

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**December 2, 2014**  
**Chesapeake C, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:32 PM.  
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 40.*

**I. Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes for the meeting of the Faculty on November 4, 2014, were **approved** unanimously by voice vote:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/index.php>

**II. Report of Administrative Officers**

a. Provost Michael Halleran

- Reminded the Faculty that Monday, December 8<sup>th</sup>, is the deadline to apply for a Creative Adaptation Fund award:  
<http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/initiatives/creative-adaptation/index.php>
- Encouraged the Faculty to consult a report on the costs of public higher education in Virginia that was recently released by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC):  
<http://jlarc.virginia.gov/reports.shtml>  
For the period from 1998 through 2012, the report concludes that the single largest cause of increase in the cost of public higher education was the reduction of state support. Additional emphases of the report include fee increases, the costs of athletics, building on campus, and affordability.
- Reminded the Faculty that the Governor's executive order now requires chairs of departments and directors of programs to disclose their financial interests by completing the Statement of Economic Interests form in accordance with the State and Local Government Conflict of Interests Act:  
<https://commonwealth.virginia.gov/va-government/conflict-of-interest/>  
<https://commonwealth.virginia.gov/media/2864/statementeconinterest-712014.pdf>  
David Feldman (Economics) asked whether the College intends to express to the Governor's office any concerns about this requirement. Provost Halleran responded that he is considering whether such expression could actually produce useful effects. David asked what penalties faculty would incur if they did not complete the Statement of Economic Interests, and Sarah Stafford (Economics) replied that the stated penalty for failure to report financial interests is a \$2500 fine. Heather Macdonald (Geology) asked for clarification as to whether the

phrase “department chairs” mentioned in the order was meant to refer to the chair of an academic department or instead to the chair of a department of procurement, for example. Bruce Campbell (Modern Languages) further asked whether a chair could avoid the requirement to report personal financial interests by relinquishing their signing authority over departmental funding. Sarah Stafford (Economics) also asked why the order should be implemented at the College to include program directors when the language of the order had specified only department chairs. Provost Halleran responded to Heather, Bruce, and Sarah that the language of the statute and of the executive order refers to those who would potentially have influence on funds; it thereby categorizes state employees from a functional, not titular, perspective. Bruce then expressed concern that this order could potentially apply to a very large number of faculty who have influence over even very small funds at the College. Kay Jenkins (Sociology) also noted that the reporting requirement extends even to the financial interests of the immediate family members of those chairs and directors. Sarah Stafford (Economics) expressed concern that this requirement of program directors might serve as a deterrent for faculty members who are asked to direct programs in the future. John Gilmour (Government) added that the full ramifications of the order may not be clear to state government officials, so it could prove beneficial for someone from the College to explain those ramifications to them. Bill Cooke (Physics) asked whether this policy was going to extend also to all principal investigators who are awarded funding. Provost Halleran replied that he had not heard any evidence that it would. Chuck Bailey (Geology) added that a colleague at Virginia Tech has reported that the order will soon extend to principal investigators. At the end of the FAS meeting, Marc Sher (Physics) explained that he is an NSF Program Officer and asked that any faculty who can confirm this planned extension to principal investigators please inform him, as such a policy may be in violation of federal law.

- Announced that the Board of Visitors has adopted the proposal that will change the by-laws of the Faculty Constitution to allow non-tenure-eligible faculty to run in regular elections for seats on the Faculty Assembly. Provost Halleran urged the Faculty to prioritize NTE inclusion where appropriate in policy development.

b. Dean Kate Conley

- Reported that she has had conversations with the Faculty Affairs Committee, Associate Vice President for Government Relations Frances Bradford, Provost Halleran, Vice President for Administration Anna Martin, and Dean Baucom at the University of Virginia regarding the Statement of Economic Interests (see above) in order to assess how the College can best respond to this executive order by the Governor. Dean Conley also emphasized that completion of the form is less time-consuming after the first year in which it is submitted.
- Announced that she will report in the spring semester on the outcome of the activity-based survey, once she has received a full report from the Censeo consultants and the Business Administration Steering Committee and knows what measures the administration is considering.

