

MINUTES  
Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
5 April, 1994

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer in the Commonwealth Auditorium of the Student Center at 3:36 PM.

The minutes of the meeting of 1 March, 1994 were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Lutzer announced that he expected the day's business to extend beyond the time available, and therefore it would be necessary to adjourn until 19 April at the end of this meeting.

Student Association Representative Kristen Campbell announced plans to hold student representatives on committees accountable for their service.

REPORTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

President Sullivan reported on the actions taken in the recently completed session of the General Assembly and the success of our team in meeting the challenges presented. Future problems involve confronting public misperceptions about the relevance and future of higher education in order to create better understanding. Although the legislature enacted the first increase in tax dollars for higher education since 1989, the best cut went to the schools eager to increase their admissions. We have a challenge to maintain our size and quality; we need to define concretely and in narrow terms a plan of what we want to become in 10 years. The Self Study and Strategic Planning Process must determine the allocation of resources at the margin. We have internal strength and alumni/alumnae support; the faculty must be supportive of efforts to achieve the goals to be set, and we need maximum participation in shaping a consensus.

Professor Abdalla asked if the problem was a lack of focus or fear of the Assembly?

President Sullivan replied that we had failed to be as crisp as possible in explaining our mission, and that the adding of programs without adequate resources has led to a loss of focus.

Professor Greenia asked whether we can resist the pressure to grow.

President Sullivan said that this is something he values and that we shall take a strong line on it: he doesn't foresee significant growth in the next decade.

Dean Scholnick commented that we need to learn how to listen to the outside about the concerns causing economic and social pains -- we need to develop an interactive process.

President Sullivan responded that the planning process and other efforts must catalog concerns and show what we are doing to meet them in order to create understanding and change misperceptions.

Professor Eckhause asked whether we might be in danger of trying to make ourselves too special in the face of an increase of 60,000 more applicants statewide; we need to consider the level of qualified students.

President Sullivan replied that the 60,000 number seems fugitive -- no one will pin down the source, and that history indicates that serious increases in enrollments are not economically beneficial to the schools who attempt them because new needs are only partly funded.

Professor McGlennon asked the President to state what his priorities have been.

President Sullivan listed the following:

1. complete the Campaign for the Fourth Century;
2. complete the Celebration of the Tricentennial;  
(the above were inherited from the previous administration)
3. assemble an administrative team;
4. engage in dialog about goals and strategies;
5. create a sense of community and of our possibilities;
6. build a consensus to implement our goals;
7. reconnect the alumni/alumnae and other external constituencies with the College.

Provost Cell began by thanking the faculty for their help during her first year. She then reported on a decision to use a sum of \$330,000 to give faculty members (excluding the Law School) a retroactive salary increase, to be calculated on the salaries as of 1 December, 1993, as if the increase which went into effect on that date had begun earlier. She complimented the Department of Mathematics on the unique thoroughness of its section by section response to the Strategic Planning Principles document and encouraged other departments to do likewise.

Professor Houle asked when the Self Study and Strategic Planning groups would be brought together.

Provost Cell responded that the committees are to be meshed at the end of the summer to prevent glaring contradictions and inconsistencies.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### Nominations and Elections

Professor Greenia placed in nomination the following:

#### Academic Status Committee:

Professors Maryann Brink, Gary Rice, Franco Triolo, and Henry Coleman;

#### Educational Policy Committee:

Professors Anthony Anemone, Chris Bongie, Jackie McLendon, Ed Pratt, Carol Sheriff, and Laurie Sanderson;

#### Procedural Review Committee:

Professors Hans Tiefel, Edgar Williams, Ed Remler, and Ellen Rosen.

#### International Studies Committee:

Professors Brad Weiss, Earl McLane, Jim Griffin, Bill Davis, Jerry Smith, John Williams, Brian Blouet, and Diane Owen.

#### Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee:

Professor Miles Chappell.

Dean Lutzer called for nominations from the floor for each committee; there were none. A motion was made and seconded to close nominations and it was approved by a voice vote, and ballots were distributed and collected.

### Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Chappell reported that in 4 meetings since the last Arts and Sciences Faculty meeting, the Faculty Affairs Committee had:

1. Recommended to the Provost on 16 March names for the 12 member Search Committee for the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
2. Responded to concerns about the award of Summer Research Grants by making proposals for consideration to the Research Committee concerning:

- 1) The eligibility for Summer Research Grants.
- 2) Possible approaches to ensure encouragement for younger faculty members while maintaining or increasing the number of grants for faculty in general.
- 3) Increasing the number of grants by lowering the total amount of the Summer Research Grant.
3. Expressed concern to the Provost about the decrease in funding for Summer Research Grants in 1993-94, which is down from 62 in 92-93 to 50 this year.
4. Expressed concern to the Provost, in a letter of 29 March which Professor Chappell read to the meeting, about the salary supplement to 1993-94 contracts being applied as a bonus. The Committee does not know the particulars of when and how we will see the adjustment.

Professor Chappell also reported on the Faculty Assembly meeting of 22 March. Professor Gary Smith, Chair of the Board of Faculty Compensation, made a preliminary report and will bring a recommendation to the 25 April meeting that the Faculty Compensation Board be involved in all issues regarding salaries. The effectiveness of the Faculty Assembly and issues regarding the privatization of the Bookstore and its impact on personnel were also discussed, and a resolution conveying these concerns was sent to the President.

Professor Tiefel inquired as to whether there had been any discussion about the relationship between Arts and Sciences and the Faculty Assembly.

Professor Chappell: "Not specifically."

Professor Rublein asked about the coming Affirmative Action Guidelines.

Professor Chappell answered that a new document was being prepared by Michael Powell.

Professor Funigiello asked to what extent these guidelines had been discussed in other committees.

Provost Cell pointed out that there were two things going on, the second of which is that the State Council has requested a new plan on faculty hiring, which will come to the Faculty Assembly when it is ready.

The Educational Policy Committee

Professor Fowler pointed out that there were 11 items for discussion, 10 GER's and 1 Computer Proficiency Requirement, and

he asked that the latter be skipped for today in order to move on to the others. There was no dissent.

Professor Fowler then moved and called for discussion of item II on page 4 of the document in question, on assessment. There was no discussion and the item passed by voice vote.

Dean Lutzer asked the members of the Faculty to consider a motion to refer an item back to the Committee whenever there is disagreement, rather than try to rewrite it on the floor of the meeting.

Professor Fowler then moved item III, motion A, on Course Equivalency and GER Fulfillment (p. 5).

Professor Conlee asked whether this section applied only to new students' transfer credit.

Dean Lutzer explained that it would not change the current practice regarding requiring permission in advance to transfer credit for courses taken after admission to William and Mary.

Professor James Harris argued that this would represent a relaxing.

Dean Macdonald responded that that was incorrect -- such permission can be granted now, and the requirement for a chair's permission would continue.

The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Professor Fowler then moved motion B (p. 5), regarding the required information for all GER course proposals. The motion passed by a voice vote.

Professor Fowler then carried the discussion into the criteria for the GER's proper by moving III C 1: GER 1: Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning (p. 6). There was no discussion and the item passed by voice vote.

Professor Fowler next moved III C 2: GER 2: The Natural Sciences (p. 8). After a brief discussion of details of specific criteria, the motion passed by voice vote.

Professor Fowler then moved III C 3: GER 3: The Social Sciences (p. 10). There was no discussion and the item passed by voice vote.

Professor Fowler next moved III C 4: GER 4: World Cultures and History (p. 11) and explained amendments which had been made as a result of faculty comment.

Professor Anemone asked whether Russia would be considered European or Asian.

Professor Fowler responded that such definitions would best be made by the working groups in the context of specific course proposals.

Professor James Harris requested an explanation of the 4th criterion on p. 12: "explore topics comparatively across traditions."

Professor Brink offered an example of a course comparing slavery in Africa, in Europe, and in the New World.

Professor James Harris raised the question of whether it is the discipline or its subject of study which must be compared.

The question was posed as to what wouldn't meet these requirements -- they seem too inclusive.

Professor Livingston responded that the intention of the original committee was to exclude the excessively specific and narrow -- perhaps this needs better language.

Professor Pratt added that the working group wanted both historical and cultural perspectives broad enough to convey a sense of process and change.

Professor Livingston replied that he thought that a holistic treatment of a primal culture would be acceptable without historical breadth.

Professor James Harris asked if we have the resources to do things in such breadth.

Professor Fowler answered that those concerned believe that we do.

Professor Bohl pointed out that resource questions were not considered by the working group at all.

Professor Brink commented that the definition of critical periods has to be flexible.

Professor Funigiello asked if this excluded the seminar on the '60's.

Professor Anne Henderson reminded him that we are to leave individual cases to the working groups.

III C 4 then passed by a voice vote.

Professor Fowler then moved III C 5: GER 5: Literature and the History of the Arts (p. 12). It was adopted by voice vote without discussion.

At this point Dean Lutzer requested that the Faculty suspend discussion of the Educational Policy Committee motions in order to hear the report of the Faculty Research Committee.

#### Faculty Research Committee

Professor Archibald pointed out that some important changes were under consideration to allow flexibility in the distribution between semester and summer grants, and asked for input about how the faculty feels about the relative importance of the programs, and also about the size of summer grants: whether it would be acceptable to decrease the stipend to increase the number of grants, whether non-tenure eligible faculty should be eligible for summer grants, and whether special consideration should be given to younger faculty for summer grants.

Professor Fraser asked whether summer grants can be related to summer school salaries somehow.

Professor Archibald pointed out that that might tie it to something which never changes.

Professor Hausman added: "Tie it to anything but Summer School!"

Professor James Harris commented that 2 months full time versus 5 weeks on 1 course is what makes the difference.

The next question was why we don't support the research expenses and not the person. The response was that such support is available through the Minor Research Grant Program.

Professor James Harris noted that younger members of the faculty also get priority on Faculty Research Assignments if they have never had one.

Professor Tracy raised the question of whether we are subsidizing the lawyers by giving them research grants when they have money from their own sources.

Professor Archibald explained the grant recovery funding sources, the distribution of money among the Schools, and the possibility that we might recover some funds from the Law School.

Professor Alan Ward suggested that we be careful about creating comparisons among ourselves, but that the Law School does seem to have some extra funds kept for themselves.

Dean Lutzer then announced the election results:

Academic Status Committee: Brink and Henry Coleman  
Educational Policy Committee: Anemone, Pratt, and Sanderson  
Procedural Review Committee: Tiefel and Edgar Williams  
International Studies: McLane, John Williams, Blouet,  
and Diane Owen

Chair of the  
Faculty Affairs Committee: Chappell.

The meeting was then adjourned until 19 April, 1994.

The April meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences reconvened on 19 April in the Commonwealth Auditorium and was called to order by Dean Lutzer at 4:06 PM.

There being no reports of administrative officers or other committees, the Dean called upon Professor Fowler to continue the process of discussion and approval of the various motions left to be acted upon in regard to the curriculum reform proposals.

Professor Fowler began by moving III C 6: GER 6: Creative and Performing Arts (p. 13); he explained some changes in the exemption rules designed to make it possible for departments to suggest more stringent requirements in their field to the EPC.

Dean Lutzer called for discussion and reminded the Faculty of the wisdom of referring any points of serious disagreement back to the committee rather than attempting to rewrite parts of the document on the floor.

After a period of silence, Professor Jack Edwards expressed surprise that no one else objected and asked about the sources of the objections mentioned in the revised document.

Professor Fowler suggested that those objections may have been adequately met by the revisions made.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

Professor Fowler then moved III C 7: GER 7: Philosophical, Social, and Religious Thought (p. 16), and asked to be permitted to emend 'and' of p. 17, question 3, to 'and/or'.

Professor Boozer suggested that just 'or' might be preferable to avoid any sense of a preference.

Professor Fowler answered that 'and/or' does not privilege a preference at all.

The motion passed by a voice vote.

Dean Lutzer then called for a voice vote on the GER package as a whole, in accordance with procedures adopted at the beginning of the discussion.

The GER package was adopted by a voice vote.

Dean Lutzer then called for comment and discussion on other EPC items which are to be voted on at the May meeting, beginning with the Computing Proficiency Requirement.

Professor Kincaid asked for an explanation of point 3 on p. 1 of the EPC document.

Professor Robert Noonan responded that the emphasis should be on 'analyze' as the strongest of the three words used.

Dean Lutzer called for further email to Professor Fowler on this proposal, and the latter noted that feedback must be in by 8 AM Thursday, 21 April, if it is to be circulated in the report for the May meeting.

Professor Axtell asked if this document demanded a computer proficiency requirement of all departments.

Professor Fowler responded affirmatively and pointed out that the requirement remains department governed, but that a case will have to be made for all changes in the nature of the requirement by individual departments.

Upon arrival of a number of people from the Faculty Assembly meeting, Dean Lutzer asked for a report on the elections held there.

Professor Fuchs responded that Professor Rublein had been elected Vice-President and Professor Chappell chosen as Secretary, Professor Lynda Butler having been previously elected President.

Discussion then turned to the EPC Proposed Implementation Motion for Freshman Seminars, also to be voted on in May.

In response to a question from Professor Robert Johnston, Professor Fowler reviewed the specifics of the requirements for a course to qualify as a freshman seminar.

Professor Remler's voice emerged from the primordial darkness which had suddenly returned to declare that a ratio of 50% discussion would be impossible in a physics seminar.

Professor Fowler responded that at the time these guidelines were discussed and adopted, no such objections had been raised by the faculty of Area III, but if the scientists now see a need for changes, they can bring them up for discussion through the available procedures.

Professor McCord asked if we had approved the 3 hour option.

Professor Fowler answered that we had, but that seminars must be writing intensive within the guidelines, even if they don't offer "W" credit.

Professor Ewell asked whether the last part of the 2nd page of the document left continuing certification of course's eligibility to the department.

Professor Fowler replied that it did, but that these courses would be part of the ongoing assessment program.

Professor Ewell added that the 'must' in the 3rd point of the proposed catalog statement on p. 2 seems to be canceled by the second clause.

Professor Fowler answered that we intended it to strengthen the statement.

Professor Stephen Knudson pointed out that the wording seems to declare that anyone who does not complete this requirement as a freshman would be permanently ineligible to graduate.

Professor Fowler conceded that these effects were not intended and that the EPC would propose modifications of the document to remedy them.

Several questions were raised regarding the status of transfer students in relation to this requirement, to which Dean Lutzer responded that the legislature has, unfortunately, decreed a standard "transfer module" of courses as fulfilling all freshman/sophomore requirements, not including language requirements, but that the proposed computer proficiency requirement is a concentration requirement and therefore not affected.

Miles Chappell expressed concern about the student who may slip through the system and not get a course in the first year.

Professor Fowler affirmed that they would have priority for these courses during their next term.

Professor Chappell then asked what would happen if an upper level student gets in to take a space in a seminar.

Professor Fowler pointed out that they can only enroll in these courses through the add/drop process with the instructor's permission, after all freshmen's preferences have been satisfied, and upperclassmen can be prevented from enrolling entirely if the instructor prefers.

Professor Hamada asked if some seminars will be cross-listed.

Professor Fowler: "Yes."

Professor Johnston asked whether the committee would consider altering the requirement to fulfill this requirement before declaring the concentration.

Professor Schwartz responded that he felt strongly about the need to do everything possible to push them to do the seminar in their first year.

Professor Johnston answered that this statement might rush them into declaring a major too soon.

Professor Fowler pointed out that the credit hour requirement prevents premature declarations of concentration, but that the committee would consider revising the wording of this section.

Professor Ewell asked whether the committee had considered specific supply and demand problems, especially of people being forced into seminars they didn't want in order to finish in their first year.

Professor Fowler replied that this is an important logistical issue which we must try to handle by carefully planned preregistration procedures.

Professor Schwartz affirmed that in spite of the great variety of seminars offered, not everyone will get their very first choice.

Professor Ewell asserted that this will still be a problem.

Professor Fowler responded that we will always have this problem of some degree of dissatisfaction with the course selections available.

Professor Kim Whitley wondered whether procrastinators wouldn't overload the system for the second semester.

Professor Schwartz pointed out that most students do try to get into a seminar in the fall, and that the ratio of demand between fall and spring is about 2 to 1.

Professor Funigiello asked whether a student who fails a seminar in the fall term would absolutely have to pass one in the spring.

Professor Fowler said that such a student would be in the same category as those who did not attempt one at all in the fall.

Professor Homza added that the EPC will have to do some experimenting with ratios, etc. as the program develops, because there have been a number of seminars which were seriously underenrolled.

Professor Schwartz conceded that there had been empty seats, and that planning and adjustments will be made.

The Dean called for a motion to adjourn, and all rose affirmatively.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James R. Baron