

## MINUTES

### Faculty of Arts & Sciences Special Meeting

Tuesday, February 26, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm

### Tidewater A, Sadler Center

*Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.*

*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 52.*

1. Terry Meyers, A&S Parliamentarian, described the procedure for the seriatim discussion of the Proposed New Curriculum, according to Robert's Rules of Order.
  - a. consider and revise so that the final draft, after all amendments along the way (and still subject to final review and amendment), represents the will of the body after full discussion.
  - b. the proposal will be discussed seriatim (from one coherent unit to the next, e.g., bullet point by point)
  - c. faculty may propose amendments. If seconded, these amendments will on the floor for discussion. Amendments require a majority vote.
  - d. motions to amend may consist of adding or inserting a word or phrase, by adding or inserting a paragraph, by striking out a word or phrase, by striking out a paragraph, by striking out and inserting a word or phrase; a motion to amend by substitution can be made for a sentence, a bullet point, a section, etc, (but consideration in seriatim reserves any motion to substitute something for the whole document until the final consideration of the document as amended). So-called "friendly amendments" should be handled as formally as any other amendment, i.e., moved, seconded, and subjected to debate.
  - e. no one may speak a second time until all who wish to speak have spoken, no one may speak for more than ten minutes
  - f. As we move through the parts, we accept them, as amended or not, **provisionally**, as part of the developing final draft of the document. At the final meeting when the fully amended document that has evolved and developed during the seriatim discussions is on the floor, it is subject still to amendment. It is at this point when a motion to substitute a resolution for the whole would be in order—i.e., until that point amendments should be germane to the particular section then under discussion.
  - g. From the by-laws: All persons holding full-time teaching or research appointments as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and lecturers in Arts & Sciences are members. Faculty members retain voting privileges on becoming Faculty emeriti/ae. All persons holding appointments as research associates or post-doctoral fellows are non-voting members of the Faculty.

#### Questions:

- Paul Manna (Government): if language is proposed and defeated, can that exact language be returned to the floor for discussion? *Yes, if in a different context. The*

*intention of Robert's Rules is to allow the fullest possible discussion and debate. I would always err on the side of inclusiveness.*

2. EPC Presentation of section on Principles from Document on Proposed New Curriculum)  
[https://blackboard.wm.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp?tab\\_tab\\_group\\_id= 2\\_1&url=%2Fwebapps%2Fblackboard%2Fexecute%2Flauncher%3Ftype%3DCourse%26id%3D\\_19341\\_1%26url%3D](https://blackboard.wm.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp?tab_tab_group_id=2_1&url=%2Fwebapps%2Fblackboard%2Fexecute%2Flauncher%3Ftype%3DCourse%26id%3D_19341_1%26url%3D)

Kim Wheatley (Chair of EPC) explained the following:

- as EPC chair, she is responsible for reading out the principles bullet point by bullet point, each one can be discussed and possibly emended, amendments can be proposed to be added and voted upon.
- changes made after the Feb 5 EPC meeting.
- distinctions between suggested emendations (come to EPC from working groups or individuals) and proposed amendments (voted on by faculty).
- emendations rejected by the EPC can be brought to faculty as proposed amendments.
- and that faculty preferring old amendments/earlier language could propose changes that would restore the original documents.
- sections of the document can be returned and re-emended if necessary.
- the schedule for discussion is posted on the BB Curriculum Review site, and that revised language will be posted on BB.
- schedule assumes that the entire working document will be available for April 30 meeting.
- because of meeting schedules, EPC has nothing new to present to faculty at regular March 12 meeting (unless today's discussion runs over).
- plan to discuss domain names and COLL 100/150 at next special meeting (March 26).
- March 15, EPC meeting to discuss suggested emendations to those parts of document
- there are online discussion fora – all A&S faculty invited to contribute. Working groups will take comments under consideration. Or email Prof Wheatley directly and she will forward to the chairs of the working groups.
- there are working groups for each of the subsections, except for the principles— about which very few faculty inquired and which are not to be published in the catalogue, just for internal guidance.
- principle 3 was streamlined to avoid misinterpretation (e.g., requirements of particular and specific courses).

Questions:

- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): Should we expect minor revisions and clarifications from EPC rather than major changes to the proposed curriculum? Inquired about the EPC's mandates to the working groups. *The working groups were asked to look over the document with fresh eyes but not to duplicate the steering committee's work. They are to suggest clarifications of language and possibly some improvements to the context, which the EPC would then approve or not. Changes suggested by these groups can still be proposed as amendments by individuals. Kim requested that complex amendments be circulated among the faculty in advance of the meetings. Terry: complicated amendments*

*can be submitted to EPC or brought to floor of faculty meetings. Expectation/hope is that they would be circulated ahead of time. If a long complicated amendment is made on the floor that seems to involve questions not easily answered here, they can be referred back to EPC for further study/recommendation.*

### 3. Discussion on the Principles and votes on proposed amendments to this section

#### **Principle 1:**

discussion:

- Bob Archibald (English): “mainly” is a weasel-word, how do we know students are taught “mainly” by W&M faculty? *Teresa Longo: in COLL 300 students often go abroad, did not want to preclude those courses. “with the exception of study abroad?” Kim Wheatley: yes, that is what we meant.*
- Laura Ekstrom (Philosophy): worried about not being able to rely on adjuncts for COLL courses (limited resources, faculty on leave, TE faculty needed to teach upper level courses). Are COLL courses only to be covered by W&M faculty unless they are taken abroad? *Kim Wheatley: I think that was the intention.*
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): expressed need for leeway for incredibly talented adjuncts who just happen not to be NTEs.
- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): was not the original problem with the GER system was that those courses were being taught by adjuncts? Or has this gone by the board completely? I thought the problem was having NTEs at all teach GERs was the problem. *Kim Wheatley: misunderstanding of original proposal that COLL courses were to be taught only by TE faculty.*
- Josh Erlich (Physics): clarifies the emphasis on **continuing** NTEs. And proposed motion to replace “mainly” with “to the extent possible”. This sends message that we would like support for the resources needed in order to make this possible. (motion passes)

final language: Be taught to the extent possible by William & Mary faculty (TE and continuing NTE).

#### **Principle 2:**

discussion:

- Bob Scholnick (English): suggests that the responsibility for making the curriculum a “rich intellectual experiences” lies with the students.
- Arthur Knight (English): suggests motion changing “making” to “encouraging”.
- (\*): asked for clarification about “Integrated”, is this supposed to happen within the regular courses? *Kim Wheatley responded that the courses are supposed to integrated over time, offering a common experience.*
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): responding to Bob’s concerns, argued that we as faculty are major actors in integrating and enriching the college experience through team-taught, cross-listed, and interdisciplinary courses. We have to create resources and support to create integrated knowledge.
- John Delos (Physics): prefers Bob Scholnick’s wording “rich and challenging”, “allowing”.

- John Swaddle (Biology): friendly, friendly amendment: pointed out that many students are not here for 4 years (transfer students, students in 5<sup>th</sup> year).
- Timothy Costelloe (Philosophy): suggests changing encouraging to facilitating.
- Arthur Knight's motion is accepted.
- John Swaddle's motion is accepted.
- Anne Rasmussen (Music): points out the reduplicated "across".
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): argues against removing "integrated" as removing that word changes the entire spirit of the principle.
- Laurie Koloski (History): adding "rich and challenging" is not clear, and changes the topic of the principle, as no longer about fundamental effort to integrate across disciplines. Presumably the entire curriculum is "rich and challenging", or we wouldn't be doing it.
- Kitty Preston (Music): in favor of substituting "integrated" for "rich and challenging".
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): trying to make sense of Bob's original point (emphasis on students) and Silvia's, suggests "provide students with opportunity to..." Keep the spirit but also provide emphasis on students. We provide opportunity, they intergrade and find interconnections.
- George Rublein (mathematics): has questions about gerunds: what is doing the encouraging?
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): friendly amendment: "that allow...that encourage".
- Laura Ekstrom (Philosophy): these are not good arguments against "rich and challenging"—of course our courses are rich and challenging...
- Bob Scholnick's motion is rejected.
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): motion to make 2 bullet points out of principle 2.
- Deborah Morse (English): new principle #3 sounds too much like therapy-speak.
- Hermine Pinson (English): suggests omission of "meaningful".
- Kim Wheatley defends original wording. The two aspects of principle #2 as originally presented are meant to work together, splitting them sets them up as two separate goals.
- Berhanu Abegaz's motion is rejected.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): suggests wording – "that encourages".
- Kim Wheatley: we do want students to make interconnections for themselves, but part of what we are trying to propose is that the courses themselves would make those interconnections also.
- John Delos (Physics): already mentioned that "meaningful" is one of the most meaningless words. motion to omit "meaningful and" (rejected).
- Josh Erlich (Physics): finds the language confusing, what is the subject?
- Silvia Tandeciarz's motion passes.
- Kitty Preston (Music): proposes deleting a repeated "students".
- discussion about substituting a repeated "across".
- Monica Potkay (English): proposes a motion with new, tighter language (passes).
- John Delos' motion is rejected.

final language: Provide an integrated intellectual experience during the undergraduate years that encourages students to make coherent and meaningful interconnections across disciplines.

### **Principle 3:**

discussion:

- Elizabeth Wiley (Theater, Speech, and Dance): “inculcate” has negative implications.
- Paul Manna (Government): motion to substitute: “help students learn essential knowledge...”.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): what constitutes essential knowledge?
- Paul Manna (Government): same thing that would constitute an integrated intellectual experience that we the faculty in our judgment believe is essential in our fields.
- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): would like to teach (in)essential knowledge!
- Kim Wheatley: speaks to the relativism of what is considered “essential knowledge”.
- Rob Hinkle (Chemistry): friendly amendment “help students develop...”
- Paul Manna (Government): The audience for the document is unclear. Anyone who may give money would like to see this concretely expressed (essential knowledge). This document helps us move to a better place with our curriculum. Regardless of the intended audience, this document is political, we are a public university and this document, by sending the right signals, can help accomplish what we want.
- Leisa Meyer (History): suggests “acquire knowledge and develop”.
- Jennifer Bickham Mendez (Sociology): request for clarification—that this is meant as an internal document.
- It’ll be in the VA Gazette soon
- Bob Pike (Chemistry): to include something about the knowledge base is important. In some disciplines there is a right answer and a wrong answer. Relevant, discipline dependent, but important to include here.
- motion passes.

final language: Help students acquire knowledge and develop the skills and habits of critical *and creative thinking and expression*.

### **Principle 4:**

discussion:

- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): what does “synergy” mean?.
- Christopher Del Negro (Applied Science): motion to change language (complement instead of “synergies”).
- Leisa Meyer (History): defends original wording.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): inquires why Chris is opposed to “synergy”. *Prefers the simpler language of complement.*
- George Rublein (Mathematics): what is the companion to “how they differ?”
- motion is rejected.

- Josh Gert (Philosophy): proposes substitution of “simpler and clearer language” (mutual enrichment).
- Cathy Levesque (Art and Art History): suggests adding “mutual enrichment”.
- Lily Panoussi (Classics): whose mutual enrichment? the theories?
- Deborah Morse (English): this does not say at all the same thing as “form synergies with”. Sounds very tame. Theories don’t always work together, sometimes they augment each other, sometimes they clash.
- Jennifer Bickham Mendez (Sociology): argues that the trajectory of the discussion changes the principle to the extent that it seems to propose an entirely different principle.
- Paul Manna (Government): defends the rewrite.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): comma after interpret.
- Kim Wheatley: the word “world” seems to narrow, how about universe?
- Arthur Knight (English): suggests “stuff” (duly typed into the onscreen text by the secretary).
- Liz Wiley (Theater, Speech, Dance): meld 1<sup>st</sup> half of original with second half of revised text.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): original wording is much more clear.
- Josh Gert (Philosophy): synergies to me is extremely unclear. Synergy not clear enough to provide any kind of guidance as a principle.
- motion is rejected.

final language: Explore the methodologies and epistemologies of the various academic disciplines, along with how they differ from and form synergies with one another.

*The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.*

Respectfully Submitted,

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

These minutes are dedicated to all the Polar Bears on International Polar Bear Day (Feb 27, 2013).