculty member has been on leave for part or all of the year under review, so they are not advantaged or disadvantaged during merit review for that period.
  - There should be a distribution of scores on a scale from 0 to 15 that reflects the range of faculty accomplishment. The entire range would not need to be used, but if two annual reports reflect substantially different levels of accomplishment, then those two annual reports should receive different scores.
  - Departments and programs should reserve the maximum score for outstanding accomplishment.
- Peter asks Mark Sher to repeat his recommendation presented in FAC which changes the last sentence on #2 of the merit review guidelines.
  - Mark’s recommendation is that while the Merit Review Committee may not be anonymous, it can take into consideration anonymous information, such as from anonymous course evaluation.
- Shantá Hinton asks who decides best practices, because as the only Black person in the room, there’s only one of her. From her perspective, she prefers one person to deal with merit review, not multiple, in case there's implicit unconscious biases. She offers evidence about this topic which is a huge conversation in academia. She has had many conversations with her department.
  - Peter responds with thanks that Shanta mentioned it and asks her share information on that.
  - Liz Allison in Biology notes that as a department, they’ve spent a great deal of time having deep conversations about the process, and in biology the Chair does the evaluation. But if people are unhappy with their evaluation, they can go to our personnel committee. They got some pushback from the previous Dean. Requiring in the merit procedures inclusion of at least one other faculty member is potentially ill-advised, and departments need to really think carefully because one size doesn't fit all. Biology compiled a lot

of information about why this might not be best practice. Shantá adds that NSF and NIH are aware of the problems in academia and #2 in the list is not a best practice. Liz offers a relevant book on the topic. A department should regularly reapprove or reaffirm their process.

- Suzanne Hagedorn wonders if the chairs and program directors are aware of the highly varied procedures between departments or if they've discussed it? Peter isn't aware that CCPD discussed this specific idea and there is a great deal of variety.

**VIII. Report from the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (Tuska Benes)**

- Since the last FAS meeting CCPD has met twice as a regular group. The first meeting was without the Dean on March 23rd and the second was with the Dean on April 6th. CCPD has also been involved in the on-campus interviews for the three candidates for the position of A&S Dean.
- CCPD responded to the CDSAS initiative. They came to a majority consensus on 6 principles forwarded to the steering committee. One of them is a concern that A&S strategic planning transpire alongside planning of a new unit in CDSAS, especially if this transition is to represent an opportunity for innovation and growth for other areas in A&S. Tuska skips the other 5 points due to time constraints.
- A second issue addressed was the morale and concerns of administrative staff within A&S, including concerns around low salaries and cost of living in Williamsburg as well as limited pathways for career advancement. They also discussed an oppressive workload and high turnover and training issues. Tuska notes that they have some concrete suggestions that they are working on.

**IX. Report from the Faculty Assembly (Cathy Levesque)**

- FA met with the Provost who discussed her review, asked for minimal feedback and thanked everyone who had taken part in the process of her review.
- They also spoke with David Yalof, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and co-chair of the CDSAS steering committee. He discussed the ongoing process for the potential new school.

**X. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned by unanimous consent