- Reported that she has had benchmarking conversations with four deans at a selection of universities with similar organizational structures: the University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina, Wake Forest, and Brandeis. The University of Virginia reported particular success there with changes to their business administration process, and Dean Baucom of UVA expressed interest in the William & Mary Promise and the new College Curriculum. Dean Baucom will likely visit the College during the spring semester to learn more about both of these initiatives.
- Reported that a November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting between the Deans, the Board of Visitors, Rector Stottlemeyer, Vice Rector Scott, the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD), and the Faculty Affairs Committee involved discussion of the William & Mary Promise, faculty research, the capital campaign, faculty diversity, and sexual violence on campus.
- Described Rector Stottlemeyer's activities during his November 19<sup>th</sup> visit with individual courses, faculty and students in the Arts and Sciences, and Fellows of the Center for the Liberal Arts; during a lunch meeting with the Rector, the Deans emphasized the breadth, diversity, and depth of the curriculum as a measure of success and highlighted the challenge of integrating additional students into A&S courses.

### **III. Report from Faculty Assembly**

Bill Cooke (Physics) described four main FA agenda items for the year: (1) redesign of the faculty survey (including its abbreviation) for distribution next fall; (2) faculty diversity; (3) retirement incentives; and (4) gender climate and sexual assault. The Faculty Assembly has also been consulting with the Office of University Advancement and working to document the ways in which the Faculty are already using available resources to advance the university.

### **IV. Report from Nominations and Elections**

Rob Hinkle (Chemistry) announced that the following candidates are running for election:

- Katherine Preston (Music) and Robert J. Scholnick (English) for a one-semester term as a replacement on the Personnel Policy and Procedural Review Committees representing Area I, beginning Spring 2015
- Carl E. Carlson (Physics) and Junping Shi (Mathematics) for a one-semester term as a replacement on the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee representing Area III, beginning Spring 2015
- Chris Abelt (Chemistry) and Rex Kincaid (Mathematics) for a three-year term on the Faculty Affairs Committee/Faculty Assembly representing Area III, beginning Fall 2015
- Michael Daise (Religion) and Thomas Payne (Music) for a three-year term on the International Studies Advisory Committee, beginning Fall 2015

There were no nominations from the floor. The ballot closes at 5:00 PM on Tuesday, December 9<sup>th</sup>. Votes cast after that date and time will not be counted in these elections.

Anyone who experiences technical difficulties in voting should contact Amy Oakes at: [acoake@wm.edu](mailto:acoake@wm.edu).

## **V. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee**

Greg Hancock (Geology) reported that the FAC had met four times since the last FAS meeting, including consultation with Dean Conley to clarify the Statement of Economic Interests and also to formulate a list of questions for the Rector and Vice Rector (see above). The FAC has created a list of A&S and College-wide committees that are open to service for lecturers and senior lecturers, following the policy that NTE faculty may serve on committees that do not deal with personnel matters; those who wish to consult the list should contact the Committee on Nominations and Elections:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/nominations/>

Discussions have also been held with the Athletic Policy Committee about the impact of concussions on students; the APC plans to attend a meeting of the FAS during the spring semester to report on this issue. In addition, the FAC is preparing a thorough report of faculty service appointments and terms as well as a review and revision of guidelines for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

## **VI. Report from Committee on Graduate Studies**

Rex Kincaid (Mathematics) explained that the COGS serves roles similar to those served on the undergraduate level by the Educational Policy Committee and the Committee on Degrees. He invited the Faculty to consult a recent report issued by the COGS:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/graduatestudies/documents/index.php>

Rex also explained that a two-day seminar of the COGS held this past May focused upon graduate regulations, streamlining course numberings, and pursuing shared expectations across graduate degree programs.

## **VII. Report from Educational Policy Committee**

John Gilmour (Government) presented two motions regarding implementation of the COLL curriculum:

### **1. Motion regarding COLL 100 class size:**

“For two years (AY 2015-17), EPC will allow COLL 100’s to be as large as 75 students if they have discussion sections of no more than 25 students, or to be as large as 40 students with no discussion sections. This would allow a pilot study of the effect of class size on learning objectives. COLL 100 courses of all sizes will be assessed over a period of two years to ensure that they fulfill learning objectives. The default size of COLL 100 will remain 25. A larger class will be approved only following an application by the instructor, who will explain how the larger class will be able to meet the COLL 100 learning objectives.”

