

**Minutes**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**Tuesday, December 4, 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: 47.*

- **Minutes of the last meeting, November 6, 2012** were approved as emended for the **Report from Faculty Affairs Committee**  
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20121106.pdf>
  - 3 regular meetings plus additional meeting with the Provost to discuss matters of general interest to the faculty; weekly discussions at their regular meeting with CRSC ad hoc committee on NTE faculty.
  - the pending memo to the ad hoc committee on NTE regarding professional faculty.
  - the possible creation of a new elective committee to review nominations for Eminent Scholars, Professorships, and Awards.
  - discussion with Ginnie Elwell re. fundraising for A&S.

- **Report of Administrative Officers:**

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

- that Michael is out of town fundraising.
    - 1) Grand Financial Bargain remains elusive, and there will likely be no resolution from the Board, and the Provost has started to prepare a resolution, nicely taken up by Board member Bob Scott who has pared it down and presented to the Board. The resolution passed unanimously:
      - *Whereas, the Board of Visitors has approved the College's 6-year plan Submitted to the State in October of this year; and Whereas, the Board of Visitors is committed to meeting the SCHEV goal of having average faculty salaries reaching the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of the College's SCHEV-defined peer group; THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Visitors will take action to achieve these goals no later than at its April 2013 meeting.*
    - This action is viewed positively by the Provost and others: if the BoV does not get in plan A what it wants in terms of the governor agreeing to a major hike in tuition, the Board has decided that it's going to move ahead anyway. Within 5-6 years, BoV plans to have faculty salaries back up to the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile. Important for faculty to remember that the Provost was the master of that Resolution.
    - 2) Curriculum Review. The Provost is beginning to have conversations with Dean Conley and the co-chairs of the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) on the issue of funding for the new curriculum (assuming it goes forward to a vote to be approved). Provost is impressed with progress and direction of CR and is committed to trying to find money to make it happen. Aware that new money will have to be found to support development of new courses (e.g., capstone

courses: if some departments do not have capstone courses, there should be administrative support for the development of such; designated professorships; etc.). There is no expectation that faculty would implement a new curriculum without financial and other support.

- 3) EVMS-W&M potential merger:
  - COLLEGE OF WILLIAM & MARY REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATION FROM THE 2013 VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY Resolution: *WHEREAS, William & Mary (W&M) has been engaged in due diligence on possibly forging a substantial affiliation with Eastern Virginia Medical School (EVMS); and, WHEREAS, the due diligence committee and its EVMS counterpart have identified possible valuable areas of partnership between the two schools; NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Visitors directs W&M's senior administration to work with the senior leadership at EVMS and submit to the Governor and the General Assembly the following language for consideration in the 2013 General Assembly session: The Virginia General Assembly hereby appropriates \$1,000,000 to W&M and EVMS to allow the Boards of Visitors to explore possible increased collaboration and development of integrated academic programs. The two institutions shall address and evaluate options for the appropriate relationship between the two institutions and the clinical affiliates of EVMS to improve the health of the citizens of Greater Hampton Roads and the Commonwealth and to meet the region's healthcare workforce needs.*
- We are asking for money to **evaluate** options (not put in place).
- Bob Archibald (Economics): we started with the idea of talking about a merger and backed away fairly quickly, but there is still considerable interest in seeing what the possibilities are. There is a real sense that health care is a growing fraction of the economy, and it might be a very good idea for W&M with a partner to play a bigger role in studying how that is all done. Programs of interest at W&M include Law, Public Policy and Business, and I am surprised that the language does not include “delivery science”.
- KS: increased collaboration on the development of integrated academic programs. It's vague. But obviously integrated between the two institutions. Provost wishes to emphasize that the money is for **study**, not implementation. And of course, it goes to the Assembly who could say, “go away, we're not giving you anything.”
- QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
- Bill Cooke (Physics): regarding issue #1: there was a critical timing concern. If the decision was not made by December 1, then they'd kick the can down the road another year. Does the motion passed by the BoV mean that they will try to fix it a year from now? KS: “Board will take action to achieve these goals no later than its April 2013 meeting”. How they play that out is anybody's guess. Certainly the Provost felt that we would see action at the 2013 meeting— that is the intent of his motion. Prof Cooke's follow up: is there consequence to the BoV or Provost or President if they do not follow through? KS: Egg on face; I can't

