Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:33 PM.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 40.

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes for the meeting of the Faculty on September 1, 2015, were approved unanimously by voice vote:
http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/index.php

II. Report from Administrative Officer

a. Dean Kate Conley
   • Noted that the recent move to year-long scheduling is facilitating long-term planning of the curriculum.
   • Reminded the Faculty that Homecoming Weekend (October 22nd-25th) will mark the launch of the next major capital campaign at William and Mary; Arts and Sciences seeks to raise $140 million in pursuit of three main goals (listed here in no particular order):
     1. “Where great minds meet”: a commitment to raising money to support student fellowships and professorships. Financial support for undergraduate students is already included in the broader university goals, so Arts and Sciences will focus particularly on support for graduate students.
     2. “Making the remarkable”: focused on the curriculum and the various centers on campus that foster innovation (e.g., the Charles Center, the Center for the Liberal Arts, the Center for Geospatial Analysis, and the Dean’s Innovation Fund).
     3. “Passion for impact”: emphasizing how the College provides transformational experiences with lifelong impact for our students (e.g., service learning, study abroad, and “study away”). “Study away” refers to programs that are both domestic and cross-cultural, as well as to brief trips abroad that are attached to an on-campus course.
   • Reported that Mark Begly (Associate Vice President of Development) and Dean Homza (Educational Policy) delivered presentations at the retreat of the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD) summarizing plans for department and program open houses and also for a University Showcase to highlight faculty involvement in the new COLL curriculum; the University Showcase will take place in Tucker Hall from 1:00 to 2:00 PM on Saturday, October 24th.
   • Announced that the College recently submitted to the Mellon Foundation the first report on the $900,000 grant supporting the new COLL curriculum. Next month,
Dean Conley and Joel Schwartz (Government) will deliver an in-person report to the Mellon Foundation.

- Announced that she held office hours to meet with full professors last month and will do the same this month to meet with non-tenure eligible faculty (NTE’s). Dean Conley has scheduled four such rounds of office hours this year to meet with different groups at the College.
- Reminded the Faculty that Dean Griffin (Undergraduate Studies) will be leaving the College very soon to accept a new position as Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Clemson University.

III. Report from Faculty Assembly

Eric Chason (Law School) encouraged faculty members to give even as little as $1 each to the new capital campaign in order to demonstrate complete faculty participation. He also reminded the Faculty to participate in the FA Survey and clarified that it is *not* identical to the 2015 William & Mary Employee Survey recently distributed by the Gelfond Group via e-mail. Eric announced that the FA had recently heard a presentation from Title IX coordinator Kiersten Boyce regarding proposals to change the Faculty Handbook; specifically, the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education has proposed that allegations of sexual misconduct be assessed according to a “preponderance of the evidence” standard, rather than the “clear and convincing” standard currently stated in the Faculty Handbook. He clarified that any proposal will come out of the Personnel Policy Committee, after which the FA will have thirty days to approve or disapprove the proposal.

Eric then announced that the Faculty University Priorities Committee (FUPC) has been disbanded: [https://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/committees/fupc/index.php](https://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/committees/fupc/index.php). The Provost has decided that, instead of having FUPC review small planning budget requests (PBR’s), the Provost and other senior administrators will instead directly involve the FA’s Committee on Planning and Resources (COPAR) in regular discussions of large-picture, strategic budgetary allocations. Bill Cooke (Physics) reminded the Faculty that FUPC was initially an elected committee separate from the Faculty Assembly but that FUPC then ceased to review primary PBR’s when that role was first assumed by another, non-elected committee. Dean Torczon (Graduate Studies and Research) also noted that an agreement in recent years involved FUPC in the review of how external grants would be administered, so this role previously exercised by FUPC needs to be revisited now that the committee has been disbanded. Scott Nelson (History) added that during the 1990’s FUPC’s involvement in PBR’s was important, because it allowed the Faculty to have some input in, for example, choosing which available Banner options would be most helpful for those teaching and advising at the College. Eric responded that FUPC has not performed this function in more recent years, because large PBR’s have not come before the committee for review.

Eric also encouraged the Faculty to submit to the FA suggestions for how to integrate NTE faculty more fully into the College community. Mike Tierney (Government) asked
what percentage of PBR’s typically get funded in a year, and Dean Conley responded that last year one of six requests was funded.

