

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Thursday, December 12, 2013, 1200 – 1350 (i.e., noon – 1:50 pm)
Commonwealth Auditorium, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 131.

Continued discussion of document on proposed new curriculum (Diane Shakes and John Gilmour). If discussion reaches an end at this meeting (*dis voluntibus!!!*), a final vote on the new curriculum will be held.

Documents are all available on the Curriculum Review Blackboard site:
https://blackboard.wm.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp?tab_tab_group_id=2_1&url=%2Fwebapps%2Fblackboard%2Fexecute%2Flauncher%3Ftype%3DCourse%26id%3D19341_1%26url%3D

Dean Conley welcomes us all to this meeting, an historic opportunity to address one of the matters of greatest importance for a faculty of Arts and Sciences – the curriculum. The proposal in front of us has been three years in the making, the result of the hard work of many colleagues, and we have been assured, as recently as Monday, that the extra resources will in fact be provided for the new curriculum to proceed forward. The rest, she says, is up to us.

John Gilmour outlines how the meeting shall proceed. After a brief statement from Phil Daileader, we will then progress to amendments submitted by Chris Tucker (Philosophy), Bill Cooke (Physics), David Feldman (Economics), and a fourth amendment – not promulgated – from Will Hausman (Economics). Additional amendments will be entertained before we proceed to a motion to adopt the proposed curriculum, followed by general discussion, and then the vote. In order for the vote to occur, discussion will have to end no later than 1:40. If the curriculum is approved, then the whole thing gets punted to the EPC to work out the *kleine technische* and slog through the logistics of implementation. Throughout the meeting, Professor Gilmour will do his best to ensure the strict observance of parliamentary procedure which demands the careful balancing of the right of the majority to act with the rights of individuals to speak their minds (*as indeed he did*).

Be sure your seatbelts are fastened and your trays tables are up in the locked position. Here we go!!!!

Phil Daileader (History) makes a brief remark regarding his amendment (to postpone discussion of the proposed curriculum until the ramifications of section 8 are fully understood). Our ambitious new curriculum is based on a number of assumptions of teaching responsibilities, namely that faculty sufficient time to build exciting new courses, and that faculty will then have sufficient time to teach those courses as they should be taught. But in April, we were faced with Resolution 25.8 of the W&M Promise (section 8) which mandates the increasing the instructional contribution of full-time permanent W&M faculty. What is meant by the instructional contribution, how this increased is to be

achieved, and how much the contribution will be increased are all undefined. But the resolution does say that by 2014-15, the institution will implement policies that will bring about this increased instructional contribution. These policies do not yet exist, and we cannot know if (or to what extent) such policies will undercut the assumptions upon which the proposed curriculum is predicated. We may be left with insufficient time or resources to build this curriculum – hence the link between section 8 and the new curriculum. On Monday (December 9, 2013), the Dean assured us that the policy (response to section 8) would be faculty-driven, and the Provost assured us that the increased teaching expectations would be “**modest**”. Because of these public assurances, Professor Daileader no longer feels the need to bring his amendment to the floor, but he remains concerned that 25.8 may yet prove fatal to the new curriculum but optimistic that the policies will be crafted and implemented with care and collaboration in the spirit fairness. With thanks to all who weighed in, and apologies to all those who suffered heart attacks.

The **Chris Tucker** (Philosophy) **Amendment** to condense and clarify the ALV description.

- seconded.
- no discussion.
- the ayes have it.
- *an auspicious start!*

The **Bill Cooke** (Physics) **Amendment** to require “an EPC approved experience in each of the three domains where the primary mode of instruction is not classroom lecturing”. This is likely to have little affect on what we do already but is meant to emphasize that W&M teaching is innovative and the student experience goes beyond a MOOK.

- seconded.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): in full sympathy with the spirit of the amendment, suggests that the wording, nonetheless, is unclear and “squishy”. Are these experiences supposed to be part of a course? How do we classify experiences “outside” the curriculum within the Domains? e.g., does a “sports” experience count as leadership, i.e., Government?
- Bill Cooke (Physics): admits that the wording is “beyond squishy”, expects that details will be hammered out in the implementation phase, has no desire to exclude any courses, and trusts the EPC to make such decisions.
- Michael Deschenes (Kinesiology and Health Sciences): reiterates that the wording is disconcerting, as he would not consider it appropriate to award academic credit to Kinesiology majors for coaching Little League Baseball during the summer break.
- Gene Tracy (Physics): supports the amendment, recalling concerns raised at Monday’s meeting, concerns about Domains, concerns about hidden resource grabs. He tries to direct discussion back to the amendment on the floor and our focus to the underlying principle: in each of the Domains there should be some hands-on activity: participating in an ensemble, conducting a survey, taking a lab, *aut sim*. Since we all agree that this is good for the students, let’s embrace this and let the EPC worry about implementation.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): supporting the amendment in principle but wonders why COLL 300 is excluded. The assumption that Study

Abroad is necessarily experientially active? Agreeing with Gene that it would be relatively simple to find a number of courses in each Domain to satisfy the requirement. *BC: COLL 300 and 400 are both missing – 400, which will almost certainly be satisfied in the major; 300 because of general confusion on his own part.*

- Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures): queries about COLL 400 – research-, discussion-centered seminar experience, preferring to see it omitted so the “active” experience must occur within the first three years and not be postponed to the end.
- Colleen Kennedy (MLL & Film and Media Studies): wonders about the language of “classroom lecturing” since in **so many** of our courses there is no “classroom lecturing” **ever**. *BC: not intended to be restrictive, the intent is to get it into the curriculum that we value these types of learning experiences.*
- Georgia Irby (Classical Studies): *yes, I finally mustered the courage to speak my mind in public*: with thanks to Professor Kennedy for the segue into my own remarks, I wholeheartedly endorse Principle 9 and do as much “Active Learning” as possible in all of my courses, including the large lectures (I require Projects/Papers from students in Mythology and Roman Civilization where the enrollment is 100+). But neither is this language, nor the language it is meant to replace even necessary. It seems redundant and irrelevant. If we are to define “Active Learning” as learning that is not centered around “lecture”, then much of our curriculum is, by definition, active, and every single one of us teaches a courses that falls under this rubric: discussion intensive seminars, the array of courses that involve the collection and analysis of data (labs, the sorts of Social Science courses described by Professor Stafford on Dec 3, anthropology, archaeology), the arts – performing and studio arts, creative writing, mathematics (I did not learn integral calculus by watching Professor Edwards write proofs on the board; he set problems, we worked through the proofs, discussing and correcting as we went). foreign language (in my own beginning classes, perhaps 25% of the time is spent on lecture – the rest of the time, students are manipulating the language, translating). I am sure that there is much that I’ve omitted. Finally, Active Learning can be legislated about as effectively as morality. Students are either active or they’re not. In language classes, we have three types of students: those who just get it, those who work really hard, and those who couldn’t care less. In the big lectures classes, some of my students put their hearts and souls into their projects, producing truly amazing and wonderful work. Others could not care less. These kids are just checking boxes. There has been a lot of talk about “box-checking” over the past year, and I am sorry to burst the bubble, but as long as there **any** requirements **at all**(even if it is the number of classes or credit hours) there will be box-checking. And finally, there has also been a lot of talk about how the GER system has failed. I speak neither against Professor Cooke’s amendment, nor in favor of it. I speak neither against the curriculum proposal nor in favor of it. The GER curriculum did not fail. Perhaps some faculty have failed it, or some courses, or some students. Nonetheless, I believe in what I do, I believe that the courses I teach are interesting and important. It is not the GER system. It is a matter of designing and offering the best possible courses and teaching those courses in the best possible way – with heart and creativity and enthusiasm, with

respect for the material, with respect for the discipline, and with respect for the students, whether it be in our current GER system or in the new COLL system (*applause – yeah! – it made me smile, and I curtseyed, which made you laugh – applause and laughter, not bad for my inaugural comments at a faculty meeting. My father would have been proud*).

