The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by Dean Geoffrey Feiss.

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the 3 April 2001 meeting were approved as amended in email communication with the Secretary but with no further amendments from the floor.

II. Report of the Nominations and Elections Committee

Academic Status Committee/one 1-year replacement:
Gina Hoatson (Physics)
X Cam Walker (History)

Academic Status Committee/Fall 2001 replacement:
X Elizabeth Wiley (TSD)

Committee on Degrees/one 3-year replacement:
Robert Hinkle (Chemistry)
X Patty Zwollo (Biology)

Committee on Degrees/one 1-year replacement:
X Robert Kohl (Kinesiology)

Committee on International Studies/One-year replacement:
Gary Smith (MLL)
X Laurie Koloski (History)

Procedural Review Committee/one-year alternate replacement:
Steve Knudson (Chem.)
X Ronald Rapoport (Govt.)

Faculty Hearing Committee/four-year replacement:
X Hermine Pinson (Eng.)
Alan Wallach (A&AH)

Faculty Hearing Committee/one-year alternate replacement:
X John Conlee (Eng.)
Gul Ozyegin (Soc.)
Educational Policy Committee (chair):
X  Joan Gavaler (TSD)

III. Reports of Administrative Officers

Dean Feiss presented the list of faculty who have received special honors this academic year:

Faculty Awards 2000-01

Art And Art History
Lew Cohen – Juror For 179th Annual Exhibition at The National Academy of Design
Adam Cohen – NEH Summer Seminar on Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts Chemistry

Chemistry
Bill Starnes – Elected a Fellow of The Society of Plastic Engineers

English
Paula Blank – Fellowship to the National Humanities Center
Chris Bongie – NEH Fellowship
Tolly Taylor – NEH Fellowship
Susan Donaldson – Fulbright to Germany
Jack Martin – PBK Award for the Advancement of Scholarship
Peter Wiggins – Folger Fellowship

History
Joan Hoff – Senior Fulbright Lecturer at Moscow University

Mathematics
Charlie Johnson – SCHEV Outstanding Teaching Award

Modern Languages
Jonathan Arries – Carnegie Scholar

Music
Kitty Preston – Gilder-Lehrman Institute for American History Fellow
Anne Rasmussen – William and Mary Phi Beta Kappa Award for Teaching Excellence

Philosophy
George Harris – NEH Fellowship

Physics
Anne Reilly – NSF Career Award
Shiwei Zhang – Cotrell Scholar Award, Research Corporation
Nathan Isgur – 2001 Prize for Theoretical Physics, American Physical Society
William and Mary Honors

Alumni Fellowship Award
Christopher Bailey – Geology
Laura Ekstrom – Philosophy
Pamela Hunt – Psychology
Shiwei Zhang – Physics

Chancellor Professorships
Will Hausman – Economics
David Lutzer – Mathematics
Kate Slevin – Sociology

Associate Professor Term Professorships
Todd Averett – Class of 1963 Associate Professor of Physics
Laura Ekstrom – Robert F. and Sara M. Boyd Associate Professor of Philosophy
Chris Howard – David D. and Carolyn B. Wakefield Associate Professor of Government

Dean Feiss also reported that the Personnel Policy Committee had approved two draft policies, one on intellectual property and another on changes in how service is defined for purposes of personnel evaluation; both now go to the Assembly for final approval. Moreover, the revised Consensual Amorous Relations policy goes to the Board for final approval.

A moment of silence was observed in memory of Professors Steve Park and John Selby.

In response to questions about the impact of the budget stalemate on salaries and benefits, Dean Feiss reported that contracts were to be sent out May 11 so that faculty would receive them before leaving for the summer. All retirement and promotion agreements will be honored, but it is not possible at this point to do much more on raises or with regard to payments into retirement account. Ever more faculty who have chosen an Optional Retirement Plan are nearing retirement, yet that fund has not had time to be built up sufficiently; the issue needs review.

In reply to another question, he pledged that the Faculty Compensation Board will be consulted.

IV. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Will Hausman reported on a number of items being worked on by the FAC:

Post-tenure review procedures have been in the works since 1997: all but five of some 25 Arts and Sciences programs are now formally approved; those from Modern Languages and Mathematics are coming along, along with those from Physics, Applied Science and Theater, Speech and Dance (Religion’s policy remains somewhat in limbo, however). [During questions, it was pointed out that the university-wide document on post-tenure review is already in the hands of the Assembly (as a discussion item: no vote is planned until fall. Hausman pointed out that this
document will necessitate some modifications in the policies of Arts and Sciences].

Use of Faculty Research Assignment replacement funds to fund graduate assistants rather than fulltime replacement faculty has come under discussion: Professor Hausman reported FAC’s sense that this practice violates the spirit of the program and hurts teaching. It has therefore asked the Undergraduate Dean to monitor the situation. [A faculty member noted that the use of FRA replacement funds is often driven by specific Department or Program interests and that there should be no blanket ban on using it for graduate assistants].

A new committee will be established to evaluate new or proposed graduate programs: members of FAC feel that there need to be clear standards for this process.

A task force on international affiliations will also be set-up: until now the process has been somewhat ad hoc and needs to be somewhat more regularized.

V. Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Dean Barbara Watkinson reported that EPC this year approved 57 new courses and 57 changes in descriptions or number), as well as several more General Education Requirement designations (1 for GER 1; 6 for GER 4A; 1 for GER 4B; 3 for GER 4C; 5 for GER 5; and 2 for GER 7).

She noted that EPC has also authorized changes in concentration requirements for Applied Science, Anthropology, Chemistry, French, Geology, Hispanic Studies (formerly Spanish), International Relations, Linguistics and Mathematics’ teaching certification track.

In addition, Dean Watkinson cited the EPC’s approval of new policies on credit related to internships and the Concentration Computing Proficiency.

She noted EPC’s deliberations on inconsistencies or ambiguities in the catalog, including whether the grade of “C” is classified as “fair” or “satisfactory.” She also noted the committee’s decision to lift the ban on counting more than one statistics course toward the total 120 credits needed for graduation: the latter step was taken in light of changes in the content of stats courses and a sense that more than one can actually be beneficial for students.

Dean Watkinson reported that EPC has received assessments for GER’s 1 and 7, and voiced appreciation to those involved in the process: the sense is that the GERs are working but need some tweaking. Assessments on GERs 2, 4 and 6 (the last ones) are due in 2001-2002. Any recommendations for changes will be brought to the Arts and Sciences faculty.

She also noted the expanded use of on-line applications and the idea for an Educational Policy Committee manual as a record of past policies for the benefit of discussions by the committee.

Aside from one question on when the change in policy on credit for internships takes effect (Dean Watkinson said that it would apply as of fall, 2001), discussion centered on the EPC’s decision to allow more than one statistics course to be counted toward the 120 credits needed for graduation.
It was asked whether these course in various departments are really now so different from one another as to warrant this change. She said that students are already permitted to take two stats courses for credit with permission from the chairs of both departments offering them: permission is usually granted and about seventeen students do so each year. She agreed it would be possible under the proposed policy change for a student to take all six stats course; EPC could ask the Registrar to monitor enrollments to see if this happens (though that it would be ex post facto).

Another faculty member asked why there was a need to change if the current policy, including the possibility of exemption with chair approval, is working. She noted that it was in the interest of the departments involved and that EPC has to balance that against the small risk involved. Other faculty members pointed out that, while the common core of all stats courses overlaps, the applications are different in different concentrations. Moreover, it was noted, under current policy, a student with AP stats credit is barred from taking college stats (perhaps even in a major).

Another faculty member pointed out that there are different emphases, especially within Area II departments, and that students rarely master stats in one try—often it only registers on two tries.

Another faculty member argued that while some students may take two stats courses now, taking more than two is unlikely because it is complicated (under the new policy it would be costless). Watkinson stressed that the risk of abuse is just too small to warrant preserving the restriction. Under current policy, she said, some students simply don’t know they can’t do both for credit until graduation when it is either too late or a chair releases them from the limit anyway. Moreover, given the character of stats courses, she added, students are unlikely to want to take it too often.

It was proposed that students actually be limited to just two stats courses as part of their 120 total credits needed for graduation. That was in turn amended to two introductory statistics courses. Discussion centered on whether this will increase or decrease reciprocity among departments: some felt it will decrease it since departments will feel that concentrators now have no reason not to take their stats course. The motion carried on a voice vote.

During discussion, one faculty member urged that the Catalog Committee go through the catalog: thoroughly: it is not readable for those who use it and useless as a marketing device for prospective students. Another faculty member also urged improving the Catalog’s indexing.

VI. Report of the Committee on Graduate Studies

   Report of the Acting Dean of Research and Graduate Studies
   The Annual Report of the Ombuds Office

Acting Graduate Dean Gene Tracy began with a tribute to the work of his predecessor Steve Park.

He reported that Steve Park had begun a review of reports that our PhD stipends were not competitive by obtaining data from SCHEV and a supplemental peer group (most direct competitors). William and Mary was in the 50th percentile but should be in the 75th percentile.
There is a disjunction between the Dean’s authorized stipends and those actually awarded since fewer are given in order to increase the amount, thus in effect shrinking the program. So the College is giving fewer (and for a shorter time, four rather than five years). A review of the data indicates that the base level for stipends in all William and Mary PhD programs is below average, even very far below: the total pool is one million dollars for 90 students and has not risen. This issue should concern all faculty as retaining doctoral one status keeps the College in a more competitive peer group for salaries, means a more vibrant faculty research assignment program and assures more library money; it also helps undergraduates; finally the College is currently having to divert funds from elsewhere in order to make up the difference in some areas.

One question was whether figures from peer schools also distinguish between stipends authorized and stipends actually given (that is unclear). It was suggested that external funds should be there for stipends if a program is actually strong. However, another member of the faculty pointed out that such external money is often only forthcoming when there is adequate internal money.

Dean Tracy then reported on a review of the impact of closing down Masters programs: it concluded that there is a need for additional funds to support interdisciplinary programs; that the merit systems of participating departments should be reviewed; and that there need to be evaluation guidelines for any additional MA level programs.

Dean Tracy also reported on the restructuring of the governance of graduate programs. He concluded that there is greater need to streamline the process—more automatic approvals of routine items by the Dean should be authorized to take work off of the Committee. There is also a need for a better way to develop joint policies and help administer set priorities. COGS might also be scaled back: rather than having one representative from every graduate department, there could be a system of rotation for participating departments so that it becomes more a matter of thinking about graduate programs as a whole rather than just one’s own. In response to a question he agreed that there is a need to take into account the interests of departments like Mathematics and Government that do not have full-scale graduate programs but take part in others’.

Tracy then delivered the report of the Committee on Graduate Studies itself, mentioning innovations since the last report: the establishment of the Ombudsperson and the opening of the Graduate Center; the review of the impact of closing MA programs; and external evaluations of the programs in Applied Science and Anthropology. Ongoing work includes a review of procedures for extending PhD study beyond the seven year limit; what materials should be in a personnel file and what may be removed; and restructuring of the Dean’s Open Fellowship. Tracy commented in particular on the move to Graduate House, noting that it is increasingly self-managed, with the students themselves taking on an ever-larger role in its administration. He also mentioned among other things the establishment of a new graduate student data base on workshops, short courses, reading groups and internships/fellowships.

Leisa Meyer delivered the report of the Ombuds Office. She briefly cited the origins of this position in the 1999 learning climate report; it was officially established in 2000. Its purpose is to provide a venue for conflict resolution and as an information clearinghouse. Students set the agenda and raise the issues that it considers. As for its initial record, she noted that much of the work at this stage has consisted of getting the word: 38% of graduate students report having
already contacted the office (4% multiple times) mainly seeking information and advice on careers. To date no student has sought action by the office. It has developed plans to help deal with the kinds of conflicts with faculty advisors cited in the learning climate report. She noted that departments and programs need to develop adequate communications mechanisms of their own between faculty and grad students. She also urged faculty to advertise the services of the Ombuds Office to students. Future considerations include whether to extend its work beyond graduate programs; to recruit a pool of future ombudspersons; and communication.

A question from the floor was whether the Ombudsperson should intervene so early in conflict resolution as this was not the original intent of the faculty in authorizing the position. Professor Meyer replied that the office provides only information at the early stage of a potential conflict: it may recommend using a grievance procedure, but only involves itself directly at a later stage after exhaustion of the grievance procedure. In reply to the question of whether it was appropriate for a student to be discussing a leave of absence with the Ombuds Office before doing so with a faculty advisor, she stressed that the topic in such cases would only be the implications of such a step and technical issues involved; the Office would not instruct a student whether or not to take a leave. The questioner maintained that someone in the department/program should be consulted early on.

VII. Report of the Committee on Honors and Interdisciplinary Studies

In view of the lateness of the hour, this report was put off until fall, 2001.

VIII. New Business

Given the lateness of the hour, anyone raising new business would have risked bodily injury.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25–on

Respectfully submitted,

Clay Clemens

Professor of Government

Secretary’s Note: This May, 2001 meeting set a record for the number of reports delivered and for time spent in listening to reports (perhaps only the prospect of a wine and cheese reception to be held afterwards prevented it from entering a third hour). On a related note, it is not too early to begin thinking about a successor to the current Secretary, the remainder of whose term is just one academic year--nine months, eight meetings, and fifty-some reports (but who’s counting?).