John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures) asked what actions the FA had planned for addressing the issue of faculty diversity. Eric responded that Mark Forsyth (Biology) will join the working group on faculty diversity in order to advise the FA in November or December on what actions should be taken.

IV. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Mike Deschenes (Kinesiology and Health Sciences) reminded the Faculty that last year the FAC worked on the COLL curriculum, as well as on filling committee posts, assessing the use of student evaluations, expanding eligibility for faculty summer research grants, and formulating best practices for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (RPT). The FAC was asked to adjudicate the allocation of library carrels but elected instead to defer that role to Swem Library. Greg Hancock (Geology) collaborated last year with IT to draft a centralized list of which faculty members are serving on what committees and for how long.

Mike then announced that in the Fall 2015 semester FAC has held six meetings at which they have heard several presentations: Maryse Fauvel (Modern Languages and Literatures) and Provost Halleran both came to discuss service imbalances across departments; Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures) presented on the Quality Enhancement Project; and Lesley Henderson (Dean of Students) explained the relationship between the Americans with Disabilities Act and special accommodations granted at the College. In addition, the FAC received a report from the ad hoc committee tasked to formulate best practices for the RPT.

Mike added that the ad hoc committee assessing the use of student evaluations has confirmed that participation dropped sharply after the transition to online forms, so the FAC is discussing how this and other factors should affect the use of student evaluations in faculty members’ annual merit evaluations.

V. Report from Nominations and Elections Committee

Amy Oakes (Government) announced that the following candidates are running for election to terms that will all begin in Fall 2015:

a. For a one-year term as a replacement representing Area I on the Faculty Assembly/Faculty Affairs Committee:

   Michael Daise (Religious Studies)
   Sophia Serghi (Music)

b. For a one-year term as a replacement representing Area II on the Faculty Assembly:
Robert Archibald (Economics)
Simon Stow (Government)

c. For a three-year term representing Area I on the Nominations and Elections Committee:

Simon Joyce (English)
Brett Wilson (English)

d. For a three-year term representing Area III on the Nominations and Elections Committee:

Carl Carlson (Physics)
Gexin Yu (Math)

e. For a one-year term as a replacement representing Area II on the Nominations and Elections Committee:

Tuska Benes (History)
Jennifer Stevens (Psychology)

There were no nominations from the floor. Amy also encouraged the Faculty to complete the volunteer survey, so that faculty members can be matched with appropriate committees.

VI. Report on Quality Enhancement Project

Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures) explained that the Quality Enhancement Project is a forward-looking requirement for the ten-year reaffirmation of the College’s accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC):

http://www.wm.edu/sites/sacscoc/archives/sacs_review_reaffirmation/sacs_qep/index.php

The Faculty Steering Committee chaired by Teresa is concerned that some students may have limited exposure to high-impact educational practices between their freshman seminar and their COLL 400 capstone. In an effort to bridge this gap, the committee is drafting a proposal due in January of 2016 that will seek to identify high-impact practices in the curriculum, to help faculty to identify them, and to steer undergraduates toward those courses in order to ensure that students are adequately prepared for the COLL 400. Because these practices are often discipline-specific, the committee is also requesting feedback from faculty regarding how student success will be defined in a COLL 400 course. Bill Cooke (Physics) noted that if high-impact practices correlate with lower student-faculty ratios, then increased pursuit of these practices would require a financial commitment on the part of the College. Teresa responded that the list of high-impact
educational practices provided by American Association of Colleges and Universities also extends beyond seminars to include practices such as undergraduate research:

https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips

Bill responded that undergraduate research is also very faculty-intensive and could likewise require a financial commitment. Teresa assured the Faculty that submission of the proposal will eventually be followed by budgetary discussion with the Provost. Jennifer Bickham Mendez (Sociology/Global Studies) noted that high-impact educational practices are already integral to the curricula of several departments at the College, so she expressed concern as to whether the committee’s attempts to steer students might divert them from discipline-specific preparation within their chosen major. Teresa assured the Faculty that the committee is aware of the discipline-specific nature of high-impact educational practices and has no intention of steering students away from the requirements of their majors. Scott Nelson (History) suggested that a count of how many students are taking seminar courses would be one potential metric for estimating students’ exposure to high-impact practices. Jennifer then added that the Program in Global Studies does not currently require a capstone course for undergraduate majors because the program is unable to staff capstone courses, so the faculty of Global Studies would like to discuss the COLL 400 with members of the committee. Teresa emphasized that the effort to ensure that there is a sufficient number of capstone courses is a related but additional matter beyond the committee’s current objective to ensure that students are adequately prepared for those courses. William Hausman (Economics) expressed concern that Arts & Sciences will not have obtained sufficient funding for the COLL 400 capstones before the committee requests funding related to the Quality Enhancement Program. Susan Grover (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs) responded that the committee must formulate a budget in advance of the January deadline. Dean Conley added that the Provost has pledged $170,000 to support COLL 400 courses.

VII. Report from Educational Policy Committee

Bill Hutton (Classical Studies) explained that in December 2013 the Faculty conceptualized the COLL 300 objective to “lift [students] out of their familiar surroundings” as a requirement that could be satisfied through both an off-campus experience and also through an on-campus course:

“Alternatively, they may fulfill COLL 300 through the W&M Colloquia, academically rigorous courses of at least 3 credits that address global or cross-cultural issues, and are organized around a series of lectures by W&M faculty, visiting scholars, artists, and public intellectuals. Students may take the W&M Colloquium at any time.”

Bill cautioned that it would be impractical to assume that all such on-campus COLL 300 courses could invite a separate set of visiting speakers funded by the Dean’s Office; he therefore introduced a motion from the EPC that would amend the language for the COLL 300 in order to more clearly define what kinds of on-campus courses could satisfy the requirement and how they could do so:
Specifically, the motion modified the language quoted above to state instead:

“Alternatively, students may fulfill COLL 300 on campus through academically rigorous William & Mary courses that prominently feature global or cross-cultural issues. While students may take on-campus COLL 300s at any point in their career, COLL 300 will typically be taken in the third year, and will consist of a minimum of 3 credits taken in one course or a series of courses. To receive EPC approval, on-campus COLL 300s must address a theme that will be chosen for each semester and must engage with a series of events that feature visitors nominated by the faculty. The Center for the Liberal Arts will be responsible for arranging these events and for choosing the themes and visitors on the basis of faculty suggestions and nominations. On campus COLL 300s will require students to attend all events and to take part in an end-of-semester symposium, which will also be arranged by the CLA.”

The EPC’s motion also added to the COLL 300 language the following provision:

“In fall 2018, the faculty will reevaluate the procedure for selecting themes and speakers for the on-campus COLL 300 events.”

Bill explained that the motion introduced by the EPC derived from discussions with the fellows of the Center for the Liberal Arts (CLA) and that the plan currently envisioned would involve three visiting speakers each semester on a given theme who would then remain on campus long enough to interact with students after the lecture. Gene Tracy (Physics/CLA) clarified that this proposal seeks to create a stronger sense of community, rather than having departments and programs compete for limited resources.

Cindy Hahamovitch (History) expressed concern that the motion introduced by the EPC might limit the number of COLL 300 courses that could be offered in a given semester by rendering ineligible for the COLL 300 attribute many courses and student experiences that do still “lift [students] out of their familiar surroundings and deepen the way they see themselves in the world” in accordance with the language of the COLL 300 description (e.g., courses connected to the Sharpe Community Scholars Program, or a labor history course that involves interviews with housekeeping staff on campus). Cindy therefore introduced a motion proposing to amend the EPC motion as follows so that such courses be included in the COLL 300 language while simultaneously retaining the lecture series for other COLL 300 courses (modifications in italics):

“To receive EPC approval, on-campus COLL 300s may address a theme that will be chosen for each semester and engage with a series of events that feature visitors nominated by the faculty. The Center for the Liberal Arts will be responsible for arranging these events and for choosing the themes and visitors on the basis of faculty suggestions and nominations. These COLL 300s will require students to attend all events
and to take part in an end-of-semester symposium, which will also be arranged by the CLA. Other on-campus COLL 300s may be approved by EPC on a case-by-case basis.”

Cindy’s motion was seconded by Scott Nelson (History).

