

MINUTES

Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Tuesday, February 5, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm

Commonwealth Auditorium, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 167.

- I. Dean Conley's welcome
 - the Dean announced that the meeting was not closed and she asked visitors to identify themselves (3 hands).
- II. Minutes of the last meeting, Dec. 4, 2012
 - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20121204.pdf>
 - approved as posted.
- III. Dean Conley's Remarks on Procedure for the Curriculum Review Discussion
 - purpose: to consider EPC proposal to endorse guiding principles and conceptual framework of proposed College Curriculum.
 - endorsement means faculty will continue to discuss, debate, and amend the proposed curriculum, proceeding seriatim through the proposed curriculum before final vote on the entire proposed/amended curriculum projected for special May meeting, assuming the motion today passes.
 - will proceed according to Robert's Rules of Order.
 - grateful to the FAC for their careful reading of these rules and their work for the preparation of this meeting, particular thanks to the Chair, Barbette Spaeth for her expert steering of this process.
 - fortunate to have Parliamentarian Terry Myers to help with procedural questions.
 - faculty were asked to identify themselves by name and department before speaking.
 - faculty were reminded that according to Robert's rules: no one may speak a second time until everyone else who wishes has had already spoken.
- IV. EPC procedural motion presented by Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies)
 - that the vote on EPC's motion on the proposed new curriculum be conducted by secret ballot to enable faculty to vote on their conscience on this issue without concern for peer pressure or publicity.
 - motion comes from committee, therefore there is no need for second.
 - "do we need a secret ballot for this?"
 - motion passes.
- V. EPC Resolution on Curriculum Revision

- Kim Wheatley (English) thanked the Curriculum Review Steering Committee for all their hard work in preparing this proposal and putting countless hours of research, writing, and meetings with faculty. After reading resolution, will explain a few mostly small changes made by EPC to the original proposal. EPC kept well-informed by Curriculum review Committee with regular updates at each EPC meeting by Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures, Dean for Curriculum Review) and Michael Lewis (Mathematics) and impressed by their responsiveness to our concerns.
- Special November EPC meeting to discuss the 12 page executive summary, and suggested minor changes at that point.
- December 7 meeting to vote on Executive Summary and endorsed it by vote of 12 to 0.
- responsibility now rests with EPC to move the proposal forward in consultation with Curriculum Review Committee.
- today, affirmation that we can confidently proceed and bring to faculty various pieces of proposed new general education curriculum.
- positive vote this afternoon gives EPC go-ahead to refine different parts of the proposal and work together with faculty to finalize content.
- http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/educationalpolicy/documents/motion_edorse_cr_framework.pdf
- Resolved, that the Faculty of Arts & Sciences endorse the guiding principles and conceptual framework for a College Curriculum designed to replace the current General Education Requirements, as specified in the attached document. The endorsement shall be made with the following understandings: that the vote will signal an agreement to move forward with the Curriculum Review; that this resolution will serve as a starting point for seriatim discussions of the curriculum proposed by the Curriculum Review Steering Committee and endorsed by the Educational Policy Committee on December 7, 2012; that changes to both the principles and the components of the framework of the proposed curriculum are possible.
- we are here today to vote on this paragraph, alluding to guiding principles and conceptual framework described in 2-page summary attached to today's agenda (link above)—listing proposed guiding principles and summarizing proposed framework.
- small EPC changes to Executive Summary:
 - two minor changes to wording of guiding principles
 1. College courses taught mainly by W&M faculty, tenure eligible and continuing NTEs—the word **mainly** acknowledges that COLL 300 could be satisfied by study abroad and courses taught by non-W&M faculty; change also clarifies the addition of continuing NTEs, that intention is not to exclude continuing NTE faculty from teaching general education courses.
 2. enlarge students global perspective through experience of the world beyond campus: “beyond the traditional classroom” was deleted because study abroad often still involves the traditional classroom.

o more substantial change:

1. regarding COLL 300/400 graded as P/F. EPC does not concur that those courses should be graded P/F. 2-credit colloquium to fulfill COLL 300 for students who do not study abroad, is still envisioned as P/F, but not study abroad courses or courses taught through the W&M Washington DC program.
- changes are possible as we proceed, we are seeking a positive vote to give faculty the opportunity to weigh in and help shape proposal.

VI. Discussion:

- Dean Conley: since motion comes from committee, second not required, Dean Conley opened the floor for discussion.
- Bob Scholnick (English & American Studies): re. COLL 100, the 1st version gave as an example a course related to DaVinci. Is that the sort of thing you have in mind? It struck me that course was way beyond the ability of college freshmen. Students would need something in way of history of art, renaissance thought, world history, before trying to pull apart DaVinci's art. The proposal gave me the sense that perhaps curriculum is trying to do much in way of interdisciplinarianism. My questions: what is in mind for COLL 100 courses.
Teresa Longo: 100 courses to be at the introductory level but framed according to interesting questions. Actual content depends on faculty choices. If we move forward today, there will soon be a meeting to debate nuances of COLL 100. We also imagine COLL 100 to take up some of the pressure on freshman seminars which are asked to do a lot of things: writing, communication, collaboration.
- George Rublein (Mathematics): re. "The domains shall be defined in such a way that *courses in* every discipline on campus will have a place in one or more of the domains." may I take credit for italicized word? In the Math Department there are about a couple of dozen courses in undergraduate catalogue, beginning remedial math up through partial differential equations and other exotic things. Is it the sense of the steering committee, following this template described (in document linked above) that courses in mathematics will have place in one or more of the Domains? *Teresa: yes it is the intent that courses in every department will have a place, that it is not to say every course in every department.*
- John Delos (Physics): thanked the committee for their hard work, but will explain why he is voting "no", and urging others to vote "no" as well. "This is not a vote to keep things as they are, but a vote to revitalize the curriculum we now have, which I believe is an excellent framework. The proposed curriculum is the weakest in my memory, and possibly the weakest in the history of the College. Never have we seen such a stream of letters from alarmed alumni, the latest of which has the phrase 'lazy faculty.' It does no good for me to say that that is not an accurate description. We had better be very cautious about accepting a proposal that conveys such a poor impression of us. I am going to give ten reasons to vote no on this proposal, and I am sorry that it will take 10 minutes. But apparently I am either the leader of the opposition, or the only opposition here, and these concerns have to be expressed. What is wrong with the proposal?"

1. It expresses the view that faculty are supposed to integrate student's knowledge for them. That is preposterous, and it is not our responsibility. Many years ago, I had a course in Organic Chemistry, and it affected my world view. And I had a course in Primitive Religion, and it affected my world view. I would never have imagined that my teachers were supposed to integrate these disparate subjects for me. What would that be? A course in the Chemistry of Religious Experience? Includes Lab? NO. This is the Students' responsibility. Dartmouth and Brown are explicit about it: "The challenge ... is for you to make the connections." "You will find yourself integrating your knowledge."
2. The college 100 courses are undefined, of doubtful value, and certainly misplaced. Bob has already addressed this.
3. The college 300 courses are also undefined, and the proposals are such a quivering mass of jello that it is impossible to discuss them coherently. For our science students, the third year is not a good time to be away. They are acquiring knowledge in depth, and it is not helpful to have the structure and sequence disrupted by going to another institution. Furthermore, this is one of their few opportunities to study Chinese History, or Russian Literature, or English Poetry. Instead, they are to "use their emerging expertise in framing questions..." this makes no sense to me. I guess I'm pretty old. I thought the goal of education was to learn how to *answer* questions. I do not know what this is, neither does anyone else. How can anyone think that that the proposed College 300 is more valuable than the courses we teach?
4. The proposed Curriculum is a good expression of a popular educational philosophy: 'We know that students are going to forget most of what they learn anyway. The important thing is to teach them to think.' This philosophy of education was known to be a failure long before it became dogma. It's 1962. I'm sitting in my first class on European History, and the prof is handing back a graded quiz. He says, 'You know, we hate making people memorize dates – that's not what attracted us to the study of history. We much prefer the essay questions. But then we get a paper – beautifully and carefully written – about how event A led to and influenced event B. But event A happened 150 years after event B. So we make you memorize dates.' Well – in educational philosophies, nothing succeeds like failure. Similarly, at least one of the advocates of the new curriculum expressed the view that they want the required courses to focus on 'the big ideas'. But in history, there is only one big idea, and it can be expressed in three words – "Here's what happened". Herodotus is called the Father of History because he was apparently the first in Western culture to write this: "Some people say..." and then he tells a story. "And other people say..." and he tells a story. And then, "But I think what really happened is this..." and he tells a third story. And there is the Greatest Idea in all of history – "I think what really happened is ..." When we know what happened in the past, then SOME elements of the present can begin to make sense. Likewise, there is only one really big idea in physics,

and I will reveal it to all of you right here. “Some things are predictable. Some things are predictable. Here’s how we do it.” And then we start in. The first experiment in my physics lab was to measure a tabletop with a meter stick. The second is, do it five times, and see if you get the same result. That’s how we do it.

5. If this proposal passes, it will still be possible to get a good education at W&M. But a good education will not be a requirement for graduation. If students make good choices, they will get a good education. But to make good choices, one has to already have an education. For example, how many students know the value of Classical Studies – Greek and Roman civilization? Why should every young woman read the love story of Aeneas and Dido? Ask me afterwards and I’ll explain it to you. Students who come from homes where Classics are on the bookshelves might sense that there is something important there, and then make good choices. But those who don’t are at a serious disadvantage. This is what requirements are for. We cannot require everything, but the current curriculum forces them to get at least a taste of a broad range of knowledge.

6. Now five more reasons to vote “NO” on the proposed curriculum:

7. No requirement for a lab science. NO

8. No requirement of artistic or musical performance. NO

9. No requirement of ethical, religious or philosophical thought. NO.

10. No requirement for Western History and Culture. NO

11. No requirement to study at least one Non-Western History and Culture. NO.

12. I thank the committee again. But I believe that the proposed curriculum is not worthy of the quality of students we get here. Thank you. Thanks for listening.

- Gary Defotis (Chemistry): 3 problems with the principles of the proposed curriculum which:
 - intends to do what the existing GER system does, but actually with fewer courses.
 - development of imagination emphasis. Part of imagination is creativity. I think this is essentially impossible and far too ambitious. Creativity is an individual gift.
 - attempts to give relatively uniformed, inexperienced undergraduates a global perspective among the synergies, among the various disciplines and parts of the Arts and Sciences. A fantastic ambition. The undergraduate education is far better focused after fundamental details have been given, and then to see what emerges. I find too many words like synergy, innovative, coherent, integrated. I don’t think these are arguments. These are words to try to sell something, They are not intellectual arguments. Why go through this enormous trouble and some expense for a change that is so tenuously justified? Also, despite some small improvement which may have occurred, I am disturbed that in the 21st century a curriculum proposal could emerge in which natural science is not required.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): I am a strong and enthusiastic supporter, came back to W&M because I believe in the liberal arts education. What I learned over the last 18 months in playing a minor role in putting together some of the data that the curriculum review steering committee looked at is that ½ of the GERs don't work in any sense that I would think that they should. Students take GERs either in HS or as transfer courses. Standard, run of the mill introductory courses can be taught anywhere, and they should be taught anywhere, and as a high school student we should expect to get something better out of college. With the freshmen seminars, that is where a lot of the excitement is among faculty and students, because you really get to experience the liberal arts education. I would hope that this framework and this direction would lead us to more courses like (the freshman seminars). I say that coming from a department that actually offers a lot of courses for non-majors of the GER type. Although they weren't really redesigned, but it hasn't been part of our essence as I hope this new curriculum will be. It is going to require some extra work and I know there are concerns that we won't have the resources to do the work well, and especially coming from a department that is very short on faculty. Concern over resources not a reason to back away from the vision of a real liberal arts education. Our students have really good HS preparations. Of last year's graduating class, there were 100/150 students who graduated without taking any science courses at W&M. We're not doing what you think we might be doing with the GERs, it's time to move on. I would not see this as a perfect curriculum—it's not really developed yet. We're voting that we'll go forward to develop the curriculum. I, for one, would like to see some element that looks like GER 6 reintroduced, some performance/creativity element. GER 6 is one of the few that don't satisfy in HS. So, it's actually serving a role. Looking forward to the coming discussions.
- Alan Goldman (Philosophy): Virtually the entire Philosophy department is against the trend of this, we tend to think of rather fundamental matters. I think the purpose of the requirements is to try to guarantee a somewhat well-rounded education by exposing students to different disciplines. They don't get philosophy on HS for example. I think all the buzz words we find in here—integrated, themes, interdisciplinary—will tend to narrow not broaden the scope. Once they are exposed to disciplines that they haven't had before, they do concentrate in their majors and go on from there. But to focus them in one direction with integrated themes is not the right goal for a set of requirements. The GERs have the right intention. We should modify in ways needed but not completely abandon them as an idea for another one which, frankly, most of us, don't really understand, even the wording. It is so vague and nebulous as it stands now we really have no idea except to see all these buzz words.
- Lu Ann Homza (History): incredibly enthusiastic about the change to teach in the COLL 100/150. It is energizing to have students cover the same material from different methodological stances. Doing this now in the first *-link course in Renaissance Studies. A range of freshmen to seniors are enrolled in that class. My colleague in English Monica Potkay just covered Augustine's Confessions last week with a literary and theological eye; I covered it with an historical one. Students are completely enraptured at the fact that they see their professors,

instead of giving them only one version of the truth, they see multiple versions of the truth at the same time, in an hour and 20 minute class, neither of which was wrong. It all depends on our methods and priorities that we bring to this particular subject. I think that our students are far smarter and will be engaged that much more quickly if they cover a topic such as Leonardo DaVinci by listening to Brian Kreydatus talk about print-making and drawing, by listening to someone in physics talk about DaVinci's plans for tanks and flying machines, by listening to me talk about DaVinci's illegitimacy and what that would have meant in 15th century Italy. I think this is a creative opportunity to match our interests around topics and then to go on and do something really, really dynamic in a literal sense.

- Gene Tracy (Physics): Addresses a couple of the questions that have been implicit in some of the comments that have been made. I think we have an opportunity to do something significant. I urge the faculty to endorse the proposal which is conversant to moving forward as a group of faculty struggling to understand what it is we are trying to accomplish together, rather than to vote “no” which essentially leaves us where we are. Why now? 5 years ago, as a part of strategic planning there were surveys, fora, focus groups, wide discussion within the college community. What came back from that:
 - 1) deep-seated anxiety among part of the faculty that we were turning away from the Liberal Arts. A part of the plan had to be a recommitment to the Liberal Arts—that what the faculty said they wanted.
 - 2) Sense that the College not fully supporting faculty research.
 - notion that developed in those discussion was that these were not isolated thrusts. They had to be entwined/in balance, part of what makes us distinctive as an institution of higher education: a recommitment to the Liberal Arts and to an aggressive research program. To accomplish that goal, it was important to undertake a thorough curriculum revision, to make sure that we had a curriculum that reflected that: a full-body Liberal Arts curriculum and that it benefitted from the fact that we are a community of teacher-scholars, and that benefit is supposed to apply for all students, not just our majors. Undertaking a curriculum review came out of strategic planning. Intervening financial difficulties, that affected morale low and concerns over resources. I would argue that by moving forward on this curriculum review, by endorsing the framework we are taking back and empowering ourselves to do this. If we don't, we are essentially letting the external environment stymie us. Periodic curriculum reviews ensure that what we teach and how we teach it reflect our pedagogical objectives. Furthermore, curriculum reviews also empower junior faculty to engage in the creative evolution of the university. Now is your moment to take ownership of this place and use it wisely. The proposed curriculum answers the call: the call was to make sure that the curriculum was innovative, energizing for the faculty, energizing for students, and that it entices (word used deliberately) faculty to bring their best creative work into the classroom for the benefit of all students, not just the majors. This opens up a creative opportunity to bring research into the classroom, if you want to.

- If you vote “no”, if you think this is completely off the track and a disaster and not worth further discussion, which means we’re back where we started 18 months ago. These conversations today – this is the first time in nearly 20 years that we’ve had this many faculty in this room arguing about what it is we’re trying to achieve for all our students. I want to see us do that for the rest of the spring. A vote “no” shuts that off. A vote “yes” strengthens the Arts and Science position in Campaign planning discussions, saying that we are moving forward in these discussions. A “no” leaves us in a kind of, limbo, where people who have been waiting to see what faculty are going to do, keep waiting. Regarding the Campaign, it is important to know that we have friends out there who are waiting to know what the faculty are going to do with this curriculum.
- Laurie Koloski (History): thanked the committee for all their hard work, and addressed the questions that the discipline of history asks: “here’s what happened, and then now ‘so what’”. As an active member of W&M, one of the limitations of the GER system is that there is a lot of “what” but not a lot of “so what”. And for me what the new curriculum offers is the opportunity to work with other faculty and also with our own students to answer that question.
- Carey Bagdassarian (Chemistry): I have never thought so deeply and creatively as I do now with a class I teach now called Emergent Dialogues which forced me to re-evaluate the connections, the confluence of art and science and this flows into my teaching in chemistry classes, my scholarship, and the way I think about the world. This is an extraordinary opportunity to really be extraordinary.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): To catalogue words like Interdisciplinary as buzz words is mistake. Interdisciplinary is a guiding pedagogical principle. When W&M calls itself a Liberal Arts University, it is a guiding pedagogical principle. I support the resolution because it is about trying to get past this system that we have in which there is no individual investment in courses, as something that crafts students around a central identity, a central W&M identity. While some of the answers haven’t been figured out, the new curriculum forces students to meditate what makes them W&M students.
- Noah Lemos (Philosophy): As we think today about what’s important regarding the curriculum, we’ve heard a lot of buzz words, like “buzz word”, “empower, “move forward”. I think it would be a mistake to move forward. One of the reasons: There is no requirement for ethics/values, in a systematic way. What is important? in life? society? What is worth knowing? What is not worth knowing? That sort of omission is indicative of the failure of this proposal.
- Chandos Brown (History and American Studies): speaking in support of the proposal. We in the history department would argue that purpose of studying history is to examine change over time. The fact that Alumni are reacting with hostility to the proposed change is an indication of the extent to which we have failed as an institution. We have not conveyed skills, perspectives, judgment that would allow them to see that institutions must change; the world changes constantly. We have an opportunity to align ourselves alongside the forces of historical change. There is a lot of thinking left to be done on this, I think we are in complete agreement about that. I would like to imagine that one of the

outcomes of the proposal is that we'll have the alumni goading us to change. We must continue to examine, to re-examine, to adapt to changing circumstances within the context of great knowledge. I think this proposal is a step in the right direction.

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): thanks the work of the committee, impressed at the diligence, intense work that you've put into thinking about this new conceptual framework to take us forward. "I am very excited about the possibilities that this represents for us as a faculty, as a college, and the possibilities it represents for our students. The strengths of the conceptual framework and the vision are that it does foreground the best of what we have to offer in the context of general education so that faculty are invited to bring the best of what we do to COLL 100/150/200/300. It poses for our students a four year pathway as opposed to what we see currently in the GERs in that we have students taking their GER 6 in year 4 in order to get it done, etc, or bringing them from HS. Let's think about the major issues we face in the 21st century. Let's have a curriculum that prepares students to engage with these issues. That's what the proposed makes curriculum makes possible. Issues will be resolved as the conversation continues, should we all agree that this is the path we want."
- Douglas Young (Chemistry): I really like some of the ideas in the current proposal. What we need as we move forward is an amalgamation of the current GERs. The problem with the GERs, and why there are not as useful as they could be, is what we've allowed them to become over the years. We've allowed them to become courses that are, frankly, pretty darn boring—a lot of boring stuff in introductory chemistry, but stuff they need to know in chemistry. If this proposal goes forward, we still need to re-examine what we allow as these courses, and design new courses. And we need to find funding to do all this.
- Josh Gert (Philosophy): My main concern is that in the current proposal has three general areas. The result of there being only three general areas is that it seems very possible for W&M students to go through their four years and not take a lot of massive areas (no history at all, no philosophy at all). There are probably a lot more than three areas that we think W&M should certainly take courses in. That is my main concern. My question: Should this pass, whether an amendment is something that could add more areas? If we approve this, are we approving that there are basically three areas? *Kim Wheatley: if the proposal passes, EPC will set working groups, and different groups will work on different components (framework, areas of knowledge, different levels), each will propose language to the EPC, which the EPC will approve and bring to future meetings. Amendments large and small can be generated from the faculty. And we will vote on those amendments. If passed, those amendments will become art of the evolving document.* In the last document, the language of the three areas was given, and then there proposals for alterations to the names. What is the status of those suggestions, part of the proposal? *Teresa Longo: the steering committee could keep rewriting the domains. EPC: what makes the most sense.*
- Cindy Hahamovitch (History): motion to call the question.
- Faculty voted by show of hands to vote on the proposal.
- Faculty approved the proposal: 155 (yeah); 57 (nay); 7 (abstain).

VII. Report of Administrative Officers:

Provost Michael Halleran

- thanked everyone involved in the curriculum review process.
- lots of stuff occurs at these meetings but this (the curriculum review) is at the core of what we do.
- encouraged faculty to attend Charter day (the College turns 320 only once).
- the BoV is in town this week, and though fire works are not expected, one never knows.
- the General Assembly is in its cross-over period: when the House and Senate begin to share information. Signs look good for the College.
- Tyler renovations are moving forward.
- re. the budget amendment to study the EVMS-W&M merger (proceed with “dating” not with “mating”), the senate approved 200,000; the House approved 50,000.
- Jennifer Mellor (Economics and Director of the Schroeder Center for Health Policy) has agreed to serve as the coordinator for the W&M’s exploration of a possible partnership with EVMS, especially in the area of healthcare delivery science. She will be working closely with faculty across the campus and with colleagues at EVMS and its healthcare affiliates in this faculty-driven process. Jen will be contacting faculty and setting up meetings about their possible involvement.

Dean Kate Conley

- welcomed the faculty back from winter break.
- Merit review also going on, and they are close to preparing a draft of their proposal.
- NTE working group passed a draft, met with FAC and will be presenting draft of their report to CCPD and will schedule open fora for the faculty, allowing for proposal to be submitted to the Provost by March 1 deadline in anticipation of review of all proposals from all faculties and schools.
- reported result of the vote.
- exciting news that Mrs. Hunter Smith (Philosophy, 1951) has pledged \$10 million the for Freshman Seminar programs at W&M.

Questions:

- Liz Barnes (English): How will the funds be spent? *No details have yet been worked out, but the funds are intended to provide enhancements. We have no access to the funds for 1.5 years.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): what is the process to make decisions about the funds? *The process will be consultive, in discussions with the Deans, the FAC. We have time to make plans.*
- Anne Rasmussen (Music): Is there an item on the Agenda at this Board meeting to soften up the Board regarding the intensely discussed Arts Quarter. *MH: There will*

be update re. grounds. Every two years we update the so-called 6-year plan, which doesn't really matter until there is money. Andrews Hall now called Arts Complex phase I.

VIII. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies)

- FAC spent most of its time trying to work out procedures for this meeting.
- reported 3 regular and 4 special meetings of the FAC during the break largely to discuss moving the curriculum review forward and procedures for this meeting.
- regarding EVMS, more information has been requested from the Provost and there has been discussion of a motion.
- currently working on a longer letter to Provost detailing our specific concerns remaining after information was given to us.
- see further:
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/index.php>

IX. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following

- we also wrote letter to provost regarding EVMS, about the pilot program, how organized, etc.
- continue to work on retirement incentive.
- Michael Fox is looking at procedures at other VA Universities regarding having a faculty representative on the standing committee with the BoV.
- a bill to require at least one member of the BoV with academic experience, that bill died in committee.
- see further: http://www.wm.edu/sites/facultyassembly/documents/minutes/2012-2013/approved_12_11_12%20.pdf

X. Report from Committee on Nominations and Elections

Paul Manna

- reported the results from the last election:
 - FA: Leisa Meyer (Women Studies, American Studies) (II) and Greg Hancock (Geology) (III)
 - RTE replacement: Deborah Morse (English) served as replacement for Simon Joyce (English) on leave. Professor Joyce is back and has returned to the committee. Jennifer Miller (Economics) to replace LuAnn Homza on Committee on Academic Status.
- and announced the following elections:
 - Faculty Assembly, Area I (three-year term to begin Fall 2013)
 - Michael Daise (Religious Studies)
 - John Eisele (Modern Languages & literatures)
 - Faculty Assembly, Area II (two positions for a three-year term to begin Fall 2013)
 - Berhanu Abegaz (Economics)

- Brennan Harris (Kinesiology & Health Sciences)
- Larry Ventis (Psychology)
- Brad Weiss (Anthropology)
- March elections will include: RPT, EPC, Committee on Academic Status.

XI. EPC Motion on Change in Name of Women's Studies Program
Kim Wheatley (English)

- The EPC moves that the Women's Studies Program be renamed the Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies Program (GSWS), as better describing what the program is doing and its direction.
- approved by the faculty.

XII. New Business

- there was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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