

Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The College of William and Mary

May 2, 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 April 4, 2000 meeting were approved with corrections of an editorial nature.

II. Report of Administrative Officers

Provost Cell explained the background to recent reports about a rise in athletic fees. She noted that the administration had two reasons for proposing a hike in fees (which do not come under the tuition freeze): a) the state had mandated a salary raise for all employees, but does not fund those paid out of the auxiliary budget, e.g. in athletics; and b) the out-of-state tuition rise triggered a commensurate increase in student grants-in-aid for athletes. She noted that fee hikes, though not proposed by the units, were needed to keep programs running. The administration initially suggested a rise sufficient to cover the increase in salary costs. The Board of Visitors Finance Committee at first felt that this measure would undercut the tuition freeze and endorsed a smaller fee hike, proposing to make up the difference with private funds. This plan was presented by the administration to the Budget Policy Advisory Committee (BPAC). By the general Board meeting in April, however, most Finance Committee members had concluded that sufficient private funding could not be raised in time, and thus adopted the administration's original higher fee rise (with a proviso that it produce a plan for achieving a 50:50 balance between fees and private funds in covering athletics). In response to questions, she noted that the athletic fee would thus now be over \$800 per year, and in-state tuition over \$2000.

Dean Feiss announced that Professor of Computer Science Steve Park will become Dean of Graduate Studies, and thanked Franz Gross for his service in that post. He then went on to acknowledge a string of outside and College honors won by Arts and Sciences faculty:

Anthropology: Grey Gundaker, William Fisher (Fulbrights)

Biology: John Griffin, Cindy Van Dover (NSF Career Awards)

Classical Studies: John Oakley (Mellon Fellowship/Metropolitan Museum of Art)

English: Joanne Braxton (Fulbright); Hermine Pinson (Virginia Humanities Center Fellowship)

Geology: Chuck Bailey (Briggs Award of GSA)

History: Craig Canning (Fulbright); Phil Morgan (Guggenheim); Kim Phillips (Wentworth)

Military Science: Cpt. Daniel Rose (Instructor of the Year/Training and Doctrine Command)

Modern Languages & Literature: Ann Marie Stock (Rockefeller Humanities Fellowship)

Music: Sophia Serghi (Salvatore Martirano Composition Prize/Illinois); Mark Tucker (NEH)

Physics: Todd Averett (Outstanding Junior Investigator/DOE Division of Nuclear Physics)

Religion: David Holmes (Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters/Lycoming College)

Jefferson Awards: Hans von Baeyer (Physics), Carol Sheriff (History)

Alumni Society's Service Award; Ed Crapol (History)

Charles and Virginia Duke Award: Jewel Thomas (Chemistry)

Phi Beta Kappa Awards: Tom Heacox (English), Yana Rodgers (Economics)
Hamilton Professorship: Tomoka Hamada (Anthropology), Chris McGowan (English)
University Teaching Professorship: Barbara King (Anthropology); James Whittenberg (History)
Chancellor Professor: Mary Voigt (Anthropology)
Walter F.C. Ferguson Professorship: Chi-Kwong Li (Mathematics)
Forrest D. Murden Jr. Professorship: John Oakley (Classical Studies)
NEH Professorship: Susan Donaldson (English)
Thomas Graves Award: Jerry Johnson (Geology)

III. Faculty Research Committee Report

Professor Wanda Wallace (Business) delivered the FRC's annual report. She noted that the Committee had met regarding Faculty Research Awards (FRAs), Summer Research Grants, Minor Grants, Subvention Requests, NEH summer stipend proposal evaluations, and its own policies. The Provost's office acted expeditiously on its grant recommendations. Professor Wallace urged that all faculty make use of current year application materials for all grants. Forms and policies are on the Grant Office website <http://www.wm.edu/grants/WMGRANTS>. She noted that additional funds had been found for research this year, and the FRC's strong recommendation that the budget be raised. She also reported the Committee's conclusion that faculty involved in the REU were also eligible for summer grants.

In reply to a question Professor Wallace explained that the Committee had formalized its policy of counting years of service for purposes of FRA eligibility so as to include only time engaged in teaching or research, including previous leaves. She acknowledged the argument that it would be more humane to count time on non-academic leave (for dependent care, business or personal reasons) in years of service. But, she added, there was concern about where to draw the line. For example, time on disability might add up to several years. What about leaves that are not continuous, or were taken during previous employment at another institution? Rather than attempt to make these evaluative judgements, she reported the Committee's conclusion that it would be best to stick with a policy of counting only time spent in teaching/research, expand the overall budget so that FRAs could be granted after six (or ideally even five years), and allow applicants to explain in their materials any gaps in productivity resulting from time away.

Several faculty raised arguments for counting non-academic leave as time of service. One noted that a community of scholars need not resort to a blanket policy in this regard, in effect docking all colleagues on dependent care leave but not faculty who have, for example, been in the administration or chaired a department/program. Another argued that deducting time spent on dependent care leave in effect undermines the latter program by imposing hidden costs, putting faculty with equal length of service in two separate pools: FRC divides applicants with seven years of service from those with less, and can fund any from that latter pool only at the cost of eliminating three summer grants. It was pointed out that many faculty on non-academic leave are often still active in such roles as advising students, yet are penalized in seeking an FRA. Other faculty questioned the FRC report's statement that language in current FRA application materials (Leaves not funded by the College will be counted in determining the number of

service years only if they were for the purposes of teaching or research) excludes family care leave since the latter is indeed funded by the College. It was also argued that the FRC's interpretation of this language constitutes a policy change which the Committee itself can not make (the Provost pointed out that the Committee only advances policy recommendations). In response, it was argued that procedures adopted by FRC this year do not constitute a change in policy because the Committee has in practice always excluded time on non-academic leave from its calculations of years in service: the new factor is the dependent care program itself. Moreover, in response to a question, Professor Wallace noted that FRC still has the discretion to determine the number of FRAs and summer grants, respectively. Indeed, it reads the entire set of applications for both types first, and thereby gets a sense of the relative strength of the two pools. Thus while the Committee funded all FRA proposals from faculty with seven (or more) years of service, it excludes no one and takes into account reasons for considering any application.

Some faculty pointed out that, while it was always indeed FRC policy not to count time on non-academic leave, there were also longstanding objections to this practice.

It was asked how institutions with standard entitlement sabbaticals determine time of service. Professor Wallace suggested that it was individually negotiated. The Provost replied that she does not have direct experience at an institution which granted sabbatical as an entitlement.

Professor Wallace reported that the State's legal counsel had told the Committee that it was viable to limit the definition of years of service for leave to time in teaching and research.

Some faculty pointed out that leave eligibility in earlier years was calculated by years of service and that this figure was always driven by the number of applicants as well as by availability of resources. As a result, there has never been "anything magic" about the number seven.

Provost Cell inquired of the Committee why it did not also exclude time taken by faculty who teach elsewhere for a year from this calculation: why does going to another university to teach for a year represent service to a greater degree than, for example, time on maternity leave?

In reply, a former FRC chair noted that the College encourages faculty exchanges and thus does not punish it in terms of FRA. Moreover, current policy does not count unpaid leaves for business or personal reasons as constituting service years for FRA purposes.

Professor Wallace urged faculty to bear in mind that no one is being "docked," but that FRC simply was not counting certain time as in service for FRA calculation purposes--just as students would not get course credit for a semester that they took off.

An FRC member noted that the Committee was sympathetic to extending eligibility but also concerned by the growing number of potential applicants at a time when funding has leveled off. Given the pressing need for research money FRC did not want to expand the applicant pool.

Faculty members reiterated the argument that FRC procedures now rest on a misinterpretation of current language in the application, as non-academic leaves are College-funded leaves. And since, all else being equal, someone with seven years of service is more likely than someone credited with fewer than seven, this represents a penalty. The College has introduced funded non-academic leave, which has and should have a ripple effect on other policies and practices.

Another faculty member noted that in some departments, those on non-academic leave continue to advise or assist students with their research, yet this time is not counted toward an FRA.

[Discussion described below took place later under New Business]

An initial motion proposed that the faculty request that the Provost, in consultation with the FRC, examine and clarify how non-academic leave counts in accruing years of service. The motion received a second and an endorsement as a useful measure, along with a friendly

amendment to include consultation with the Faculty Assembly Academic Affairs Committee. Others objected that such a resolution would do too little. One urged the faculty to insist on counting this time (perhaps limited to one year per FRA application) if that is the way it feels. Another agreed that the faculty should make its sense more well known: the College non-academic leave policy is designed to support colleagues whose careers are disrupted for a time by certain circumstances, and not counting that time as service is unfair and unwise. A second motion was thus invited to express the view that up to one year of non-academic leave as specified in the Faculty Handbook will count toward years of service for FRA.

After further words of support and another friendly amendment, the original motion read: □The Faculty of Arts and Sciences requests that the Provost--in consultation with the Faculty Research Committee and Academic Affairs Committee of the FASS--examine and clarify the question of how non-academic leave counts in accruing years of service toward FRAs and report back to this body at its October meeting□ passed on a unanimous voice vote.

A faculty member echoed the general sympathy for counting time on non-academic leave toward FRA eligibility, but noted that since there might not be time for agreement on a new standard in time for the 2000-2001 FRC deliberations, perhaps the Provost could negotiate these definitions on a case by case basis. She replied that doing so would be too complicated.

A second motion (with two friendly amendments) was then introduced: □It is the sense of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences that non-academic leave as specified in the Faculty Handbook will count towards years of service for an FRA, with a limitation of no more than one year of such leave being counted in the years of service accrued for that FRA.□

The Dean raised the issue of whether stopping the clock for probationary faculty on non-academic leave would also remove that time from the accrued years of service for an FRA.

A question was raised as to how productivity would be evaluated in a non-academic leave year: would expectations of productivity be the same for applicants who (for health reasons, for example) could not work at all and for those who could advise students or conduct research?

The Dean noted that faculty are entitled to this leave, regardless of what they undertake during it, and the Provost suggested that there would be legal difficulties in treating faculty members under the same leave program differently from one another for FRA purposes. But the question was again raised of how productivity would be measured for a year on non-academic leave. In reply the Dean stressed that nothing about the content of applications would or should be affected by a change in how years of service are counted. A faculty member also pointed out that the FRC does not look at productivity in any individual year but only overall.

It was asked whether any deliberations (as recommended in the first motion) would be likely to produce new procedural language before decisions on FRC recommendations in fall 2000. The Provost replied that this time frame would be desirable, but not likely.

Another question concerned whether faculty on non-academic leave for reasons other than dependent care (business or personal leave without pay) could count that time toward an FRA.

The second motion, the sense of the Faculty [above], was approved on a voice vote.

IV. Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Will Hausman reported that FAC has had numerous discussions regarding enforcement

of the Honor Code and that no consensus is emerging on a new standard of proof. He agreed to the idea of surveying the faculty on this issue. In the meantime, he urged that the Honor Council be taken up on its offer to do presentations to departments on the Code and its enforcement. Professor Hausman reported that FAC had also received and was reviewing the report of the Committee on Graduate Studies, paying particular attention to its recommendations. He wanted to emphasize that there is no rule against proposing new degrees, but funding is scarce. Finally, he proposed that a vote on the proposed new university Joint Appointments Policy (which had originally been discussed as an FAC item at the April meeting) be moved forward from Old Business to this point in the meeting. There were no additional comments on the proposal, and it received unanimous faculty endorsement by voice vote.

V. Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Professor Bill Cooke moved proposals for two new concentrations in Modern Languages and Literatures--German Studies and Italian Studies. Both received unanimous endorsement, the latter subject to friendly amendment that it include relevant Classical Studies courses. In reply to a question, the chair of Modern Languages confirmed that work is progressing on proposals for concentrations in French Studies and Spanish Studies as well.

Professor Cooke noted EPC's approval of revisions in the concentration requirements for American Studies, Black Studies, History, Kinesiology, International Studies, and Music, as well as its approval of a new minor Teaching English as a Foreign/Second Language.

Professor Cooke also mentioned results of the assessment of GER 5 (Language and Literature): students and faculty alike report that this requirement is meeting its goals. He noted that there is not really any way to test skills in that area, but that a GER is not meant as a skill.

Finally, Professor Cooke referred to a list (drawn up by the EPC and the Writing Committee) of skills and goals to be achieved through Freshmen Seminar sections that carry writing credit. In answer to questions, he noted that it is to provide guidance/information, and not necessarily something that would be enforced. Still, it was suggested that faculty approval ought to be sought--in the view of some because the guidelines are important and non-controversial, but in the view of others because they constitute a new set of expectations, some are open to dispute. For example, some faculty objected to the line implying that instruction of these skills must take place "in a formal way during class time," as they might better be conveyed in one-on-one conferences. Professor Cooke did not object to modifying this language so that instruction could be in class or in conference: EPC's aim is to ensure that Freshman Seminars carrying the "W" designation pay attention to writing--where and how that should be done is immaterial. Some faculty objected to the requirement that teachers instruct students in library skills, something that might seem extraneous in certain courses. In answer to a question, Professor Cooke said there was no way to compare this list of expectations for "good writing" to previous lists, as no such inventory had previously been produced; however the list could be compared to existing guidelines for Freshmen Seminars that qualify for writing credit. By unanimous voice vote, the faculty agreed to postpone any approval of this section of the report until September.

Thanks was expressed to the EPC for making forms and other materials more easily available.

VI. Report of the Committee on International Studies

Professor Brad Weiss noted changes in personnel at the Reves Center--Mitchell Reiss as Dean of International Studies, and Guru Ghosh as Director of Programs Abroad. He also highlighted several positive statistics--the number of International Studies concentrators, the general rise in the number of students studying abroad (summer and semester), and number of programs run by the College or in conjunction with other universities (including a new one in Ghana).

VII. Old Business

[A vote on the Joint Appointments Policy was moved ahead to the FAC report; see II above]

VIII. New Business

[Deliberation on the Faculty Research Report continued at this stage; see IV above]

The meeting adjourned at 5:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Clay Clemens

Associate Professor of Government

Secretary's Note: After this marathon session dealing with FRC, FAC, FRA, EPC, FASS, etc., the Secretary has overcome a longstanding aversion to acronyms. Indeed, he has concluded that they are a major time-saving device, and there is a need for more. Hence a few suggestions.

ORIB for "our report is brief" (Stated before every committee report, regardless of length).

ATAAN for "are there any additional nominations?" (Always followed by silence).

TIGS for "time is getting short" (Example: "TIGS, and there are only twelve faculty left").

ITAQ for "is there a quorum?" (Used sparingly and at some risk).

CACETARB for "could a committee examine this and report back?" (Useful at or near 5:00)