- Suzanne Raitt (English): requests clarification on which language exactly Professor Cooke’s amendment is meant to replace. *BC: reiterates that the term “Active Learning” seems to have side-tracking some people, and he agrees that his amendment will have no real affect on what we are doing, but the concept is sufficiently important that it should be emphasized. His amendment is intended to recognize what we value pedagogically. The crux: “active learning” is to be replaced by “primary mode of instruction is not classroom lecturing in each of the three Domains”.*
- Kim Wheatley (English): offers that the essence of the amendment seems to be the mandate that such courses are to be taken **one in each Domain**.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): suggests that the language needs to be changed, active learning **outside** the classroom might satisfy the principle. *BC: seminars satisfy the principle, so no.*
- Kitty Preston (Music): interprets the amendment as trying to get at something beyond all the exciting ultra-lecturing courses that we already offer, beyond traditional academic college classes, **beyond the norm**: getting the hands dirty, creating, performing, surveys, oral history. Not all seminars would fulfill this requirement. By extending the requirement to each Domain suggests that such activities are important in all Domains. We need to get students out of their comfort zones, to expand their intellectual horizons, to try out different and new things. Increasingly, students often come in with a set idea of what they want to be when they are 30 years old, they are not experimenting, not trying, not exploring.
- someone tries to call the question.
- voted down.
- George Rublein (Mathematics): believes that he served on the committee that entertained the discussion of the “so-called doing part”(Lily Panoussi assures him that he did in fact attend those meetings). His sense is that the intent of the “doing requirement” is meant to engage students physically in intellectual experiences which will result in a grade. Which is to say, bowling a 290 does not constitute a leadership experience, nor does ringing the holiday bell outside Walmart. It is also his understanding that the EPC would exercise oversight. *BC: such activities must occur under the aegis of a faculty advisor and such activities are intended to graded.*
- John Delos (Physics): favors the amendment but disagrees that “beyond lecture” adequately captures the intended spirit. This requirement should not be satisfied by discussion-centered seminars nor by many Physics courses where lots of assigned homework satisfies the criterion “beyond lecture”. The core is that the experience should be EPC-approved, and we should leave it to the EPC.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): proposes adding “satisfied by a credit-bearing experience in each of the Domains” to the original language.
- the question is called.
- discussion is closed (with two or three nays).

- *JG: you could ask for a recorded vote, but please don't.*
- the Cooke amendment is defeated (“*sorry Bill*”).

The **David Feldman** (Economics) **Amendment**: to restore “or global” to the description of COLL 300 and to open up the COLL 300 rubric to include some courses currently offered in high quality classes that have a global orientation. Not vilifying “cross-cultural”, he reminds us that our principles include globalism, but not “cross-cultural.

- seconded.
- Francis Tanglao-Aguas (Africana Studies and Theater): moves to expand Professor Feldman’s amendment to include “or race and ethnicity”.
- seconded.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): requests clarification.
- Francis Tanglao-Aguas (Africana Studies and Theater): global courses are not necessarily cross-cultural but they can and often do deal with issues of race and ethnicity. When dealing with “whiteness”, one is bound to discuss (hopefully) the intersections or relationship of one particular nationality with others. An incoming faculty member suggested a move to a race and ethnicity requirement and this seems an opportune moment to entertain such a proposal. Global and cross-cultural are not necessarily exclusive, but race and ethnicity also concerns the relationships between peoples in terms of nationalism.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): a similar proposal was already considered at the initial COLL 300 discussion (though the majority in attendance at this meeting did not hear those arguments). Allowing any number of courses to fulfill COLL 300 undermines what COLL 300 is meant to do. The on-campus colloquia are meant to be exciting opportunities to do something new. Any number of courses in MLL would satisfy COLL 300 (*and Classical studies, too, for that matter*). Opening up COLL 300 to other courses poses no change to what we currently do, this would only insert a distribution requirement. With utmost respect for the excellent work that all of us, her colleagues, do, COLL 300 is supposed to be something new, exciting and different. She calls the question.
- discussion on the Tanglao-Aguas Amendment is ended.
- The **Tanglao-Aguas Amendment** to the Feldman Amendment is defeated.
- *Or did we vote not to continue debate? There was a great deal of confusion.*
- Diane Shakes (Biology): asks Professor Tanglao-Aguas if his language would work in either version. *FT-A: It makes a stronger statement that we require our students to address issues of race, racism and ethnicity alongside cross-cultural and global issues. Since these are important to Africana Studies, we will organize further so we can revisit the issue.*
- John Gilmour: as the question is complex, recommends submitting such a resolution to EPC where it can be deliberated in a more “thoughtful” setting (*by “thoughtful”, that is to say, a setting where 190 faculty members are not trying to weigh in simultaneously – not that the meeting was raucous, not by a long-shot, we are not the English Parliament – imagine what sort of nightmare that would pose for the secretary!!!*)

- Francis Tanglao-Aguas (Africana Studies and Theater): blames David, had he not proposed his amendment, this issue would not have clicked in in his own mind.
- David Feldman (Economics): sanguinely accepting the blame, turns us back to Principle 7 which encompasses a great deal, but does not mandate cross-culturalism. Many courses in MLL would satisfy this spirit, but not in the Social Sciences. The issue is Discipline specific. Race and ethnicity are fine things to think about, but would a class on “Race in the South” qualify? Despite not going beyond the nation into the rest of the world?
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): reminds us that courses that might fulfill a certain requirement do not have to carry such a designation.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): admits to some deja-vu since he recalls a similar conversation at a much smaller venue.
- the question is called (again).
- discussion is ended (again).
- The Tanglao-Aguas Amendment to the Feldman Amendment is defeated (again).
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): continues – in defense of the COLL 300 as described in the curriculum, most public lectures, unless given by celebrities – Cornell West, Dalai Llama – are poorly attended. He himself admits to attending a mere 20% of the items entered into his own planner. The COLL 300 colloquium offers a real opportunity to pull students outside their comfort zones through active engagement with a different set of ideas. Certifying a spectrum of courses to fulfill COLL 300 dilutes the intention of COLL 300.
- Will Hausman (Economics): having no problem with COLL 300, posits that about 60% of our students (from 1600, about 1000, or about 960 – so corrected by the historian) will likely satisfy COLL 300 through the on-campus colloquium. The new curriculum will be expensive to implement and it is prudent to open up options to help in the implementation.
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): notes two trajectories in the conversation: 1) global versus cross-cultural, and 2) classroom experiences – or just which courses will satisfy COLL 300? Can these be separated?
- Paul Manna (Government and Public Policy): perhaps a middle ground can be reached. To do these colloquia well is HARD and students may feel some sense of incoherence in courses built around a lot of guest speakers unless the faculty leader is doing a lot of work to pull it all together. The Feldman amendment offers us attractive flexibility for the short term, and courses can then be decertified once we emerge from the colloquia learning curve.
- Ron Rapoport (Government): as a point of information, how large will these Colloquia be?
- JG: *emphasizes that we are talking about Colloquia in the plural (not Colloquium in the singular).*
- Ron Rapoport (Government): 100, 150, 200 students? or 25, 30, 50? Surely these will be very different experiences. More information is needed to make an informed judgment on the Colloquia.
- JG: *larger than average classes, but compensated by the celebrity of the guest speakers.*

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): there are a number of important implementation questions, and a lot that we do not know. She calls the question.
- discussion is ended (with one dissenter).
- the Feldman Amendment is defeated (57-94).

The **Will Hausman** (Economics) **Amendment**: to strike “taught by continuing W&M faculty” from the description of COLL 400, since we frequently have distinguished visitors who should indeed be eligible to direct such important courses.

- the motion is seconded.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): calls the question.
- no discussion.
- The Hausman Amendment carries (*with two or three stray nays that sounded to the secretary not altogether enthusiastic*).

There are no further amendments, and members of the FAC and EPC, as well as the secretary and the Dean express an audible sigh of relief, as the time approaches 1310 and the window for voting on the proposal quickly begins to wane.

Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): requesting a microphone, moves that we adopt the new curriculum.

- seconded.
- Ron Rapoport (Government): requests clarification on the changes. *JG: The Chris Tucker revision to the wording of ALV and the Will Hausman deletion from COLL 400.*

Dean Kate Conley then invites discussion of the whole.

- John Delos (Physics): although conceding that the current version of the curriculum seems closer to reality than earlier versions, still opposes the proposal on the grounds of philosophy and religion, on the grounds that there are no visible mechanisms for assessment, and on the grounds that mathematics and the laboratory and performing arts requirements have been eliminated. Philosophically, the new curriculum emphasizes process instead of content (e.g., we are no longer working under the assumption that there are bodies of knowledge that students ought to learn – western history and culture), a philosophy that has failed in the secondary educational system. Further, the new curriculum imposes the religion of interdisciplinarianism on “freshpersons”. Interdisciplinarity only works, is only successful, when the foundations are in place. Interdisciplinary studies are hardly suitable to freshmen, and many (people) are attracted to interdisciplinarity because they are intellectually lazy. “Beginning students need the discipline of a **Discipline**”. The purpose of a curriculum is not to entertain faculty, not to make the Dean’s job easier, but to educate students. And under this new curriculum, nothing is offered but points of view, and the proposed curriculum requires more resources to deliver less education. Professor Delos prefers a content-based curriculum.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): observes that the new curriculum eliminates an awful lot of space from finding a major. Undecided students often find their majors while

satisfying GERs, and the COLL 100/200 system is an inadequate substitute. The extreme focus on interdisciplinarianism is a real flaw in the design of the proposal, and will prove critical for a number of undecided students.

- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): requests clarification about the implementation process. *KC: this is to be addressed after the vote and it will be a gradual process with some pilot courses to be offered in the Fall 2014 and the appointment of College Fellows. John Griffin (Dean of Undergraduate Studies): there will be discussions with Chairs and Program Directors regarding how the COLL system will accord with major and program requirements and how departments will cover major courses while also contributing to the COLL system. The discussion with the Provost will be ongoing. The new curriculum will not go into effect until Fall 2015.*
- *and – your secretary here – the audio abruptly breaks off (1 hour and 20 minutes in), leaving us at the mercy of notes hastily scribbled by a hand that aches to the bone directed by a mind fatigued after so much intense debate – nine meetings this term – two meetings this week – I did the best I could. In no way is this indicative of any kind of laziness, but is perhaps meritorious punishment for the hubristic assumption that technology would fill in the gaps where either my hands were unable to keep up or the acoustics militated against an accurate and immediate comprehension of the more subtle statements.*
- Francis Tanglao-Aguas (Africana Studies and Theater): point of information – are we voting on the entire curriculum or will there be room for malleability after the vote? *John Griffin: we will follow the guidelines that are being voted on.*
- John Gilmour (Government): after the vote, there will be a process of “muddling through”. The EPC expects changes as we go. Some aspects will no doubt work well, others will be jettisoned. The new curriculum will be implemented with common sense, and “we won’t do anything stupid”.
- Francis Tanglao-Aguas (Africana Studies and Theater): procedurally? *JG: there is not yet enough detail in the proposal. Courses will be approved. The curriculum will be deliberated in greater detail. It will be a participatory process.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): assures that no changes will be implemented unless brought to the faculty for a vote.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): having attended almost all the meetings, which have been at times “tedious” (to use a “kind” word), he observes that much of the new curriculum is predicated on how much we trust one another as faculty members. He trusts his colleagues not to jettison content, and he notes an ethos that recognizes the sacredness of content. In secondary education, content seems to trump process, and this is problematic, as our students come to us every Fall with less and less critical reasoning ability. He is excited about the possibilities. (applause).
- Josh Gert (Philosophy): Although the document is much improved from last year, his concerns abide: that it is possible to graduate from W&M with no courses in History “at all” or natural science “at all”. With the three knowledge Domains, it would be easy for students to satisfy Domain requirements without ever taking courses in areas in which they think they have no interest. Students tend to take classes in areas in which they already have an intellectual interest. They avoid courses in

disciplines of which they are afraid or those of which they've never heard. We need to push our students to take courses in these areas of personal fear or ignorance, so they might learn something they otherwise would not have learned.

- Matthew Haug (Philosophy): noting the unintended philosophical tag-teaming, reiterates his colleague's concern that students could graduate without ever taking courses in any number of important areas – Biological or Physical Sciences, or without any courses in Behavioral or Social Sciences, etc. A philosophy major could easily fulfill Domain distribution requirements with courses just in Philosophy. This reality deserves our full consideration as we cast our votes.
- David Armstrong (Physics): trusting his colleagues, he calls the question.
- The voice vote seems unclear (some yeas are louder than others; some nays are louder than others), so a count is in order. Those who wish to end discussion stand, clearly about 2/3 of those present. The faculty agree that the time has come, at long last, to end debate.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): specifies who is able to vote according to the Faculty Handbook.
- Paper ballots are distributed.
- votes are counted and recounted and recounted again.
- the declaration comes that the FAC have a count.
- suspension builds.
- the vote is disclosed.
- 101 yeas, 83 nays, 1 abstention.
- the new curriculum passes.

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 1:47 pm after thanking members of the FAC, EPC, and those who attended these special meetings with such assiduity.

The secretary heartily thanks Laura for hitting “record” on the audio player, and, once again, Steve Otto for compiling the list of faculty who spoke on the Curriculum Review (for the final time!), Trina Garrison and the cheerful staff at Technical Services for processing the audio recording, especially Robin. Happy Holidays, everyone!

Respectfully Submitted,
Georgia L. Irby, Secretary
Associate Professor of Classical Studies
gkirby@wm.edu

What more is there to say?! Stay tuned to this station for the next all-new, unscripted, live episode of the minutes from the W&M A&S faculty meeting! Who will attend?!? Will there be a quorum?!? What issues will galvanize the faculty?!? Will there be fireworks?!? How many times will Professor X speak? Professor Y? Professor Z? Will Colonel Potter finally grant that Section 8 to Klinger?!? (No, wait, that's a different show!) How many points of order?!? How many points of information? And who (pause) will **call** (pause) **the question**?!?

<http://www.seaturtles.org/>