

AGENDA
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Oct. 3, 2023, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Tucker 127 and Zoom

Zoom : <https://cwm.zoom.us/j/7116417933?pwd=Y3FjSEdNYjkyRnBFV2cvdjNYb2Zldz09>

Meeting ID: 711 641 7933

Passcode: 123

- I. Approval of minutes from meeting on Sept. 5, 2023 – minutes attached
- II. Report from the dean (Suzanne Raitt)
- III. Report from admissions – see attached and video in email sent to FAS (Jeremy Martin)
- IV. Motion from EPC on new Kinesiology tracks – attached (Jim Deverick)
- V. Charles Center (Elizabeth Harbron)
- VI. FAC report – Merit Review Policy – (Marc Sher) -- attached
- VII. Adjourn

MINUTES

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Oct. 3, 2023, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Tucker 127 and Zoom

- I. Approval of minutes from meeting on Sept. 5, 2023 – minutes attached
Minutes approved by unanimous consent.
- II. Report from the dean (Suzanne Raitt)
 - a. School of Computational and Physical Sciences
 - i. Last week, the Provost told Faculty Assembly she will recommend to President Rowe that the new school of computational and physical sciences be established outside of Arts & Sciences. President Rowe and the BOV are likely to likely approve this proposal.
 - ii. Suzanne sent Chairs and Directors a survey to provide input on the process to move the new school forward. FAC will get this survey soon. The process should be as inclusive as possible. The steering committee overseeing the process will consider constituencies to be represented and actively consulted.
 - b. Pre-planning for the next fundraising campaign

- i. Deans have been asked to pitch big ideas. Suzanne notes A&S will undergo many changes in the next few years and part of the campaign could be applied learning experiences for A&S students.
 - ii. Suzanne called for a meeting in 2-3 weeks of CCPD, FAC, and the Dean team to think about additional campaign priorities. CCPD will ask their departments to prioritize ideas for fundraising.
 - c. New Inclusive Excellence framework from the Office of Diversity
 - i. Chief Diversity Officer Chon Glover developed the Inclusive Excellence Framework for 2023-26 which is available on the Office's website. Every unit was invited to identify 2-3 actionable items to focus on this year.
 - ii. A&S is focusing on 1. Access and Success, OBJECTIVE 2 - Increase retention and academic success of historically underrepresented and underserved undergraduate students and OBJECTIVE 4 - Recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff. The framework provides strategies and metrics.
 - d. A&S policies and practices
 - i. The Dean team is reviewing older policies and practices to ID those which are advantageous to A&S.
 - ii. Suzanne will let faculty know when updated policy items are posted on the A&S website.
 - e. Faculty Success research productivity software
 - i. Faculty Success is a piece of software for collecting information about faculty productivity. It replaces Digital Measures.
 - ii. The Provost asked A&S to get research productivity data from the last 10 years into the Faculty Success platform by Nov. 1. We can't meet that deadline, so we have asked new faculty to upload their research activities. A&S will do this for the other faculty as an ongoing effort.
 - f. Revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*
 - i. The BOV presented President Rowe with a resolution to revise the *Faculty Handbook* by November 2024. The president will work with FA and the Personnel Policy Committee to streamline the process.
 - ii. The BOV's resolution says revisions are necessary to make sure that those terms and conditions therein meet our legal obligations. The BOV also seeks to ensure each school of the university is treated in the same manner. Finally, the BOV wishes to reflect the view that the dean of each of the several schools and colleges is responsible for the administration in the interest of that school and has the ultimate authority to recommend the employment of faculty members. Suzanne encourages questions on this process.

