

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
The College of William and Mary
May 6, 1997, Andrews Hall 101**

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m., Dean Robert Archibald, presiding.

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of April 1, 1997 were amended and annotated as follows: In V. Report of Educational Policy Committee, "Council on Graduate Studies" should be corrected to "Committee on Graduate Studies." Also, although various speakers referred in the discussion to "t.a.'s," the position under discussion was that of teaching interns, "t.i.'s." In VI. Report of the International Studies Committee, "Professor Bruce Blouet" should be corrected to "Professor Brian Blouet." The minutes of the April 1, 1997 meeting were approved as amended.

II. Reports of Administrative Officers

Provost Cell thanked Robert Archibald for his excellent work as interim dean, work that will ease the transition to a new dean. The provost expressed her pleasure at the appointment of Dean Geoffrey Feiss, and noted this year's NEH fellowships awarded to Henry Hart and John Oakley as well as many excellent student achievements.

Dean Archibald expressed his appreciation for the support of the faculty. In answer to questions regarding a recent grant made to VIMS, the new building could be used for departmental retreats, but otherwise, all the money goes to VIMS. Five finalists for the position of Assistant Provost for Information Technology will be on campus next week; any interested faculty should plan to attend the open meetings.

III. Report of Nominations and Elections Committee

Professor Chappell presented the following slate of nominees, which was accepted with no nominations from the floor:

Faculty Hearing Committee

- X Martin Garrett (Econ)
- James Griffin (MLL)

Board of Faculty Compensation

Area II

- X Philip Funigiello (History)
- Kenneth Kambis (Kinesiology)

Area III

- Norman Fashing (Bio)
- X Robert Welsh (Physics)

Faculty members whose names are marked with "X" were elected.

IV. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Schone moved the following on behalf of the committee:

Whereas the faculty of Arts and Sciences were left without a

dean at the end of the 1995-96 academic year,

Whereas the faculty and provost recognized the importance of having a responsible and effective leader during the interim, while searching for a permanent dean, and

Whereas at the suggestion of the faculty and at Robert Archibald's willingness to serve in a difficult and demanding job on short notice, the provost appointed him as interim dean,

Whereas Robert Archibald has served as interim dean during the 1996-97 academic session, and

Whereas his tenure has been distinguished by energetic and firm leadership, fairness and openness, and

Whereas his tenure has been productive, accomplished in spite of the temporary nature of his appointment,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the faculty of Arts and Sciences expresses its deep appreciation to Robert Archibald for his excellent stewardship as interim dean and welcomes him back to the faculty as a respected colleague,

And be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be presented to Robert Archibald and a copy of the resolution be spread across the minutes.

The motion was passed by enthusiastic voice vote, and a copy of the resolution duly presented to our departing (and thereby returning) dean.

Professor Schone thanked the committee for its hard work this year and moved the adoption of portions 10-17 of the new Faculty Manual. Professor Willis led discussion of the motion. Professor Willis noted that portions 10-17 are advisory to the faculty rather than to the students and are edited accordingly, and also that the proposed grading system applies only to undergraduates, as the Committee on Graduate Studies is not yet ready to propose any changes to their grading system. Many of the proposed changes come at the suggestion of the registrar and reflect current Arts and Sciences policy.

Section 10. Reporting Grades. It was clarified that this is not the proper occasion to change the grading system.

10.a. The committee suggested deleting the phrase "(and no quality points)" from the third line of 10.a (Grading System). It was clarified that departments may not alter the policy of excluding the grade of "P" from calculations of grade point (or "quality point") averages within a concentration.

10.a.i. The committee suggested that the first two shaded sentences ("Students may not be graduated with any grades of 'G'. . . .") be deleted, as they are incorrect. Only when the course credits are required for graduation must the grade of "G" be converted prior to graduation. The committee further suggested adding the last sentence of the shaded area ("It is the responsibility of the instructor to convert the grade or, in the absence of the instructor, the department's responsibility."). This represents a new policy that would allow the department to act in extraordinary cases, such as the death of a faculty member.

Faculty members expressed concern that the new statement leaves it unclear exactly who would assign the grade, on what basis, and under which specific circumstances. Further, is the department chair the best person to assign a grade? Mightn't this come under the purview of the Degrees Committee? Answer: No. Why not use the student grade review process? Answer: Because no grade has been assigned and no professor is available to participate in the process. The complicating case of departmental honors was raised, in which the grade of "G" is routinely assigned for the first semester of a two-semester project.

Professor T. Meyers moved that we refer both whether a student can graduate with a grade of "G" and the sentence providing for conversion of a "G" in the absence of the instructor to the Educational Policy Committee. That is, the entire shaded area of 10.a.i would be deleted pending a decision by the EPC. The amendment was passed by voice vote with audible dissent.

10.a.ii. It was observed that the "which" in the final sentence should be changed to "that."

10.b. Professor Bohl and Dean Fowler suggested, and Professor Willis agreed to, the addition of a final sentence: "All other grade changes are regulated by the grade review procedures." It was noted that although the grade change forms are not currently available on the Web, they can be made available.

11. Grade Review. It was noted that we lack any policy covering a case in which a professor might die or be otherwise unavailable to participate in a grade review. Professor Fuchs moved removal of the provision that the instructor must be on campus. The introductory sentence would then read: "A student . . . may request a review of the grade during the next regular semester following that for which the grade is received." The amendment was passed by voice vote with audible dissent. The committee accepted two friendly amendments: In the first "bullet" paragraph "should meet with" should be changed to "should consult with" (given the possibility that the parties might not meet face to face). In the first sentence of the second "bullet" paragraph, the phrase "following that for which the grade is received" should be added after "the end of the next regular academic semester." It was then moved that the stipulation allowing a student to request a grade review (only) "as follows within the first four weeks of" the semester be reintroduced (both in the second "bullet" and in the introductory sentence), and that the word "during" be removed from the introductory sentence. That is, the motion would reinstate the standing time limit for student submission of grade review requests. Discussion made it clear that the competing needs to have the student's work fresh in everyone's mind, to give the student adequate time to deliberate over the decision to request the review, and to leave adequate time to complete the review before the end of the semester, all need to be balanced. An amendment to the amendment, changing the deadline for initiating grade reviews from four to six weeks, was passed by voice vote with audible dissent. The (amended) amendment, reinstating the time limit for student requests for grade review ("within the first six

weeks of the next regular semester following that for which the grade was received") was passed by voice vote with audible dissent. It was clarified that an instructor requesting a grade change based on evaluation of performance (rather than on clerical error) has a deadline of the end of the semester following that for which the grade was assigned, since such an instructor is in effect submitting the results of a grade review. The problem arose that it is currently possible, with the permission of the undergraduate dean, to change a grade from before the previous semester. We are thus changing existing practice (though perhaps not existing policy), however unintentionally.

The amended portions 10-17 of the Faculty Manual were passed by voice vote with no audible dissent.

V. Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Professor Bohl moved the following supplements to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Assistants:

- Teaching interns may not teach Freshman Seminars.
- Faculty members not holding a terminal degree may teach Freshman Seminars only with the permission of the dean.
- Training for teaching interns will be required (workshops or other training approved by both the Committee on Graduate Studies and the EPC).

- A working group on t.i. workshops should meet this fall and make recommendations to the Committee on Graduate Studies and the EPC. Departments should submit their proposals for workshops to the CGS and the EPC by next spring; the workshops should be approved and ready to begin in the fall of 1998.

Prof. Bohl clarified that teaching interns are graduate students who have full responsibility for a course; teaching assistants work under a professor and lead discussion sections, etc. Concern was expressed over any use of graduate students as sole instructors, based especially on the graduate students' lack of experience in the field and on the question of public relations. Is the college sacrificing a crucial asset, one that sets us apart from other institutions, by allowing graduate students full responsibility for courses? Professor Bohl observed that we already do have graduate students teaching as sole instructors. EPC's concern is to regulate the practice, not to condemn or condone it. Professor Palmer moved that the Faculty Affairs Committee consider moving that no courses be taught by t.i.'s. The motion was not seconded. Director of Graduate Studies F. Gross noted that the proposal to provide this kind of training for teaching interns is an important innovation and an opportunity for William and Mary to model a new mode of excellence in teaching. Further, he suggested that the question of whether any teaching interns be allowed at all be considered at another time. The EPC amendment to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Assistants was passed by voice vote with no audible dissent. The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Assistants was also passed by voice vote, but with audible dissent.

Professor Bohl then moved that GER assessment take place as

set forth in the Assessment Steering Committee Report (available on the committee's Web page). In summary: all assessments use the portfolio method to assess whether a course is fulfilling the GER; student surveys may be used; working groups should be set up, constituted for a two-year period, to work through the portfolios and report to EPC and the Assessment Steering Committee. The motion was passed by voice vote without audible dissent.

In regard to the Concentration Computing Proficiency Requirement, the English, Government, and Biology departments are not yet prepared to institute the requirement. All departments that are so prepared should implement their procedures.

VI. Report of the Committee on Graduate Studies

Professor F. Gross noted that the annual report of the committee is available on the Web, and highlighted the following aspects of the committee's work this year:

- The approval of a Ph.D. in Anthropology.
- The memo of understanding providing that the mathematics operations research program will be administered by the Computer Science department.
- Completion of a study of the gender climate in American Studies.
- Stabilization of the graduate budget.
- Completion of four program reviews.
- Development of a new policy for training teaching assistants and teaching interns.

Next year's agenda includes continuing work to bring the graduate programs up to the level of the undergraduate programs; addressing the need to raise stipends at the master's level (Ph.D. stipends are now competitive); study of the climate for graduate students; pursuit of health coverage for graduate students; revision of the sections of the Faculty Manual relevant to the graduate programs.

VII. Report of the Faculty Research Committee

Professor Vold summarized the report, which is available on WAMI:

1) Budget. The committee had a budget of \$614,000 (\$80,000 below last year's budget). The committee gave high priority to faculty research assignments for faculty with more than seven years' service: twenty-two awards were made (81% success rate). Ninety one per cent of applications for summer grants for untenured faculty were funded. Semester research leaves for faculty with less than seven years' service were not protected; only two of ten applications were funded.

2) Summer Grants. The committee will in the future give special consideration to applicants who have previously received three or fewer grants from William and Mary. The committee hopes to enforce the 1,000 word limit on proposal length, and has developed new application forms.

3) Deadlines. For fall competition the deadline is Sept 25; for semester research grants, Oct 9; and for summer research

grants, Oct 16.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Julie Galambush
Assistant Professor of Religion