

Agenda
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
May 2, 2023
3:30 – 5:00 pm
Washington Hall 201 and Zoom

I. Approval of minutes from meetings on April 11, 2023

- Minutes are approved by unanimous consent.

II. Report from the Dean (Suzanne Raitt)

- Dean Raitt reports her vision for the next few years, including making sure the faculty feels their voices are heard and valued. Although there currently isn't a strategic vision in place for Arts & Sciences, she wants to have a robust and inclusive, faculty-driven discussion about the direction A&S is going operationally and academically. She uses the new CDSAS entity as an example including Arts & Sciences faculty and units most directly affected.
- The Provost's office will fund a consultant to conduct a zero-sum budgeting exercise in A&S and the rest of the university to determine if the current budget allocation is sufficient to meet the operational needs of Arts & Sciences.
- The Dean clarifies her email sent last night about ChatGPT, noting that students are struggling. She asks faculty to be aware of the challenges with ChatGPT and encourages them to work with Honor Council, Chairs, Assistant Deans, the Library, and to refer to the AI Working Group suggestions sent earlier this year to address any concerns. Faculty are reminded of the Tack lecture on AI by Dan Runfola tonight.
- Faculty are invited to attend the party outside Ewell directly after this meeting.
- The Teaching Faculty Framework (TFF) is ready to go. Placement notices will be going out this week, and the Dean thanks everyone for their input and work on this initiative. Contracts will be out by the end of June.
- The Computing, Data Science, and Applied Science (CDSAS) steering committee has drafted a report that will be shared with the Provost on May 31 and with faculty shortly thereafter. Faculty may provide feedback then which will be shared with the Provost by the end of June. The Provost will attend the September FAS meeting to share her thoughts and ask for feedback and further suggestions. Then she'll work with Faculty Assembly on the model that emerges. Nothing will go to BOV before November, or possibly early in the new year. The second survey on the CDSAS has 431 responses so far and closes Thursday. Although data aren't compiled yet, there is relatively more interest in porosity between the CDSAS entity and A&S, permitting double majors, cross-listed courses, and contributions to COLL, and less enthusiasm for direct admissions to the new entity.
- At the April meeting, the BOV raised tuition for the first time in 5 years. The increase is 4.5% for in state and 4.7% out of state. Although there is no state budget yet, all three budgets right now include a 7% salary raise for state employees. W&M funds 2/3 of that raise which will not be entirely offset by the tuition increase.

III. Acknowledgement of retirees (Chairs and Program Directors)

- Chairs and Directors recognize the retirement of Barbette Spaeth, TJ Chang, Laurie Koloski, Jim Whittenburg, Robert Kohl, Carla Buck, Kate Conley, Tomo Kato, Michael Nichols, and Brian Blouet.

IV. Discussion of annual merit guidelines (Faculty Affairs Committee, Peter McHenry)

- Peter presents the FAC's current proposed guidelines for annual merit review processes for tenure track and teaching and research faculty. Since the April FAS meeting, additional faculty suggestions have been incorporated, and it's hoped that a vote on these guidelines can be held in early fall. These guidelines include evaluation criteria reflecting different levels of performance under contracted professional expectations within the unit, and the participation of multiple faculty members in the merit review. Program directors and department chairs will lead the process, but procedures must include at least one other faculty member. Merit review committee members shall not be anonymous.
- FAC also suggests annual reporting on aggregate evaluation results to the department or program faculty, and to have mechanisms in place for transparency and feedback to faculty on evaluations as well as avenues for improvement.
- Peter also notes the FAC met with Assistant Dean Mbure to discuss how DEI values can be infused into the merit review guidelines and welcomes further discussion about what the DEI literature has to say about who does the evaluations.
- FAC also discussed different types of leaves and how they are incorporated into merit reviews. Also included were points about invisible work done by faculty, more details about the appeal process, and how ideas around bias are incorporated into the review process.
- Discussion of proposed merit guidelines:
 - Suzanne answers a question about the current role of teaching faculty in merit processes to say that the new teaching faculty framework permits TF to participate in any process (including merit and tenure eligible reviews of tenure eligible faculty) but may not make personnel decisions for tenured and tenure eligible faculty. This exception is specified in the Handbook's language. She notes the Handbook language may be amended by working with Faculty Assembly, and that the teaching faculty committee will convene soon to discuss A&S merit for TF. Suzanne, reading from the new TF framework, notes that teaching faculty may not have oversight on TTE personnel related issues or serve on committees on TTE personnel related issues, personnel issues. Teaching faculty may participate in but not vote on searches for TTE faculty. They may participate in merit reviews of tenured and tenure eligible faculty. This is being reviewed by University Counsel, HR, and the Provost.
 - A faculty member notes that while the new framework may permit the teaching faculty to participate in merit, the Handbook's prohibition on personnel decisions for tenure or TTE promotion precludes this from happening because tenure and TTE promotion are tied to merit scores. A

different faculty member says that tying merit scores to tenure and TTE promotion is not policy and in some departments merit scores are unrelated to tenure and TTE promotion.

- A faculty member notes the teaching faculty framework should be interpreted as TF voting on TF promotion, but not TTE faculty promotion. Teaching faculty (as well as students) may contribute input but may not vote regarding tenure and TTE faculty promotion. In addition to Handbook language, the reason for this is that teaching faculty can't evaluate the research contributions for tenure eligible faculty but should be able to formally evaluate any faculty member's teaching.
- A concern is raised regarding whether the guidelines address the metrics or statistics well at the A&S level. Collaboration among faculty, raises, tenure, and promotion are all affected by these proposed merit guidelines, especially for junior faculty.
- Another faculty member notes that while the current evaluation system doesn't protect faculty equally, these proposed guidelines make some progress toward protection and transparency.
- Peter encourages faculty to contact FAC with any comments or suggestions they may have on merit guidelines.

V. Nominations & Elections (Pieter Peers)

- International Studies Advisory Committee (ISAC), Area II (Fall 2023-Spring 2024 replacement)
 - Paula Pickering (Government)
 - Joanna Schug (Psychological Sciences)
- Education Policy Committee (EPC), Area II (Fall 2023 replacement)
 - William Fisher (Anthropology)
 - Cathy Forestell (Psychological Sciences)
- Committee on Degrees (COD), Area II (Fall 2023-Spring 2024 replacement)
 - Paul Kieffaber (Psychological Sciences)
 - John Lopresti (Economics)

VI. New Business

- Resolution, response, and discussion regarding faculty roles and process for the CDSAS
 - John McGlennon presents a resolution he recently circulated to FAC and to the faculty ([text](#) below). The goal of the resolution is to clarify the role of the faculty in developing the CDSAS entity in accordance with Section 4 of the A&S Bylaws. This section states FAS is responsible for developing and maintaining new educational programs. This obligation notwithstanding, it's been difficult to provide feedback on the entity, either as individual faculty or in groups. This difficulty is because faculty currently have been asked to comment on a "blank slate," despite not knowing the process or implications such an entity such as allocation of A&S resources and

academic curricula. Therefore, FAS needs opportunities to make recommendations, provide feedback, and evaluate any proposals before the decisions are made.

- John McGlennon moves to vote to approve the resolution. The motion is seconded, and Suzanne asks for discussion.
- In discussion, a faculty member suggests FAS elevate collaboration in the process by discussing the direction of the CDSAS entity over the next FAS meetings.
- Andreas Stathopoulos of Computer Science presents a prepared response ([text](#) below) to the resolution. The response emphasizes the views of the Computer Science Department on the resolution. The response states Computer Science faculty ideas are not being considered despite their work on the CDSAS entity since 2019. The response also reiterates the urgent need for, and benefits of, such an entity, and a lack of specificity regarding concerns about such an entity to date.
- Sarah Stafford addresses FAS to state some faculty have presented specific concerns in the CDSAS process. These concerns are a past lack of process or traction for other proposed programs, and a lack of information on implications for the A&S budget, hiring, and resource allocation. She notes many faculty have asked for this specific information and acknowledges the work the steering committee is doing to provide it. Suzanne affirms that this information will be presented to the faculty as soon as it's available.
- Suzanne Hagedorn addresses FAS to point out that, although they held a forum on the process of developing an entity in December, Faculty Assembly has not held a formal vote on a proposal. Suzanne appreciates that there is faculty discussion now and encourages faculty vote for John's resolution, so faculty discussions continue.
- Greg Conradi Smith addresses the FAS to note the resolution seems to be about a program when we're really talking about a graduate school and not disciplinary units. He suggests clarity on which conversation we are having.
- John McGlennon addresses the FAS to clarify the resolution's goal is support a particular model, but to elevate collaboration in the process and make sure faculty can make an informed discussion.
- Due to the lateness of the hour, a faculty member asks to call the question. The vote to call the question is made by unanimous consent and faculty vote via electronically.
- Ninety-three votes are recorded including 68 votes to approve the resolution, 21 votes against approval, and 4 abstentions. Suzanne will pass the resolution and poll results to the Provost and Vice Provost David Yalof. Faculty are encouraged to continue to share ideas and comments over the summer.

VII. Report for the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (Sarah Stafford)

- Sarah Stafford waives the right to make a report.

VIII. Report from Faculty Assembly (Ayfer Karakaya-Stump)

- At the regular April 18 meeting, the Provost provided Assembly with a preview of the presentation she would show the April Board of Visitors meeting. That presentation focused on faculty performance, included data on faculty productivity, course enrollment numbers, and compared the data with peer institutions. The data show that William & Mary faculty are performing well in terms of productivity.

IX. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee (Peter McHenry)

- Peter McHenry waives the right to make a report.

X. Adjourn

- Meeting is adjourned by unanimous consent.

Text of John McGlennon’s resolution to define the role of FAS in the development of the CDSAS

“Whereas the Faculty of Arts & Sciences recognizes that our interests and prerogatives are significantly affected by any decision on modifying the scale, scope, and structure of the Data science/Computational Science program and whereas faculty and others have devoted significant time and effort both as members of the Provost’s Committee and in providing information, quesitons, proposals and concerns to the Committee; and

Whereas the Committee is scheduled to produce a report to the Provost after the end of the 2022/23 Academic Year, with the Provost indicating would form the basis for the administration’s consideration of the preferred option for Computational Science/Data Science,

Therefore, be it resolved that before any decision is made the faculty will be provided with a full report from the Committee, as well as any preferred proposal identified by the Provost. To provide for full consideration by the Faculty of Arts & Science, full consideration must take place in the regular course of this Faculty. Such consideration should not proceed before the commencement of the 2023/24 AY, and action should not be recommended to the Board of Visitors or State Council of Higher Education until the Faculty of Arts & Science has had the opportunity to evaluate the information as well as any proposals.”

Text of Andreas Stathopoulos’ prepared statement in response to John McGlennon’s resolution.

“[A]fter months of communications with the faculty regarding the essence of, and the need for, a new school, I am saddened to see this proposed resolution that demonstrates a lack of understanding of the basic principles that are behind this effort, and this misses the vital needs of the productive minority of this university. In good faith, I want to believe this is not deliberate. First, there is no School of Data Science/Computational Science. The working name of the school has been Computing and Data Science. The Computer Science Department, which has been completely absent from all this, has been the major thrust behind this ever since 2019, when we first proposed it to the Provost. Moreover, we have explained to the administration

that computational science is a different discipline currently not part of the proposal. The presentation of the name and the character of the school opens the door for false narratives.

Second, although addressed by the steering committee, leadership, and the Provost in previous meetings, fora, and communications, the letter still brings up concerns on the process. Following this closely from the beginning, I understand that the process described in William and Mary's institutional change policy has been followed to the letter. To this day, I have not yet heard any specifics on what part of the process is concerning. As a scientist I invite the specifics and not vagaries.

Third, the departments participating in CDS have made it clear in their proposal document circulated as recently as December, in full, that the goal is to not impart any changes, not impart any changes in the undergraduate operations, undergraduate admissions, undergraduate tuition, COLL, anything that has to do with the undergraduate education that we have built. Neither the mobility of students between schools. Majors and minors should have the same ability as now. The interests and prerogatives are significantly affected, but as with the process claim, it fails to point to the specifics of what these are. Undergraduate education will not only remain the same, but it will be enhanced. Unfortunately, it is the interests and derivatives of our CDS minority that I completed this week and our voices ignored. We are telling you what we need to survive, and you're telling us we don't need it. It is said the true measure of a democracy is the way that it protects its minorities. We'll be leaving this open as a discussion. But please pay attention to our voices, too."