- g. Suzanne takes general questions.
 - i. **John Gilmour** raises a concern that the provost's discussion of a new school of computational and physical sciences at the Assembly meeting last week was not a formal proposal with an elaboration of budget projections to cover new graduate students and new faculty.
 1. During the meeting, the provost said the new school's faculty lines will be funded according to procedures currently in place.
 2. Suzanne understands the potential for faculty concern that the A&S budget is not taxed to fund new faculty lines and graduate students. The provost has assured Suzanne the A&S budget will only be cut by the amount currently going directly to those units moving to the new school; no one else should be affected. Furthermore, FNA generated by those units in 2021-22 contributed only a small part (\$78,000) to A&S.
 3. Regarding a formal proposal, Suzanne notes the provost's document to Assembly members describing the rationale for housing the new school outside of A&S had not been shared as widely as intended. There weren't very many budget details, but document did, however, discuss the \$1,000,000 to cover additional staffing at the new school. Suzanne also knows that there are some strategic funds the provost can unlock for this new initiative. Strategic funding will also generate additional external funding for new faculty lines.
 4. David Armstrong via Zoom chat notes that the intended plan in funding the new school is that significant growth would come from outside sources and there would be no initial growth of faculty lines from the creation of the school.
 5. Helen Murphy via Zoom chat asks if a zero-sum budget analysis of A&S will still be occurring. Suzanne says yes, that's still planned, and the Provost will pay for a consultant, but it's not happening this semester because A&S fiscal administrator Sherri Powers is transitioning to retirement in December. Sherri is currently training the new fiscal administrator.

III. Report from Admissions (Jeremy Martin)

- a. Jeremy discusses three topics: clarification on how admissions processes work, the Supreme Court decision on affirmative action, and admitted students with legacy status.
- b. During the admissions process, at least three humans review each application in five stages. Decisions for acceptance, waitlist, and denial are made at different stages.

- i. The Admissions Office values flourishing, which includes both the University and the individuals involved in the admissions process.
 - ii. Application reviews are detailed and comprehensive, and admission is competitive. Applications are reviewed to find individuals most likely to flourish here.
 - iii. The Supreme Court decisions on affirmative action mentioned terms like rated and scored, but Admissions' process doesn't use those terms. Instead, they have increasing contextual awareness in the five stages. The first three stages are readings by more junior staff, then senior Team Captains and regional reviews, then the Team Captain Review.
 - iv. Stage four involves the Team Captains working together to be aware of both individual regional applicant pools and the overall applicant pool. Stage five includes making decisions on any applications not completed previously. There are always highly talented students who are not admitted in each cycle.
 - v. More than half of the applicants are admitted for fall or waitlisted for admission in spring. One-third of the applicant pool is accepted outright for fall admission. Another 20% are offered waitlist for admission in the spring following a semester studying abroad or enrollment in a community college.
- c. Two recent decisions from the Supreme Court mean race and ethnicity will not be part of the reviewers' screen.
- i. W&M has moved from one longer optional essay to two shorter optional essays chosen from among six prompts. This year, students may, if they choose, tell us more about themselves in those essays.
 - ii. The principles for evaluating these essays are twofold:
 - 1. Fulfilling the university's mission mandate to be a vibrant and inclusive community, those involved in application review should be mindful that admitting a breadth of experiences enriches the vibrancy of our community.
 - 2. Experiences conveyed through application materials that are rare within the applicant pool may be considered more enriching to the university's vibrancy than conveying experiences that are more common within the applicant pool.
- d. Admitted students who are also legacy.
- i. Jeremy presents a slide presentation on the characteristics of admitted students who are also legacy students to show the profiles are the same. He also notes there is a report and video available describing this information for interested faculty members.