Gene Tracy (Physics) reminded the Faculty that courses simply inviting visiting speakers would not qualify for a COLL 300 attribute; rather, courses must have a significant global or cross-cultural focus as described in the language of the COLL 300 description.

In support of Cindy’s proposal, Bill Cooke (Physics) explained that changing the required theme from one semester to the next in the manner suggested by the EPC’s motion would make it difficult for faculty to anticipate whether or not a course designed for the COLL 300 attribute in one semester would still qualify for that attribute in future semesters.

Scott Nelson (History) explained that the courses connected to the Sharpe Community Scholars Program may fit the spirit of the COLL 300 even better than do courses connected to the William & Mary in DC Program. Brad Weiss (Anthropology) emphasized that engaged learning should not be restricted to on-campus speakers, and he encouraged the Faculty to trust their colleagues on the EPC to differentiate between courses that would capture the spirit of the COLL 300 and those that would not.

Nick Popper (History/CLA) offered to enhance the stringency of Cindy’s motion by modifying the final sentences of the COLL 300 description to read as follows (Nick’s modifications in bold font):

“To receive EPC approval, on-campus COLL 300s may address a theme that will be chosen for each semester and engage with a series of events that feature visitors nominated by the faculty. The Center for the Liberal Arts will be responsible for arranging these events and for choosing the themes and visitors on the basis of faculty suggestions and nominations. These COLL 300s will require students to attend all events and to take part in an end-of-semester symposium, which will also be arranged by the CLA. Under exceptional circumstances, in the case of courses that demonstrate significant engagement with communities off-campus, other on-campus 300s may be approved by EPC on a case-by-case basis.”

Cindy accepted Nick’s modification as a friendly amendment to her motion.

Other faculty expressed concerns about Cindy’s motion: Jennifer Taylor (Modern Languages and Literatures) and Deborah Morse (English) both questioned whether expanding the COLL 300 language in this way might undermine the curriculum’s ambition to create a shared experience for students and faculty across the curriculum. Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures) noted that Cindy’s motion might depart from that spirit of the COLL 300 design by allowing too many courses in Modern Languages and Literatures to qualify for the COLL 300 attribute. John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures) also emphasized that the COLL curriculum is intended, not only to lift students “out of their familiar surroundings,” but also to do so for faculty, and he expressed concern as to whether the COLL 300s would still accomplish this objective if the language were expanded to include the courses described
by Cindy. Sue Peterson (Government/International Relations) also expressed concern as to whether Nick’s friendly amendment to include “significant engagement with communities off-campus” might restrict the “global or cross-cultural” requirement found elsewhere in the COLL 300 language in a way that was not originally intended by the Faculty when the COLL 300 was first conceptualized. Susan Grover (Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs) added that the phrase “communities off-campus” would actually be too broad as well, because it would seem to include engagement with some communities quite familiar to William & Mary students that would not “lift [students] out of their familiar surroundings.” Gene Tracy (Physics) noted that the EPC’s motion had stricken from the original COLL 300 language the statement that these courses would bring “visiting scholars, artists, and public intellectuals” to campus; since the EPC’s motion had then replaced that language with a more specific description of the circumstances under which such visitors would be nominated, Gene advised that any modifications to the EPC’s motion should retain the emphasis upon visiting speakers.

Cindy responded that the old language did not allow for students to engage with off-campus communities (e.g., inmates) who cannot be invited to campus and who are not “scholars, artists, and public intellectuals.”

Carey Bagdassarian (Chemistry) reminded the Faculty that the logic of the COLL curriculum was to allow some dynamic flexibility. Christopher Del Negro (Applied Science) expressed hesitancy to vote on the motion at this meeting before learning more about the other kinds of off-campus engagement described by Cindy.

Scott Nelson called the question on Cindy’s amendment to the EPC’s motion. The Faculty then voted unanimously in favor of closing discussion on the issue. The Faculty then voted on Cindy’s amendment, with 23 faculty members voting against it, and 17 voting in favor of it. As a result, the amendment was not accepted.

The majority of the Faculty then voted in favor of closing discussion on the EPC’s original motion, and the EPC’s original motion was subsequently approved by a voice vote.

*The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,
Jeremy Pope (History, jwpope@wm.edu)
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences