Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences The College of William and Mary March 14, 2000, Millington 150

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Dean Geoffrey Feiss.

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the February 1, 2000 meeting were approved as posted.

II. Nominations and Elections

Chair LuAnn Homza introduced the Committee's nominations, and opened the balloting to nominations from the floor (X denotes elected).

Committee on Academic Status. 2 positions 3-year terms, not Area specific.(3 year term)

X Monica Potkay, English

Evelyn Hall, Kinesiology

X Julie Galambush, Religion

Edgar Williams, Music

Educational Policy. 3 positions, one each from Areas I, II and III (3 year term)

Area I

Bob Maccubbin, English

X Joan Gavaler, Theater, Speech & Dance

Area II

X Satoshi Ito, Sociology

Michael Deschenes, Kinesiology

Area III

X Ruth Beck, Biology

David Kranbuehl, Chemistry

International Studies. 4 positions, 3-year terms, not Area specific

X Chris Bongie, English

X Tomoko Hamada, Anthropology

John Nezlek, Psychology

X Teresa Longo, Modern Languages

X Anne Rasmussen, Music

Roberta Hatcher, Modern Languages

Bruce Campbell, Modern Languages

Elizabeth Wiley, Theater, Speech & Dance

Committee on Degrees. 1 position (4-year term)

Adam Potkay, English Steven Haynie, Kinesiology X Kathleen Morgan, Chemistry

Retention, Promotion and Tenure. 2 positions, 3-year terms, both from Area II Bob Kohl, Kinesiology
Tomoko Hamada, Anthropology
X Dale Hoak, History
X Sue Peterson, Government

Faculty Affairs Committee, Chair X Will Hausman, Economics

III. Reports of the Administrative Officers

President Sullivan led off discussion by outlining his initiative, Decisions 2010, which is not intended to result in a formal plan, but is to be an enquiry into the state of William and Mary: it is meant to test the validity of assumptions about the College by conducting a dialogue with several key constituencies. He has already spoke with alumni, students and other faculties. At the same time, although not designed to produce a planning document as such, this conversation could, he added, prove useful as the decision is made about a possible future funding campaign.

At the heart of this dialogue, President Sullivan continued, is the basic question of how the College can best educate future global leaders. To that end, he added, 2010 focuses on three areas: the student educational experience here on campus; William and Mary and the community (including public service); and the College and the world (developing a global perspective). In short, what should be the definitive features of the William and Mary experience?

Some members of the faculty noted their sense that these priorities did not include the role of the College in the discovery and creation of knowledge. President Sullivan responded that this feature was considered a given, and seen as an implicit part of the points he had introduced. Several faculty also raised the issue of the extent to which other constituencies--students, but especially alumni--know what the College is about, or whether nostalgia comes at the expense of a recognition that research is a critical part of its mission. President Sullivan agreed that many graduates from earlier generations in particular often tend to view the College as it was rather than as it is today: at times, he added, it is necessary to assure them that things have indeed improved. Although it is of course autonomous, the Alumni Society could be encouraged to help in this effort by refining the focus of publications sent out to graduates of William and Mary.

Another line of questions centered on recruiting and above all retaining faculty in the next decade, especially in light of the need for assuring diversity: it was noted that in this area the

College has some disadvantages in competing for faculty, including a considerable teaching load. President Sullivan agreed that more resources would have to be part of the answer. Some faculty voiced concern that retention is also affected by research expectations and suggested that the College should aim for a uniform policy of junior faculty leaves as part of its retention efforts: currently only large departments can afford them, disadvantaging smaller ones (without disagreeing, others argued that this should not come at the expense of leaves for senior faculty). At the same time, the view was voiced that reduced teaching load and junior leaves must be justified in terms of research expectations---something should go back to the taxpayers.

Another issue discussed was the impact of technology, and whether on-line teaching will go beyond creating a creative tensions between teaching and research, perhaps even making the campus obsolete. President Sullivan agreed that technology creates opportunities and challenges, and that hostility to it would serve no one. There was a general sense that the College strikes the right balance and will continue to find a place in the educational market, but will also need to continue expanding ways of accommodating new learning technologies.

Other points raised included the suggestion that the College aim to remove all logistical and financial impediments to any student studying abroad who wants that option (currently the difference in tuition makes it especially expensive for out-of-staters); enhancing the University Center so that, along with the new College-Colonial Williamsburg Merchants Square initiative, students have a wider array of social outlets; and reviewing the list of schools with which the College competes in athletics, with an eye to playing against more academic peer institutions.

In closing the President responded to questions about the just-concluded General Assembly session, noting that it voted to approve a salary increase of over 4%, but that something on the order of 5-6% would be needed to get back within the 60th percentile of the College's peer group.

III. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).

Professor Will Hausman listed several items on which the Faculty Affairs Committee is working:

Formulation of <u>post-tenure review procedures</u> is all but done, after three years: only about five or six departments' policies remain to be submitted/approved by the Personnel Policy Committee.

A general College-wide <u>policy statement on post-tenure</u> review has gone from the Personnel Policy Committee to the Faculty Assembly for final approval.

Work has been completed on a definition of <u>how service to the profession counts in merit</u> review: departments would be allowed to count it under either research or college service. This document will go the Faculty Assembly for approval.

FAC will suggest to the Provost that somewhat less material accompany dossiers submitted to her as part of <u>interim/mid-probationary reviews</u> (for retention of faculty).

FAC will meet with Student Affairs officials on the issue of <u>Honor code violations</u>. Professor Hausman encouraged taking up the student Honor Council's offer to meet with departments separately in order to clarify questions or concerns about the process. It was also noted that the Council has set up a website with information, including data on penalties. Professor Hausman noted that proposals are evolving in line with the <u>Civic Society Initiative</u>, and on behalf of FAC endorsed an experiment with <u>on-line course evaluations</u>.

IV. New Business

The meeting adjourned at 4:40

Respectfully submitted,

Clay Clemens

Associate Professor of Government

Secretary's Note: One final suggestion for a goal to be included in the Decisions 2010 initiative: making classroom buildings on new campus, and their surroundings, attractive enough so that we would be willing at some point to actually see them replace Wren on the College Viewbook's cover (if this requires detonating Morton Hall first, each department--including Government--should be given at least one hour's advance notice).