- ii. Jeremy reiterates that Admissions admits 1/3 of the 18,000 applications and there are several ways to engage as an applicant: interview, contact Admissions Office or a counselor, or take a campus tour. These engagement methods have different yields. Interview and students with legacy status are twice as likely to attend. The Admissions Office has considered the research on public flagship admissions from Ross Chetty from Arizona showing increasing the application rate is the best way to generate differential outcomes.
 - iii. The Admissions Office uses the Commonwealth's list of 100-115 schools with majority free and reduced lunch populations to provide applicants from those schools' fee waivers and will invite school counselors to nominate up to 10 students for admittance. Admissions is also working to expand the successful W&M Scholars Program to refocus it for Pell Grant recipients and first-generation applicants.
 - iv. Finally, Admissions is using digital marketing for the first time so we can reach more students. Admissions wants students with limited outcomes to know three things: we continue to be the most affordable option for students from families with incomes below \$100,000 (42% less on average vs other schools in the Commonwealth); we have the highest on-time graduation rate for Pell recipients in public institutions, and our graduates who receive aid receive more aid than other institutions, about \$17,000 more/year.
- e. Jeremy takes faculty questions.
- i. Lily Panoussi asks for a breakdown of in-state vs. out-of-state admit rates. Jeremy says yes, these are different: 42% in-state and 27% out-of-state.
 - ii. Hannah Rosen asks for clarification between outside readers and regional readers. Jeremy clarifies that regional readers are full-time staff and outside readers are professionals who have been engaged from agencies to do a first read. Each application is read by a regional and an outside reader. Hannah then asks how we anticipate a class size if waitlisted students are all admitted for spring. Jeremy says every year we offer 6000 letters of admission. The people on our waitlist are highly competitive at other schools, so the overwhelming majority opt out of our waitlist offer. Sixty to seventy students go to the Verto (study abroad in London, Seville, or Florence) pathway. Numbers are very consistent between cohorts.
 - iii. Marc Sher asks if there are any non-human (AI) readers. Jeremy says no, not yet. Marc notes that it's to W&M credit that our admitted students who are also legacy students are the same as all the other groups. He wonders why, if they are performing as well as everyone else, they need preference? Jeremy responds that it's not a preference but a consideration because the school has an established relationship with the family whether the student is

admitted or not, so it's a benefit to us to be able to interact with that student. We know them and they matter to us. We balance this as well as it can be done, and it helps us communicate with the student. It matters to faculty because the alumni are our former students.

- iv. A final question is how waitlist students counted? If about 180 are expected in the spring, 60 from the pathways programs, 120 are from community or other colleges.

IV. Motion from EPC on new Kinesiology tracks (Jim Deverick)

- a. Jim invites Brennen Harris, Chair of Kinesiology to take questions on the rationale for two new degree programs. Brennen says this is a culmination of the evolution of the department over the last decade. The two pathways have always a logical progression through a strong core, but it wasn't as clearly laid out as it might have been, and there were some issues with the state where parts really had never made it through the state level. The past curriculum is out of compliance with the state, and this will help our students.
- b. Diane Shakes asks if the degree programs are in addition to or replacing something. Brennan clarifies they will replace, no there will no longer be KINE degrees. Marc notes that the faculty of A&S has already voted to change the name of the department but wasn't approved by SCHEV.
- c. Jim moves to approve the motion. There is a second and no discussion in the room or on the chat, so it is approved by unanimous consent.
- d. Suzanne thanks Brennan and Sarah and all the faculty in Health Sciences, and thanks Ben Boone for supporting the department and going over regulations. Congratulations to all who worked on this; it's a model of how things can get done. BOV has already approved name change to Health Sciences at their meeting last week.

V. Report from the Charles Center (Elizabeth Harbron)

- a. Elizabeth notes that she is not required to give an annual report but there are many changes and some good news. She will share opportunities for faculty and students to get support from the Charles Center.
- b. Elizabeth describes the Charles Center for new faculty: they curate experiences for students on research and mentorship. We believe mentorship can transform.
- c. The Charles Center is best known for 1) running research programs for undergraduates on campus and in the summer; 2) credit bearing applied learning and 3) Honors programs as well as four separate scholars programs that all involve research: 1693, Monroe, W&MSURE, and Sharpe programs.
- d. One highlight from last year is that we again funded over 300 students for summer research equating to \$900,000 in private funds from donors. The

downside is that those funds are in 80 different restricted accounts making it difficult to balance wishes of the donors with what our students want to do.