*imagine a Board unanimously publically passing a resolution like this and then come April saying "Oh, well, we didn't really mean it".*

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): I wonder if anyone has any clarity about where the resolution to request for a million dollars (to study possible merger with EVMS) came from. It doesn't seem to have come from the Due Diligence Committee.
- Will Houseman (Economics): on 60<sup>th</sup> percentile resolution, Bob Scott asked Sam Jones to do a salary study on where we stand relative to the schools with whom we compete for students (about 25 schools—must be private schools and very good ones). We came in dead last. My understanding is the budget plan passed by the Board would call for a 6% raise beginning in July 2013. Sam Jones told me that he would prepare a budget that honors their statement. On the EVMS potential merger, my perception is that the Board is a lot more enthusiastic than anybody else. They clearly are business types, and they can't understand why we're acting so slowly. I'd like to think that the resolution had originally been passed by the EVMS Board, and I think they were under a little pressure that they would look like they're not playing ball if they did not pass this resolution asking the state for money.
- Mike Deschenes (Kinesiology and Health Sciences): it came to the point where we had to do something on the EVMS merger, and the Board said that this would surprise them. They were going to go to the state, and they asked if we could do something to help them along: if you ask for a million dollars to study this, it would probably be well-received. They were encouraged to do this.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): I would suggest that our priorities and the Board's priorities are not in sync. I would have liked to see a million dollars requested to explore implementation of the new curriculum, not to explore a merger with EVMS that the due diligence committee, from my perspective, has said "Let's move slowly if at all". Instead, we have a Board that seems eager to move in a direction that does not seem to be supported by at least the faculty. *KS: I don't know that your grave concern would be shared by at least some of the faculty in the natural science departments.* I would love to have a vote and have a count of how many faculty on campus (let's involve all the schools) and see if there is support.
- Gene Tracy (Physics): re. lack of action on tuition increase. The 6 Year plan is a much more meaningful statement of what the Board intends to do than a motion. We haven't acted on those plans, which have included a stepped increase for 4 years. I want to connect this to the Strategic Plan—initiated 4 years ago and supported by the Board; Provost Feiss set up a faculty Steering Committee that was faculty majority. Although a complicated a messy process, it was faculty majority and there was an enormous effort to survey all the stake-holders, including the faculty (students, alumni, etc.), at focus group meetings, open fora, multiple A&S meetings to discuss aspects of the plan. All this took about 6 months, the time it has taken re. EVMS, from the time of Taylor's letter to now. The Strategic Plan has lots of pieces but essentially it says that we are committed to being a better, stronger Liberal Arts institution with an ambitious, creative agenda. That's all it says. The implication is that there are significant new

resources needed. We need money for salaries, for investments in faculty research programs, startup, graduate stipends. All of that was in the plan, all of that was highlighted, and all of that was the reason behind the urgency of the step function four years ago. This was interrupted by the financial crisis. There have been no excuses for the last two years, but still inaction, and we are kicking the can down the road for another year. Instead, what has come in out of the blue is potential merger with EVMS. The fact that this has gone up the priority list without any meaningful input from the faculty is disturbing, and to me it erodes our sense of shared governance. The fact that we are exploring potential joint academic programs before we have acted on what were identified as critical resources is disturbing. Also disturbing is that this was done outside the usual strategic planning process. I would urge that this discussion be brought under the strategic planning umbrella, and that the faculty be asked to weigh in. This would be a major strategic change of direction for the institution; it could change the character of the place. Why hasn't this been done as part of the strategic planning process; and why if we are considering such a large strategic change of direction, why hasn't the faculty been consulted?

