

**Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences  
The College of William and Mary  
February 7, 2006  
Millington 150**

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m. by Dean Carl Strikwerda.

**I. Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes of the December 6, 2005 meeting were approved as posted.

<http://www.wm.edu/as/dean/faculty/documents/minutes/20051206.pdf>

**II. Nominations and Elections Committee Report, Steve Knudson**

Steve Knudson (Chemistry) presented the slate of candidates for elections to be held in the month of February:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/dean/faculty/documents/nominationelection/20060207.pdf>

- A. Election to the Faculty Assembly:
  - (Area I, 3 year term, 2006-09, vote for one)  
Alan Fuchs (Philosophy), Anne Rasmussen (Music)
  - (Area II, 3 year term, 2006-09, vote for one)  
David Finifter (Economics), Carol Sheriff (History)
  - (Area III, two 3 year terms, 2006-09, vote for two)  
Nikos Chrisochoides (Computer Science), Heather MacDonald (Geology), Robert Pike (Chemistry), and Gregory Smith (Applied Science)
- B. Election of the Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (vote to decline or accept):  
Terry Meyers (English)
- C. Election to the Procedural Review Committee (vote for one, one 4 year term, 2006-10, 2 years active + 2 years as alternate):  
  
Philip Daileader (History)  
George Grayson (Government)

There were no nominations from the floor and nominations were closed. Knudson then reviewed the procedures for online voting and explained that one should vote in every election (an "abstain" button will be added) and warned that one should not click "submit" unless one was sure about one's choices. There was discussion about the faster announcement of election results through e-mail or the William and Mary Digest.

**III. Reports of Administrative Officers**

- A. Provost Geoff Feiss. The Provost reported that interviews with the finalists for the position of VP for Development were underway and commented that the pool of candidates was strong. He said that he hoped that the new VP would be in office by April 1. He also confirmed some of the candidates were from bigger, richer schools and added that all had a strong record of success in their current positions.

Turning to the issue of the proposed new Scheduled Semester Research Leave (SSRL) program, the Provost reported that the Faculty Assembly would be voting in February on the revised proposal circulated in January and urged faculty to advise the FA (or FAC) on how to vote on the proposal.

<http://www.wm.edu/provost/policies.php>

The Provost explained that the new SSRL might not require a revision to the faculty handbook but noted that if it did, it would have to go through all the prescribed channels of approval culminating in the Board of Visitors. He also acknowledged that the first year of implementation of the SSRL program (leaves to be taken in 2007-08) would necessarily follow procedures slightly different than those set down in the new policy given the shorter timetable that would apply (e.g., the 18-month notice to be given by faculty who intend to request a SSRL).

The Provost also reported that work on the new Retirement Incentive and Transition programs was near completion and noted that provisional contracts could be issued to new faculty hires until final approval of the programs was given by the BOV.

- B. Dean Carl Strikwerda. The Dean reported that Steve Otto had been hired as the new A & S media specialist and would be working on improving A & S web presence. He reported that the Development Office agreed that all departmental home pages should have a donation button that would allow donors to give money directly to departmental accounts and that the use of such donated funds should be as free and flexible as possible. Turning to the issue of space planning, the Dean urged faculty to offer their feedback on the draft report of the A & S Space Planning Committee chaired by Joel Schwartz so that Arts & Sciences can issue a strong, unified report to the Provost and the campus-wide committee with jurisdiction over the issue. He announced that the A & S report would be discussed by the FAC and the DAC before being taken to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences at its March meeting.

The Dean announced with great pleasure two large year-end donations to Arts and Sciences programs made by two esteemed retired colleagues: Scott Donaldson, Professor Emeritus of English, who made a donation to the Department of English's writer-in-residence program; and Jerry Bledsoe, Professor Emeritus of Theatre, Speech, and Dance, who made a donation to endow the Virginia Shakespeare Festival, which he founded. Terry Meyers (English) moved to adopt a "resolution of gratitude thanking Professors Donaldson and Bledsoe for their generosity." The motion was seconded and passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The Dean concluded his comments by inviting faculty to attend the groundbreaking ceremony for the Integrated Science Center on Friday, February 10.

#### **IV. Ombudsman Report for 2005, Philip Daileader**

Daileader (History) the Graduate Student Ombudsman for 2004-05 began his report by stressing that the position primarily involved providing informal advice from a neutral party about policies and procedures for graduate student grievances and facilitating communication on issues of concern while preserving student anonymity.

<http://www.wm.edu/as/dean/faculty/documents/gradstudies/Ombuds%20Report%20for%202005.pdf>

#### **V. SACS Review: Developing Ideas for the Required Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), David Aday**

Aday (Sociology) first reported on the completion of phase one of the SACS re-accreditation process—the Compliance Certification Review—by noting that our Process of Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) model (excluding testing) had been accepted; however, he noted that SACS had questions about some other aspects of the Compliance Certification document, notably the absence of a policy for reviewing the performance of the President (issue to be studied by the BOV). He then presented the main component of the College's QEP (phase two of SACS): a demonstration project involving the implementation of an individual or small group experience in the junior or senior year. He remarked that data indicated that 75% of graduating William & Mary students reported that they had had such an experience and he explained that the demonstration project would be designed to bring this number up to 100%. He said that the specifics of the project would be posted on the web ([http://www.wm.edu/sacs/qep\\_prospectus.php](http://www.wm.edu/sacs/qep_prospectus.php)) by the March 15 deadline and prior to its presentation to the appropriate College governance committees (e.g., DAC, EPC), and he invited faculty to share their comments and suggestions.

The proposed project generated considerable discussion. Steve Knudson (Chemistry) asked if a small group experience would be made a requirement of all majors; Aday responded that the policy on the books did not specifically state that the experience had to be in the major field or even for credit. Jim Axtell (History) asked if a 15-student seminar would qualify; Aday said “probably.” David Lutzer (Mathematics) remarked that the Undergraduate Research Initiative offered a good model for the project (e.g., the creation of senior seminars, the addition of new positions to facilitate seminars). Bob Noonan (Computer Science) asked if this project represented the creation of new educational policy by fiat since the SACS steering committee was not qualified to make policy and the EPC had not been consulted about the steering committee’s choice even though the project’s implementation would impose new burdens on departments; Aday responded that the project did not constitute new policy since the proposal was already on the books and promised that there would be close coordination with the proper committees on implementation. Will Hausman (Economics) remarked that SACS was no longer a 10-year reaffirmation based on faculty-led self-studies, but a permanent part of the College; Aday acknowledged that accreditation had become more continuous and explained that the steering committee was doing its best to streamline the process; he also said that there were faculty and representatives of all major governance bodies on each of the four major SACS-related committees as well as a faculty member (himself) leading the review process. David Armstrong (Physics), a member of the QEP committee, said that the committee did not necessarily have to choose a project that would have to be reviewed by EPC but that the proposal would be fully discussed; he added that FAS still had the option of voting to reject the demonstration project and instruct the steering committee to report back to SACS that it had no proposal. Gary DeFotis asked if the type of small group experience being discussed could really be done without a faculty member (reference to an “advanced learner” in the project description); Aday responded that the requirement did not necessarily involve a course for credit and cited the example of Monroe Scholar research projects. Jim Axtell (History) asked why SACS was now asking for so much more (other faculty commented that SACS-type procedures were now creeping into internal assessments); Aday explained that there had been a shift from self-study vocabulary to best practices vocabulary in SACS.

Will Hausman (Economics) made motion to require any SACS committee dealing with educational policy to have a majority of faculty among its members. The motion was seconded and debated. Hausman argued that a committee with a faculty majority might have chosen a different project. Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) said that the motion might not be workable because the SACS review doesn’t always know when it is getting into EPC territory. David Lutzer (Mathematics) stated that a faculty majority on SACS committees would not resolve the issue because any project involving educational policy still must go to EPC. The motion failed (11 for, 23 against). Aday reiterated that the steering committee’s role was only to propose a project and that implementation would be left up to EPC. Following a suggestion by Heather Macdonald (Geology), it was agreed that the issue would be revisited at the March 14 FAS meeting, after EPC had first had a chance to examine it.

## **VI. Faculty Assembly Report, Alan Fuchs**

Fuchs (Philosophy) reported that the Faculty Assembly had heard from both the Provost and David Aday on SACS. The President’s focus on the concept of a “great public university” and the SSRL program were among the other substantive issues discussed at the meeting. Fuchs then turned the floor back over to the Provost to answer questions about the revised SSRL proposal. Rex Kinkaid (Mathematics) asked why there was still language that seemed to make taking a full year off at 80% of normal salary more complicated and wondered if this would have a negative impact on recruiting faculty; the Provost responded that the required proposal for a full year of leave was designed to facilitate a post-leave audit by allowing the administration—or an inquisitive member of the General Assembly—to compare actual results to the proposal and he stressed that the revised proposal stipulated that a faculty member may “elect” (and not “request”) a full year. He later stressed that the proposal was not a contract but simply a means to verify that the year had been spent effectively. Marc Sher (Physics) remarked that some departments cannot reliably project a six-year leave schedule for faculty because the conditions necessary for research sometimes became operable either sooner or later; the Provost said that allowances could be made for these types of variables. Tom Payne (Music) asked why it was necessary to make a distinction between research active and inactive faculty; the Provost responded that there were some faculty who did not do research and that the College could not fund an

automatic leave for them, but he added the Faculty Research Committee would have to approve departmental criteria for research active/inactive status and that there would be an appeal process.

## **VII. Faculty Affairs Committee Report, Terry Meyers**

Meyers (English) reported that the FAC continued its weekly meetings with the Dean and also met with Steve Knudson, Chair of Nominations and Elections, to discuss whether that committee could modify the terms in office for certain elections in order to bring term rotations back to normal. The FAC also discussed faculty buyouts, the Arts & Sciences Affirmative Action policy, data collection on undergraduate research (the creation of a data base), and average salary in rank (plans for data collection). It is also making plans to review tenure file criteria and to meet with the President in late February to discuss salaries and faculty research. Meyers invited the faculty to contact the FAC with their questions and comments via e-mail at [askfac@wm.edu](mailto:askfac@wm.edu).

Dean Strikwerda adjourned the meeting at 5:21 p.m.

### **Addendum: Election Results**

On February 15, 2006, Steve Knudson, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, formally notified the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the following election results:

#### Faculty Assembly—Area I

✓ Alan Fuchs (Philosophy)

#### Faculty Assembly—Area II

✓ Carol Sheriff (History)

#### Faculty Assembly—Area III

✓ Heather Macdonald (Geology), Gregory Smith (Applied Science)

#### Procedural Review—Area II

✓ Philip Daileader (History)

#### Faculty Affairs Committee, Chair

✓ Terry Meyers (English)

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Leruth

Associate Professor of Modern Languages and Literatures