- e. We are also doing some new things, such as adding to the value of the summer research experience by offering more summer gatherings and expanding our research-based internships. The Cohen Center helps people find internships and the Charles Center helps apply for funding if the internship is unpaid.
- f. The Charles Center had 11 Woody Museum internships, and 7 students in the new City Research Scholars group, placing students in the city of Williamsburg as well as in local non-profits. We started the Grimsley Journalism fellowship.
- g. The Charles Center is working with the Cohen Career Center to think about how all students will have an internship experience, so to that end, the students with academic internships last year took part in a pilot credit course. The syllabus was convened by A&S faculty and requires students to engage through the lens of a W&M liberal arts education. This is a deliberate effort to combine internships, careers, and arts & sciences scholarship.
- h. Additional goals in 2023-24 will expand opportunities to support faculty in four ways.
 - i. The faculty mentor research incubator, which supports faculty with new ideas or models of doing undergraduate research, will be relaunched. Funding for one team will be for more junior faculty.
 - ii. The community of scholars program which provides funding for co-curricular engagement experiences outside the classroom will also be relaunched.
 - iii. There will be a return of May Seminar funding to innovate teaching strategies.
 - iv. There will be a return of study away trip at the border in January. Additional funding will be made available. That application will be launched soon.
- i. Nominations for the Weingardner and Sharpe Professorships are due on 10/16. The English-Stonehouse (STEM) and Glover (Humanities) Fellowships are also due soon. – all are research working with students.
- j. Research in Motion is a new opportunity for senior students who need travel conference funding. Check the website for deadlines.
- k. The Charles Center will be discontinuing crowdfunding for Honors because the donations have declined and it highlights inequities. Online fundraising is not going away, but it will be more targeted.
 - i. Updated website.
- l. Summer dorm housing advertised as free for research students is not actually free. We are on a 5-year path to comply with federal taxes and financial aid.

- m. Undergraduate research stipend levels haven't changed in 20 years. When do we make a change, we might be able to fund fewer students. We will send information when we have it.
 - n. The graduate and Honors symposium occurred in March last year and was very successful. Grad students were session chairs and in mentoring roles. Honors students receiving funding are required to present at the symposium planned for 3/23/24.
- VI. FAC report – Merit Review Policy – (Marc Sher)
- a. Marc reviews the merit review guidelines revised this year by FAC, discussed at FAS, and brought today for further discussion. FAC plans a vote to approve new merit guidelines in November's FAS.
 - b. A&S Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the following guidelines for the annual merit review process:
 - i. 1. Evaluation criteria should reflect different levels of performance under the contracted professional expectations for TTE and the Teaching Faculty within the unit. The current guidelines presented here cover TTE only.
 - ii. Multiple faculty members should participate in the merit review. Program directors and department chairs may lead the process, but procedures must include at least one other faculty member. The merit review committee shall not be anonymous.
 - iii. Annual reports should be provided to the department or program faculty on aggregate evaluation results (e.g., the average evaluation score).
 - iv. Mechanisms for feedback should be transparent and feedback given to faculty on evaluations and avenues for improvement.
 - v. A timely appeal process is required.
 - vi. A distribution of scores is required (on the scale from 0 to 15) reflecting the range of faculty accomplishment. The entire range need not 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.
 - vii. There is nothing proposed for leave policies for the departments.
 - c. The Procedural Review Committee (PRC) has reviewed and approved most departmental plans. JC Poutsma notes these guidelines aren't policy yet so Procedural Review Committee and PRC are deciding if these policies are in compliance with the *Faculty Handbook*.
 - i. Christy Porter asks why were leave policies left out? Marc says FAC's goal is to come up with a policy for departments so there is consistency across Arts

and Sciences. Suzanne added that it is much better to have a single leave policy for all of A&S than 24 different leave policies.

- ii. A faculty member asks how do we reconcile that merit may vary across departments? Is there a point where some departments will be compared? Suzanne says that's not something we are not doing. Some departments have high output and some lower but the average is about the same.
- iii. Another faculty member asks what degree does merit figure into post-tenure reviews. Suzanne says 3 years of low scores triggers a post-tenure review. Maria started contacting people who had low scores and Suzanne continued but in a different way. Suzanne notes the policy for merit remains 6-6-3, so that's the benchmark.

VII. Adjourn