Gul Ozyegin (Sociology) asked whether the sample of the pilot study would be large

enough to scientifically determine what effect class size would have on learning objectives. John responded that the sample of the pilot study would not be large enough to arrive at any scientifically verifiable conclusions. John also clarified that COLL 100's would be allowed to have enrollments of less than 25 students per course. Gene Tracy (Physics) spoke in favor of the motion, adding that he has converted a three-credit course into a four-credit course by adding discussion sections, so that lecture is large but the discussion sections are small. Chuck Bailey (Geology) also supported the motion for three reasons: (1) the College needs more COLL 100's, so flexibility could increase the likelihood that faculty will volunteer to teach COLL 100's; (2) this pilot experiment with COLL 100 courses would allow small departments to serve more students; (3) this modification would not undermine the pedagogical objectives of the curriculum. Gul Ozyegin expressed concern that the ideal of smaller classes for COLL 100's might be abandoned if the pilot experiment shows large classes to be effective. John Gilmour clarified that the EPC is not proposing revocation of the stipulated enrollment of 25 students for each of the COLL 100's courses; rather the motion would allow course enrollment to be enlarged upon faculty request. George Rublein (Mathematics) asked whether the EPC has any misgivings about this proposal. John responded that there are misgivings about everything but that he favors experimentation and learning from practice.

The EPC's Motion 1 **passed** on a voice vote.

2. Motion regarding COLL 200 credit requirements and additional credits in the knowledge domains:

At the December 12, 2013, meeting of the FAS, the curriculum approved by the Faculty required that a student complete twelve credits at the COLL 200 level and six additional credits.

John Gilmour explained that a subsequent amendment was adopted last year to allow for COLL 200 courses to be either three or four credits; he further explained that the amendment adopted last year would effectively mean that any student who enrolled in a three-credit COLL 200 course would therefore need to take a fourth COLL 200 course in order to satisfy the total of twelve credits required at the COLL 200 level. In an attempt to avert this scenario, the EPC proposed a new motion stipulating that the total number of COLL 200 credits required of each student be reduced from twelve credits to nine credits. This reduction in the number of COLL 200 credits required would further necessitate that the total number of additional credits required of each student be increased from six credits to nine credits in order to reach the required number of total COLL credits.

Under the EPC's new motion, the revised requirements for COLL 200 courses would therefore read as follows:

“Each COLL 200 course belongs to one or more of the domains. Each of these courses significantly enhances student knowledge of a specific topic and also calls upon students to think about how its discipline fits into the broader framework of the

Liberal Arts. Thus, each course emphasizes ideas and methods central to its domain(s) while also looking outward to one or both of the other domains. To the extent possible, COLL 200 courses also give students the opportunity to put methodologies represented in the course into practice. Every student must take a total of **nine** 200-level credits, with at least one course in each domain of no less than three credits. One COLL 200 must be taken in year 2; transfer students must take one during their first year at William and Mary. COLL 200 courses may or may not have prerequisites.”

Under the EPC’s new motion, the revised requirements for additional credits in the knowledge domains would therefore read as follows:

“Additional Credits in the Knowledge Domains: Courses in the Undergraduate Catalog will be designated as belonging to one or at most two of the three domains, as recommended by departments and programs, and with EPC approval. Students will be required to take at least two credits in each domain, completing a total of at least **nine** credits in this way. Credits from a single course may be counted in only one domain. Courses at any level, from introductory to advanced, may be used to satisfy this requirement.”

Sarah Stafford (Economics) proposed an amendment to the motion that would instead require students to complete **three** additional credits in each domain to achieve the total requirement of nine additional credits.

Teresa Longo (Modern Languages) clarified that the two-credit requirement was initially designed to allow departments with several two-credit courses to contribute to the new curriculum. Sarah replied that her proposal would not preclude students from enrolling in those two-credit courses. Bruce Campbell (Modern Languages) expressed concerns that students may experience difficulty cobbling together credits in the way that Sarah described, and he also raised the possibility that advisors would find it more difficult to explain the curriculum; in the name of inclusion of the arts in particular, he advised sticking with the two-credit requirement for each domain. Bill Cooke (Physics) likewise expressed the concern that students would be less inclined to take a two-credit course if doing so would not satisfy the additional credit requirement in that course’s domain.

