Faculty Assembly Agenda
October 22, 2013
3:30 – 5:00pm
Blow Hall Board Room

Members Present: Eric Chason, Bill Cooke, Sarah Day, John Eisele, Nancy Gray, Rick Gressard, Susan Grover (Vice President), Will Hausman, Carl Hershner, Gina Hoatson, Scott McCoy, Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian), Lily Panoussi Suzanne Raitt (President), Ron Rapoport, Lea Theodore (Secretary), Brad Weiss, Jeanne Wilson.

Members Absent: David Dessler, Courtney Harris, Brent Owens, Gul Ozyegin.

Others in Attendance: Michael Halleran (Provost), Gene Roche (Director of Academic Information Services), Bernadette Kulas (Office of the Vice President).

The meeting was called to order at 3:36pm by Suzanne Raitt.

1. Approval of the Minutes

    A. The minutes of the September 24, 2013 meeting were approved.

2. Provost's Report and Q&A
    A. The Provost reported that on Tuesday, October 29th, 2013, the Fall Tack Faculty Lecture will be held at the Kimball Theater at 7pm. Debbie Steinberg of William & Mary's Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) will be discussing "From Plankton to Planet." Through the Tack Lecture Series, a William & Mary professor addresses the community on a topic of general interest at least once a semester. The intent of the series is to showcase the talents, excellence, and excitement of the faculty. A reception will follow the lecture.
    B. With respect to e-learning, the Provost sent Suzanne Raitt a slightly modified version of the remarks that the Provost made to the Board of Visitors last month. The document has been posted to the Faculty Assembly 2013-2014 Blackboard site and is on the Provost's website as well.
    C. Bob Scott will be visiting The College of William and Mary next week to meet with various groups on campus regarding the W&M Promise as well as other items. He would specifically like to meet with the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee and Academic Affairs Committee. His visit is not part of an official Board action, but merely to get the pulse of the faculty.
    D. The Provost discussed our tenure system, noting that it is thorough, transparent, transparent, and that our expectations are reasonable. The Provost reported that the College College of William and Mary espouses a model of hiring excellent faculty and providing them with the assistance they need to be successful. Statistically, if you count faculty who actually come up for tenure, approximately 85-90% are awarded tenure. The Provost further further noted that William and Mary's expectations have become demonstrably greater over over time. However, the Provost does not believe that there is a precipitous incline towards towards "higher standards," but did note that standards evolve over time. The Faculty

Handbook provides specific information regarding evaluation standards and procedures for for retention, promotion and the award of tenure. Tenure and tenure-related issues are addressed by the college via implementation of tenure workshops that demystify the process. process. Also, during the 3rd year reappointment process, the Provost sends each faculty member a letter which explicitly addresses issues that have come up in the course of their review. This allows the faculty member time to address the concerns before they come up for for tenure in their sixth year at the college. The Provost noted that most colleges/universities colleges/universities also have a six-year time clock. However, we are different from some some institutions in that we give credit for time served at previous institutions. From the Provost's perspective, it is important to respect different disciplines, which is why standards standards are different for the various schools.

   E. Finally, the Provost discussed hiring and the diversity of our faculty. He met with the Deans to discuss the efforts that we make to diversify our faculty. In addressing this issue, there are some things that we can do easily at no/low cost while others require further action. The Provost addressed the affirmative action plan which allows us to understand what the field is like and aims towards achieving diversity in employment. For instance, in some fields, there are few African Americans or females. Further, there are some areas where diversity is not as robust, such as the arts. The Provost noted that this is useful information, but it is not determinative. The Provost concluded his remarks and asked the Faculty Assembly if they had any questions. Jeanne Wilson asked the Provost what his assessment is of the diversity of our faculty. The Provost responded that there are different comparisons that one can make. For instance, you can look at your talent pool, such as who is getting into your group, or you can look at your peers. If you look at the former, our talent pool, we are doing rather poorly. However, if you look at the latter, we are not doing badly. The Provost further noted that he looks at the disconnect between the faculty and the student body. Bill Cooke stated that it wasn't clear in the Provost's remarks where the problem areas are and how we would know about them. His concern involved hiring guidelines that should be adjusted by area or discipline. Gina Hoatson noted that, particularly in her field, if you want to hire a female, it is a two body problem. It would be useful if the college had a spousal hiring or partner hiring policy, which the Provost noted is an important matter.

Suzanne Raitt thanked Terry Meyers for providing the members of the Faculty Assembly with Roberts Rules of Order. As Parliamentarian, Terry wanted everyone to know what the rules are.

3. Report from E-Learning Committee: Gene Roche
   A. Gene Roche thanked the Faculty Assembly for the opportunity to attend our meeting and share information on e-learning with us from last year's Digital Educational Technology Committee. He and Scott Nelson were asked to co-chair this committee and Gene began his presentation by stating that we are in a a technological revolution, noting where we were seven years ago, in the year 2007. At that time, Google bought a little company called YouTube. Prior to that point, virtually everybody in the technology business said that it is impossible impossible to stream video from the internet; computers are too slow, processing processing power is too inefficient, and there is no way that video will ever become

become important. Folks thought that video would become a niche product. Then, Then, in 2007, Google bought YouTube, and at that point, the videos were limited and folks did not believe that this would be anything that would make a a difference. Seven years later, we are at the point where one third of internet traffic is Google streaming high definition video. There are hundreds of hours of of high definition lectures that may be viewed online by prominent scholars in this this country. And that change has happened in the last six to seven years. If it weren't for that change, if those technologies had not developed to the level they they have now, we would not be having this discussion in higher education at this this time (e.g., the power of MOOCS, business learning, and e-learning, and the the power to transform). It is that platform that has made this possible.

The bigger question that we have to deal with as an institution is what is going to happen in the next six years. The computers that we have to work with when we teach students six years from now are going to be 60x faster, more powerful and more capable than the computers that we have right now, which, for most of us, are doing much more than we had the capacity to imagine. To integrate e-learning at William and Mary, Gene noted that we need to think on two levels. The first is where we are now and what do we want to accomplish. The second is what it might be like if in fact the technological power to be able to do things continues to increase at a rapid rate.

Gene reported that one of the tasks of the Digital Educational Technology Committee was to consider the nature of what William and Mary is now and what makes it a unique institution as well as what we need to be able to retain the distinctiveness of the college as we move forward technologically. Gene discussed the report prepared by the Digital Educational Technology Committee noting that it addresses little schools and the importance of scale and the need for William and Mary to be as vigilant as possible in protecting the uniqueness of the institution's students and faculty. Moreover, we need to be careful of how much we embrace this technology and also cognizant of the downside to technology. The report further notes that the college needs to be mindful of where we have been while also looking forward to the future and what we want to accomplish.

In moving forward with respect to technology, Gene noted that it is important to to be attentive to the differences between the professional schools and the undergraduate experience at William and Mary. He reported that there is no evidence to suggest that the core undergraduate experience for students 18-22 was was under attack in any way, meaning that undergraduates were not considering considering moving to other institutions that offer high quality, engaging online online experiences. Thus, there is no any existential pressure with respect to technology. Professional schools are different in that most students are considered nontraditional (i.e., 25-years old+, are working, have families). One of One of the things that makes a difference is the kind of experience that William William and Mary offers working professionals, something that we do not have a

have a great deal of experience with.. Other institutions that have been serving that market for a long time know a lot more about that than we do. Gene then addressed three findings from the committee:

- The first finding was that the professional schools will be required to expand e-learning because of the market that we want to serve. Further, the kind of students that we want to attract are going to require, in many cases, the kind of convenience that's built into e-learning. Doing this well is going to require some investment on the part of William and Mary.

- The second finding was that one of the big challenges to William and Mary's faculty right now is finding high quality materials that are already being developed across the country and discovering ways to leverage those so that we don't have to reinvent the wheel. For instance, if there is a university that spent millions of dollars developing an interactive physics course that accomplishes many of the goals we would like to have, just because we are William and Mary, we don't need to reinvent that same course. The institution needs to find ways to involve those kinds of resources that are available (i.e., lectures, simulations, open source text-books, problem-solving tools). Another challenge is to find those high quality materials, get them, and bring them to the institution. The bottom line is that we need to capture those resources and apply them in ways that are useful for us.

- Finally, the committee felt that there might be some ways to grab revenue via extension activities.

In sum, technology is evolving at a rate that makes it very difficult for us to decide in what direction to go with any degree of certainty. According to Gene, there are three things that are real: (1) technology is going to change; (2) our students are going to be coming to William and Mary with dramatically different technological skills and experiences with technology; and (3) college is expensive. This will need to be addressed with all of the individuals whom this will affect (i.e., parents, legislators). Moreover, there is no evidence that e-learning is a cheap way of providing an education. As such, the question then becomes, how do we convince our skeptics of the benefits of e-learning? William and Mary needs to figure out ways within our own institution to capture the things that are really important to us. Equally important, we need to communicate how important e-learning is in a way that makes sense to people who are questioning us.

The Faculty Assembly engaged Gene in conversation and questions regarding what we can do to make timelines commensurate, writing simulations, lecturing and the impact of student-teacher interactions in terms of student satisfaction with faculty members and ways that technology may enhance this interaction, and practical next steps. Suzanne thanked Gene for his time and expertise.

4. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Academic Affairs: Jeanne Wilson
      a. Jeanne Wilson reported that the Academic Affairs Committee met and made some progress on principles and tentative first steps for best practices under section 8 of The Promise. She discussed three broad conclusions from the committee.
         - First, Academic Affairs concluded that we are going to have to account for what we've been calling student engagement, or all the things we do with students that don't count as part of our course load. Jeanne stated that The Board of Visitors has specifically mandated that this information is to be used to rebalance everyone's teaching load as part of the resolution.
         - Second, as a college, we are going to have to come up with a non-onerous way of tracking student engagement with students. Academic Affairs noted that this will likely need to be done at the unit level. A concern of the committee is that this seems to have serious implications for the merit system.
         - Finally, the direction that the group is heading in is to recommend adopting individually negotiated profiles for faculty contracts. How that will work will remain to be determined.

Suzanne Raitt asked Jeanne what the next steps are. Jeanne stated that all of the schools, except for Arts and Sciences and Education, have policies that probably meet the Board of Visitors' requirements. The next steps would be to work closely with the Arts and Sciences and Education committees and work on how some preliminary best practices and principles may be implemented. Suzanne and Jeanne will get together to address this issue. Conversation ensued regarding whether other schools include service in their merit system and how this is done as well as how other schools incorporate student engagement into their extant merit systems. Suzanne asked Jeanne to post the policies for the schools that already exist and Jeanne agreed to do so. Susan Grover asked Jeanne whether a memo to the Deans will be sent out regarding invisible work and best practices, and Jeanne responded that this would indeed occur. Jeanne noted that the variance in policies is wide at this point and hopefully by instituting the general principles, the policies will look more similar.

   B. Faculty Affairs: David Dessler
      a. Suzanne Raitt reported on behalf of David Dessler, who was unable to attend the meeting. David is working with NTE groups to determine what representation they would like, on Assembly or elsewhere. The NTE Network has very actively organized itself and it is now called the NTE Faculty Association. One of the things that they would like to pursue is representation on this Faculty Assembly. David met with them to ask what they wanted and to advise them on how to go about getting it. They are currently putting a proposal together which they will send to us. The proposal will include asking Faculty Assembly to amend its bylaws to have NTE representation on Faculty Assembly.

C. COP A R : Scott McCoy
   a. Scott McCoy reported that COP A R continues to review P B R s and they just received a new one. Final decisions will be made on Friday, November 1st and will be shared with the greater F U P C committee. Dennis Manos will give a presentation that day about grant overhead to the university and how that's being reallocated. Finally, Sam Jones will present to COP A R on December 6th.

D. Executive Committee: Suzanne Raitt, Susan Grover
   a. Susan Grover discussed getting out in front on faculty leadership in giving to William & Mary. The Executive Committee communicated on this issue and supported this idea. By doing this, Susan stated that we may further cement the reputation of the faculty at William and Mary as a group of people who take initiative, work hard and want to give back. Susan and Suzanne Raitt met with Matthew Lambert to talk about a way for the Faculty Assembly to take leadership and encourage the entire faculty at William and Mary to give some amount to the annual fund. Faculty may designate where they would like for their contribution to go. If the Faculty Assembly decides to do this, in the spring, we can encourage our colleagues to jump on board. By having the faculty take the lead on this and donating to the college, we can step up and communicate through action who we really are. And, who we are is a group that is very much committed and invested in William and Mary.

      The Faculty Assembly discussed strategies about how to go about making this happen.

E. Liaison/Report from PSC: Suzanne Raitt, Susan Grover, Bill Cooke
   a. Suzanne Raitt reported on the September Board of Visitors meeting and highlighted things of interest including, sharing the excellent presentation that Susan gave to the Board of Visitors on Section 8, discussion regarding e-learning, and the potential for E V M S collaboration.
   b. Suzanne Raitt passed out highlights from the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan, which includes the seven grand challenges and the specific steps in each challenge area. Suzanne noted that at its most recent meeting, the Planning Steering Committee discussed methods for tracking success in these various areas, particularly, challenge one (being a leader among liberal arts universities), two (diversity), and four (developing an engaging campus that inspires lifelong commitment to W M).

5. Old Business
      A. Susan Grover reported on Rick Gressard's behalf that he and a graduate assistant are working hard on completing the report on the Faculty Survey and will get results to Assembly as soon as they can. It was noted that the survey has become overwhelming to administer and the Executive Committee will discuss steps to address this problem at its next meeting.

6. New Business
      A. Suzanne encouraged the Faculty Assembly to consider donating to the Commonwealth of Virginia (CVC) Campaign if we have not done so already.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lea A. Theodore

Lea A. Theodore, Ph.D.