- Leisa Meyer (History): how does EVMS fit at all into the Strategic Plan? IS there some way we as a faculty could have a voice in this? We should have a voice in this.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): A&S remains consistently underfunded, and the last thing we need is a medical school that would drain even more resources. The faculty weren't even asked, and it seems to be going full speed ahead. I have very grave reservations and am concerned to see that we might be moving away from the Liberal Arts.
- *KS: faculty comprise about half of the EVMS committee. I am taking notes to convey your sentiments to the Provost and will be on the phone to California as soon as I leave here. It seems to me that faculty here can make their opinions very strongly felt to the members of this Board. They are there to represent the faculty. A powerful tool to contact your reps and say "What are you doing, how do you know that you represent the faculty? I will convey to Provost and Jim Golden that the faculty at this meeting are very unhappy about the lack of connection regarding EVMS deliberation and strategic planning; and that commitments have been made that are not being acknowledged, and that we seem to be skipping ahead of ourselves*
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): were the Committee aware that Resolution was coming out of the Board?
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): it is a question of process.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): The Committee did not know the mechanism, but they knew that the idea was cooking up between the two institutions to ask jointly for the million dollars. The proposal came out of discussions of the Committee.
- Mike Deschenes (Kinesiology and Health Sciences): people politically in the know came back with this message.

- Will Houseman (Economics): the resolution was discussed in closed meeting. In terms of representing the faculty, you have to get organized, you have to have a resolution, it has to be written; there has to be a large group voting on it.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): FAC has decided to write to the co-chairs and ask that they supply a time-table for decision-making process and how they see faculty input being made in that process. Part of the problem, we don't really understand when decisions are being made, and we don't want our input to come too late.
- *KS: Board are coming from a corporate world, and they have a very different sense of time. If we deliberate this for another year, they will have moved on and made decisions that will be visited upon us. I would encourage the faculty to move with more speed than typical.*
- Gene Tracy (Physics): we have no proposal, nothing to react to. It is hard to draft a meaningful resolution with no information.
- Leisa Meyer (History): ask FAC to draft a motion for a February vote—asking due diligence committee and/or board to clarify where EVMS fits into our Strategic Plan.
- response by acclamation: faculty prefer a motion to be crafted rather than wait for timetable.
- Sarah Stafford (Public policy): cautions about the language. Motion should emphasize faculty involvement and voice.
- *KS: cautions regarding Board reaction: faculty representation on Due Diligence; Committee; resolution stresses “exploring” merger.*
- Bill Cooke (Physics): new curriculum should be corner piece of Capital Campaign.

**Dean Kate Conley reported the following:**

- concise report in interest of time.
- Strategic Planning Committee did hear faculty response to Sarah Stafford's presentation at last A&S meeting. Addition of 6<sup>th</sup> initiative: *to continuously renew our faculty by providing competitive salaries to hire and retain world-class scholars and teachers and funds to support research and professional development.*

- **Report from Faculty Affairs Committee**

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- 4 regular meetings of FAC.
- Primarily focused on curriculum review process; I will summarize momentarily
- In addition to this matter, FAC also discussed the following issues:
  - whether the traditional Area I, II and III designations are still a good basis for the organization of A&S. FAC decided to have further discussion on this issue at a later date, once additional information has been gathered on the topic. If any faculty have an opinion they would like to express on this issue, please contact FAC via our listserve: [asfac@lists.wm.edu](mailto:asfac@lists.wm.edu).
  - the EVMS merger. FAC decided to submit to the co-chairs of the due-diligence committee a memo asking for a schedule of the decision-making

process on this matter and a statement as to how A&S faculty input would be solicited and taken into account in this process.

- Regarding the curriculum review process, in consultation with the CRSC co-chairs, FAC recommended the following plan for the immediate future:
  - Dec. 4: presentation at the FAS meeting of the CRSC Executive Summary and the Procedures and Timeline for approval of the new curriculum.
  - Dec. 7: submission of Guiding Principles and Conceptual Framework of new curriculum to EPC and EPC vote on these items.
  - Jan. 18: submission of a joint resolution regarding the guiding principles and conceptual framework by EPC and CRSC to FAS.
  - Feb. 5: FAS vote on the joint resolution.
- Providing that the FAS vote on Feb. 5 is favorable, FAC will arrange for a series of FAS meetings to be set up to approve the various parts of the COLL curriculum during the spring semester of 2013. This process will likely entail 3 or 4 FAS meetings in addition to the ones already scheduled. A more detailed calendar of meetings will be made available after the vote on Feb. 5.
- FAC will work with EPC to determine the procedure for bringing motions regarding the curriculum before the faculty and allowing for changes to be made to these motions. FAC recommends that the all amendments and new motions for the curriculum must be presented in writing as attachments to the FAS meeting agenda, except for those amendments which merely refine or clarify an original motion. This will mean that all substantive amendments and motions will have to be submitted to the Chair of FAC no later than 1 week before the scheduled FAC meeting.
- QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
- Gene Tracy (Physics): requested discussion meeting followed by a subsequent meeting to vote on the curriculum. *BS suggests this would create a disjunction—not everyone who votes may have attended the discussion meeting.*
- Gary Defotis (Chemistry): requested more opportunity to discuss conceptual basis, etc. of the Curriculum Review and laments lack of transparency.
- Leisa Meyer (History) asserted: there have been multiple opportunities for faculty to participate, the process was as transparent as possible, and the Committee have ensured that everyone has had the opportunity to participate—department and program meetings, open for a, etc. Applauds the transparency of the Committee (inciting an ovation from the attendees).
- **Report from Faculty Assembly**

Suzanne Raitt (English) reported the following, that the Faculty Assembly have:

  - started working to get faculty representation on all standing Committees of the Board.
  - discussed collaboration with or working in parallel with UVa to (ambitiously) change the code of Virginia so the Board is mission-driven in the sense that there a mandated number of people with experience of academic institutions (long-term project).
  - re EVMS: Faculty Assembly has same concerns. FA requested from Provost as Chair of Due Diligence Committee copies of reports.

- continued to keep up pressure on Board regarding salary issue.
  - heard concerns regarding more transparency on raises (who and how).
- **Report from Committee on Nominations and Elections**  
Paul Manna reported the following:
    - October Election Results: John Oakley was elected for three year term to International Studies advisory Committee.
    - two elections would open after the faculty meeting
      - Faculty Affairs Committee, Area II: Bob Kohl (Kinesiology and Health Sciences)/ Leisa Meyer (History).
      - Faculty Affairs Committee, Area III: Gregory Hancock (Geology)/ Peter Kemper (Computer Science).
    - no new nominations were made from the floor.
- **Report from Committee on Academic Status**  
Steve Holliday (Theater, Speech, and Dance):
    - reported that CAS reviewed 813 petitions combined (medical review and dean of students).
    - emphasized deadline for final grades so Committee can review students on probation, etc., in a timely fashion.
- **Introduction from the Executive Director for A&S Development**  
Virginia [Ginny] Elwell addresses the faculty, shared her background and credentials (small liberal arts education, business career), and expressed her support. She will bring to her job “the ability to translate the real excellence that goes on here at W&M into terms that donors will value and fund.” She has a pragmatic mission, and needs faculty help and the stories of the “day to day” miracles that go on here—these stories are a very eloquent way to make the experience on campus real to donors.
- **Report and Discussion of the Executive Summary from the Curriculum Review Committee**  
Teresa Longo, Michael Lewis, and Josh Erlich  
Michael Lewis (Mathematics) reported on the time-line:
    - Curriculum review grew out of Strategic Planning process and year-long discussion of W&M as a liberal arts institution.
    - proposed curriculum reflects many of the major goals that were identified in strategic planning.
    - Steering Committee began to work in April 2011; year end report May 2012; update in September 2012;
    - preliminary resource analysis reported in November 2012.
    - executive summary is turning point as we move to next stage
      - co-chairs of Steering Committee have been working with FA and EPC to plan next steps.
      - EPC reviewed executive summary and suggested minor changes as reflected in updated document posted on BB.

- EPC will vote to enforce the guiding principle of the framework of the Curriculum Review with the understanding that changes are possible.
- During the week of December 17, chair of EPC and co-chairs of Steering Committee will draft a resolution to be voted on by faculty at February meeting.
- Pending affirmative February 5 vote, faculty as a whole will take ownership.
- EPC will schedule additional faculty meetings to vote on component parts of the new curriculum, as well as final vote on entire package.

Josh Erlich (Physics) reported an overview of the conceptual framework of proposed curriculum:

- 7 College courses
- 3 departmental domains
- Executive Summary is posted to faculty BB site

Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures, Dean for Curriculum Review) reported on the principles that guided the Steering Committee's work (as presented in the BB document):

- Courses should be primarily taken at W&M, students should be provided with an integrated intellectual experience across the 4 undergraduate years and should make meaningful and coherent connections across disciplines; students should develop critical thinking, research methods, written, oral and visual communication, collaboration, problem solving, explore methodologies and epistemologies of various academic disciplines along with how they differ from and form synergies with one another; courses are to be structured in such a way that faculty routinely bring their best scholarly and creative work to all undergraduate students; encourage faculty to focus on major field but also how the fields contribute to the broader Liberal Arts; enlarge global perspectives; foster sense of academic community among students and faculty

#### DISCUSSION

- Lu Ann Homza (History): complemented the report as "crystal clear". Why are COLL 300 and 400 level classes 2 credits and graded P/F: *an effort to address student schedules in their last year*. What college body will decide the themes of COLL 100 and 150 from year to year? *to be determined*.
- John Oakley (Classical Studies): on mathematics/quantitative proficiency to be fulfilled by W&M courses or HS courses? *if HS, we would require AP exam*. There was a call for a consistency regarding proficiencies: math is real proficiency; foreign can be fulfilled by years of HS language (not proficiency).
- John Delos (Physics): would be happy if mathematics proficiency were precisely the same as foreign language proficiency (4 years of HS mathematics).
- Chuck Bailey (Biology): observed that some faculty have teaching conflicts with the A&S meetings and are thus disenfranchised.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): FAC had discussed on-line voting, but concluded that it was important for faculty to be a part of the discussion before voting.

- Leisa Meyer (History): suggested video-taping the meetings and mandating viewing the video before allowing absent faculty to vote.
  - Gul Ozyegin (Sociology and Women's Studies): there is no perfect time for the meetings.
  - David Armstrong (Physics): is enthusiastic about the proposed curriculum. Where the Committee could have tweaked the GER system, they took bold action. This is a high risk/high reward curriculum that invites us to rethink how many of our courses connect to different disciplines.
  - Bob Scholnick (English): cautioned about the risk, if voted in, we should field pilot courses to see what works and what does not. What is the evidence that the GER system is not working? Most students respond in a positive way about exploring specific ways of knowing. Every area is important, i.e., to a pre-medical career.
  - Gene Tracy (Physics): "the tenure faculty teaching system is ossified. Many GERs are satisfied through AP credit, summer school, elsewhere; only ½ of GER courses are taught by TT/TE faculty".
  - Sarah Stafford (Public Policy): not convinced that the new system won't devolve into a check-box system, and expressed worry that the language suggests a liberal arts curriculum will overshadow disciplinary commitments. The proposed curriculum may be trying to do too much with too little. She would rather funnel money into bolstering the disciplines.
  - (\*) there was deep skepticism about freshman seminars when first implemented, but now that component is one of the most beloved college experiences. It represents a profound rethinking and faith in a world class faculty. Do we want to tell our younger colleagues that this is the best we can do?
  - Gene Tracy (Physics) the new curriculum asks us to recommit to the Liberal arts.
- **New Business:**  
there was no new business.

*The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 pm.*

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia L. Irby, Secretary  
Associate Professor of Classical Studies  
[glirby@wm.edu](mailto:glirby@wm.edu)