Sarah responded that students already cobble together one-credit and two-credit courses; she expressed concern that requiring only five credits in each domain (i.e., three credits at the COLL 200 level and then only two additional credits) would sacrifice the intended breadth of the new curriculum; she therefore advised that the number of additional credits required in each domain be increased from two in each domain to three in each domain in order to maintain a total of six credits required in each domain (three credits at the COLL 200 level and then three additional credits). Dave Feldman (Economics) also highlighted the appealing simplicity of requiring that each student take three additional credits in each of the three domains.

Christopher Owens (Theatre, Speech, and Dance ) emphasized that two-credit courses often involve more than two contact hours per week, so he expressed concern that the three-credit requirement in each domain would serve as a deterrent to students considering enrollment in two-credit courses.

George Rublein (Mathematics) asked whether every course offered by the Arts &

Sciences faculty will belong to a domain. John Gilmour (Government) responded that many will belong to a domain if proposed as such by the faculty and approved by the EPC, but there is no absolute requirement that every course must be declared as belonging to a domain.

Sarah Stafford's amendment to the motion did *not* pass on a voice vote.

Gene Tracy (Physics) spoke against the EPC's Motion 2 on the grounds that its reduction from twelve to nine required credits would dilute the COLL 200 requirement in the curriculum by significantly reducing contact hours. He explained that discussion of the COLL 200 courses had initially stated that at least ten to fifteen percent of a COLL 200 course should consider another domain but that the Faculty had recently clarified this requirement as only ten percent; Gene observed that when this reduction is combined with the EPC's proposed reduction from twelve to nine required credits, this would result in a 50 percent reduction in required contact hours reaching out across domains. So he proposed an amendment to the EPC's Motion 2 to the effect that the Faculty would: (a) retain the twelve-credit requirement; (b) require that COLL 200 courses be four credits; (c) delink credits and contact hours; and (d) require six total additional credits across the knowledge domains.

Sarah added that she is concerned that Motion 2 would undo a curriculum that was agreed upon last year during much larger meetings of the Faculty. She advised that revisions be postponed until the curriculum has been adequately tested in its current form. Sarah therefore advised leaving the language as originally specified last academic year: twelve total credits required at the 200 level, with at least one course in each domain of no less than three credits. Bill Hutton (Classics) clarified that only 38 faculty members were present for the meeting last year at which the Faculty agreed to allow three-credit courses at the COLL 200 level; Sarah responded that the result of this amendment was nevertheless included in the curriculum for which the much larger group of faculty later voted in December of 2013. Teresa Longo (Modern Languages) advocated for retention of the twelve-credit requirement and suggested that the Faculty revisit the question of delinking at a later meeting.

Gene's amendment was called to question.

Chuck Bailey (Geology) raised a concern as to how automatic delinking of credits and contact hours would be justified in practice (i.e., how to account for that fourth credit-hour). Teresa Longo added that the allowance of three-credit courses at the COLL 200 level was an acknowledgment that four credits are not appropriate for every COLL 200 course. John Gilmour explained that mass delinking would be more problematic for COLL 200's than it is for COLL 100's and COLL 150's, because some COLL 200 courses will be large courses that cannot reasonably include extensive contact with faculty outside of class meeting hours. Nick Popper (History) explained that delinking can be justified as an acknowledgement that COLL 200 courses reach across disciplinary boundaries, regardless of contact hours. He also added that the language of the curriculum currently allows for a three-credit COLL 200 course to have a one-

credit lab sharing the COLL 200 designation. Sarah Stafford added that the fourth credit hour could potentially require justification to a body beyond the EPC for purposes of program review or accreditation. John Gilmour clarified that the delinking policy as explained on the EPC website stipulates that extra reading is not sufficient to justify delinking and that extra activities outside of class are necessary. Lu Ann Homza (History) further noted that the Registrar in collaboration with the Deans recently created a policy tying credit hours to contact hours.

18 attendees voted in favor of Gene's amendment and 23 voted against it. Consequently, Gene Tracy's amendment did *not* pass on a hand vote.

The EPC's Motion 2 also did *not* pass on a voice vote.

*The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeremy Pope (History, [jwpoppe@wm.edu](mailto:jwpoppe@wm.edu))  
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences