

Minutes
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, November 6, 2012 3:30-5:00pm
Sadler Center: Tidewater B

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 41.

- I. Minutes of the last meeting, October 2, 2012** were approved.
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20121002.pdf>

II. Report of Administrative Officers:

Vice Provost Kate Slevin on behalf of Michael Halleran reported the following:

- that Michael was teaching at the moment.
- an open forum regarding EVMS would occur the following week.
- salary letters were scheduled to be sent out on Friday, November 9.
 - Michael wants to emphasize that 70% of the bonus is being funded by the College, and it is his sincere hope that this 70% will remain in the budget, in the salary pool for next year.
- finances and restructuring still remain unclear, but that Board members are on their guard to discuss restructuring with the Governor, whose attention will return to such matters after the election.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

- Suzanne Raitt (English) inquired about the 2% raise and rumors that a tuition hike was in the works in exchange for adding students: *this is all a big unknown, both the Governor's reaction and the Board's reaction to the Governor.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) inquired if the financial restructuring equaled a step-tuition increase.
- Janice Zeman (Psychology) inquired if the salary letters were to go to the chairs or faculty members.

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- salary letters were to be mailed Friday. The DAC, Dean, and Provost are dedicated to equity adjustments. Dean Conley has honored the recommendations and deliberations of last spring. Deans would communicate the raises to the Chairs.
- FAC is working on the creation of a new committee to review nominations for Eminent Scholars, Professorships, and Awards. These are historically handled *ad hoc*, and it is hoped that the committee will be in place for next year.
- Virginia Elwell, the newly appointed Executive Director of Development for A&S will address Development Strategies at the December A&S meeting. Her goal is to highlight excellence at William and Mary. She is focused on scholarship and research, and is dedicated to translating what we do into a story or narrative that is more broadly accessible to people outside Academe who care about us and are interested in us.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

- Suzanne Raitt (English) inquired about the 2% raises as targeted to 30% of the faculty. *The Ewell Hall Deans recognize that more than 30% of the faculty need equity. Dean Conley is encouraged by conversations with the Provost that the amount of the bonus will remain in the salary pool.*
- Will Houseman (Economics) remarked that the state budget called for a 2% raise for all state employees.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) asked that the Provost clarify the budget/bonus quandary at the December meeting.
- Suzanne Raitt (English), grateful for the bonus, wished to express a neutral statement that, while we are mindful of colleagues needing/meriting an equity adjustment, the majority of the faculty will not receive a raise.
- *The Dean remains heartened by the Provost's optimism.*

III. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- meetings in addition to regular weekly meetings with the Curriculum Review Committee
 - the Dean (two).
 - the Provost (general interest).
 - Ginnie Elwell (fundraising).
- a memo to Committee on RPT regarding professional faculty.
- the creation of a new elective committee to review nominations for Eminent Scholars, Professorships, and Awards.
- see further
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/index.php> (under “reports”)

IV. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt (English) reported the following:

- executive committee meeting with Provost and external consultant regarding the EVMS merger (anticipating increased collaboration as a prelude to complete merger).
- liaison committee.
- salary bumps the last two years before retirement: exploring ways to retain salary bump (years of service, age sensitive?).
- faculty survey (branched according to status).
- Campus Assessment Intervention Team, mandated by the state in the wake of the Virginia Tech fiasco.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

- Leisa Meyer (History) inquired about the timeline for EVMS. *Still exploring it. Mike Deschenes (Kinesiology and Health Sciences) reported that the committee was moving forward, was cognizant of the state budget, and anticipates a gradual merger occurring over the next 2-3 years.*

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures) asked when the consulting group would report back. *Mike reported that this was ahead of schedule, a draft was expected within a week, but would not be open to the public*

V. Update from College-wide Planning Steering Committee: Draft Strategic Initiatives

Sarah Stafford (Public Policy) reported on the components of the draft:

- Vision Statement (aspirational—where we want to go).
- strategic focus (for people want to know more about what we are thinking)
- six grand challenges.
 - Be a leader among liberal arts universities – the overarching challenge.
 - Build and support a more fully diverse W&M community.
 - Develop an ever more engaging campus experience that inspires a lifelong commitment to W&M.
 - Implement a new financial model that can fund our aspirations.
 - Provide the administrative resources and infrastructure required for a university in the 21st Century.
 - Explain and promote W&M through a more effective communications structure and strategy.
- five strategic initiatives:
 - to provide a 360° learning experience, integrating learning through all dimensions of a student’s experience.
 - to foster innovative teaching approaches that use technology-enhanced modes as appropriate.
 - promote learning in applied settings.
 - encourage interdisciplinary connections across academic areas/schools.
 - forge stronger global perspectives and connections.

DISCUSSION

- Bill Cooke (Physics): the word “faculty” is conspicuously absent from this language, and this misses the point of what a university is about. Professor Cooke expressed concern that the faculty have vanished from the strategic vision.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): the other thing missing is “public”. How does our identity as a public university figure into the vision? *Sarah Stafford: the words “great” and “public” do not resonate with our target audience.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English): when “public” vanishes, what else will vanish?
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): ours is a state institution that gives students an opportunity to get a first class education, not reserved for the elite. This defines who we are and how we see our mission, our role in educating members of our community, not exclusive of the privileged. Our mission is access and service, with connections to the local and national community. There seems to be creeping elitism and privatization.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology and Women’s Studies): presentation seems to de-emphasize scholarship.

- Lisa Landino (Chemistry): The grand challenge of welcoming addresses Silvia’s concern about “public”.
- Susan Stafford: diversity for the sake of diversity does not imply access.
- John Delos (Physics): how would we grade this vision statement if turned in by a student? It lacks information *Susan Stafford: This is a document about breaking boundaries. Teaching and Scholarship cannot be broken apart. Students engage in a variety of modes of learning. And our intended audience include the BoV, the State government, and the alumni.*
- Joel Schwartz (Government): it is important to keep statements about technology in the list. But it is problematic to list technology as one of our five initiatives—this is only one of many ways to enhance education.

VI. Report from Curriculum Review Committee

Teresa Longo and Michael Lewis reported that

- the CRC completed visits to all of the departments.
- “Conversations with the Faculty” would occur on November 7 and 8 to discuss the Preliminary Feasibility Study; and what we learned from the department/program visits, especially regarding COLL 400.
- Regarding the documents: Despite some lingering confusion, the goal is to freeze as much of the existing language as possible, adding language that has emerged from departmental discussions.
- Complete an Executive Summary of our work. The summary will include the following sections:
 - Context: A summary of our charge and references to the 2010 Strategic Planning Document; a summary of the committee’s process.
 - A Rationale for Changing the Current Gen Ed System.
 - A Summary of the principles which support the change (e.g., an integrated, internally cohesive general education curriculum).
 - A Description of the Framework that realizes the principles. This summary will include rationale for and descriptions of each component of the COLL curriculum.
 - An appendix in which we answer as completely as possible all relevant Gen Ed questions; an appendix which answers questions from the department/program visits.
- Post the Executive Summary to the all-faculty BB site the week of November 12 and ask the faculty to read it.
- Submit the Executive Summary to EPC on November 16 and to FAS on Dec. 4.
- At the February 5 meeting of FAS, together with EPC, ask FAS for an endorsement of the principles and conceptual framework of the proposed curriculum. At the same time, confirm that EPC and FAS will revisit each component (the 100s, the 200s, the domain descriptions, etc.) separately, and vote on them one by one in the Spring 2013 Semester; make it clear that changes to each component can happen in the Spring 2013 meetings.
- Pending a positive vote on the principles and framework, EPC will move the initiative to its next stage. One method for doing this would be to form

working groups for each of the components, as was the case in the last review. CRSC members could serve as consultants to the working groups.

DISCUSSION

- John Delos (Physics): there seems not to be a vote on the final product as there was for the GER system.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classics): what is the intention regarding voting?
- Theresa Longo suggests that a special meeting would have to be called; Suzanne Raitt agrees that getting through all the components will be time-consuming, meriting a devoted meeting.
- Will Houseman (Economics): What is the role of the Faculty Assembly in this process? *Theresa Longo: liaisons from other schools are on the committee.*
- Will Houseman: the BoV seem to think that they have a say in this.
- Suzanne Raitt: Academic Affairs subcommittee of the BoV will review what we finally pass, and present to the full Board. They have the right to weigh in, but probably will not oppose, and their endorsement gives us cover in the current climate.
- John Delos (Physics): many people have serious concerns about the proposal. If you have concerns, make them known!

VII. New Business:

there was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia L. Irby, Secretary
Associate Professor of Classical Studies
glirby@wm.edu