

**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**Tuesday, March 12, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Tidewater A, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.*

*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 51.*

**I. I: Minutes of FAS meeting on Feb. 5, 2013 and Feb. 26, 2013** were approved

- <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20130205.pdf>
- <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20130226.pdf>

**II. Report of Administrative Officers:**

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- the rain reminds him of Seattle (secretary's note: if its raining, it must be a Tuesday, and A&S must be meeting).
- two upcoming holidays: Ides of March on Friday (be careful when you wake up in the morning...it's a tricky day... don't go near the senate house!) and St. Patrick's Day, which the Provost hopes we will all celebrate appropriately, though perhaps less indulgently than we might have in high school.
- a shout out to the History Department for its #3 ranking in US News and World Report (colonial history, just behind Harvard and Penn, and ahead of Yale—all colonial schools).
- budgetary news from the General Assembly: Funding for Tyler is in place and renovations should commence in the summer when English moves into Tucker. There is as of yet no funding for Arts Complex Phase I, but it is in the queue. All budgetary updates are provisional as the governor has yet to approve/veto the recommendations of the General Assembly. Some new money has come to light for enrollments, operations, and a little for financial aid, but there will also be additional costs (employer component of health care). This is good news all in all, with two years of no cuts and modest budget increases from the state.
- salary issues: state has approved 2% increase for coming year (3% for faculty, and variable increases for staff). The BoV 6 Year plan calls for 6% increase for salary pool for faculty, twice what has been authorized by the state. The BoV has embraced their plan but not yet formalized it. 2% has been mandated by the state, the allocation of the remaining 4% will be merit driven.
- Curriculum: invited to address the Middle Plantation Club (male, senior, retirees who meet once a week). The Provost at first abjured the invitation, thinking that the group would prefer to hear from someone who understand the *kleine technische* of the Curriculum Review (Teresa Longo or dean Conley), but spoke instead more abstractly (Curricula From Rome to Williamsburg) on what a curriculum is and why the faculty come together to discuss these issues on a regular basis, drawing in information from Seneca and Plato, grounding his thoughts in a much broader content of thinking about curricula and fighting the good fight at an ethereal level. Early reports are that the organization found the Provost's remarks useful.

- cost of new curriculum: the Provost continues to discuss cost issues with the Dean, and the projected costs seem reasonable, appropriate, and doable, but emphasizes that we are to see what will come of the process rather than worry about costs. Investments in the new Curriculum will not be in competition with \$s for salaries.

Paul Manna (Government): inquired what those dollars might be in competition with. New tenure lines, filling vacant tenure lines? *MH: good question Nothing comes without a cost, but the monies will come from opportunity costs not hard costs, from new money.*

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- seriatim discussion began on February 26, and we are learning how to speak as a group on this topic.
- regarding costs: the dean's office aware of current structural deficits in funding and the costs of implementing the proposed curriculum. Some of these costs will be a one time expenditure, and relatively modest. The Dean's office cannot be specific as we (the faculty) are not yet sure what shape the new curriculum will have.
- proposal of a new working group to examine the structure of the current interdisciplinary programs—how they work in the curriculum—since the proposed curriculum has such a strong emphasis on interdisciplinarity. The working group is not being charged with regularizing but with better understanding our interdisciplinary programs, their best practices and their needs. This group is expected to meet in the Fall.

### III. **Murphy Award** Dean Kate Conley

- **Jennifer and Devin Murphy Faculty Award**, recognizing outstanding integration of faculty research with the teaching of undergraduate or graduate students and carrying an annual salary supplement, in place for two years, was awarded to Janice Zeman (Psychology).

### IV. **Report from Faculty Affairs**

Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) reported the following:

- 4 meetings of the FAC since March meeting of A&S.
- discussions centered on:
  - arrangements for meetings on the curriculum revisions.
  - how to move these discussions forward more expeditiously—FAC recommends that e.g., amendments, friendly changes that involve **wording** are to be submitted directly to the EPC which will then reshape and edit. Faculty meeting discussions should center on **conceptual issues**. Professor Spaeth emphasized that there will be ample opportunity to revisit language.
  - budget for ISC III.
  - EVMS Issue—will be sending a letter to both president and provost, expressing concerns of A&S faculty.
  - A&S policy on NTE and worked on motion that will be voted on today.

- possible formation of committee on faculty prizes, awards, and distinguished professorships.
- review of charge to the Athletic Policy Advisory Committee.
- announcements about upcoming merit raises.
- see further:
  - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/20130219.pdf>
  - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/20130212.pdf>

## V. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- one meeting of the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee, and one of Liaison.
- discussion centered on:
  - NTE policy.
  - retirement incentive and VRS.
  - intellectual property policy.
  - BoV: potential of having faculty representative on standing committees.
- expressed thanks to faculty who submitted surveys (75% return). Faculty satisfaction has fallen to 65%.
- see further: [http://www.wm.edu/sites/facultyassembly/documents/minutes/2012-2013/approved1\\_29\\_13.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/sites/facultyassembly/documents/minutes/2012-2013/approved1_29_13.pdf)

## VI. Report from Nominations & Elections

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/nominations/documents/20130312.pdf>

Paul Manna (Government) reported the following:

- **February 2013 election results**
  - Faculty Assembly (Area I): John Eisele, Modern Languages & Literatures
  - Faculty Assembly (Area II): Berhanu Abegaz, Economics; Brad Weiss, Anthropology
- **2. March 2013 election ballots**
  - **Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (Area II):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
    - Michael Deschenes, Kinesiology
    - Larry Evans, Government
  - **Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (Area III):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
    - Henry Krakauer, Physics
    - Ilya Spitkovsky, Mathematics
  - **Educational Policy Committee (Area I):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
    - Jack Martin, English
    - Denise Wade, Theatre, Speech, and Dance
  - **Educational Policy Committee (Area II):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
    - Hiroshi Kitamura, History
    - Constance Pilkington, Psychology

- **Educational Policy Committee (Area III):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
  - Heather Macdonald, Geology
  - Junping Shi, Mathematics
  - **Committee on Academic Status (Area I):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
  - Richard Lowry, English
  - Elizabeth Mead, Art & Art History<sup>2</sup>
  - **Committee on Academic Status (Area III):** 3-year term to begin Fall 2013
  - Elizabeth Harbron, Chemistry
  - Marc Sher, Physics
  - **Upcoming April elections**
    - Nominations & Elections Committee (*FAC recruits & announces nominees; N&E runs actual election*)
    - Committee on Degrees
    - Faculty Compensation Board
    - Faculty Hearing Committee
- Christopher Del Negro (Applied Science): queried if there would be positions for faculty from all areas for upcoming elections

**VII. Motion from NTE Working Group** (Rachel DiNitto): The NTE Working Group asks the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to accept the following motion:

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences approves the recommendations for personnel policies and practices contained in Sections 3 and 4 of the NTE Working Group report (attached).

[http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/documents/other/nte\\_personnel\\_policies\\_rept\\_2-13.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/documents/other/nte_personnel_policies_rept_2-13.pdf)

- Provost Halleran commented two items might come back to us:
  - level of benefits for continuing faculty (made at University level).
  - salary allocations might be centrally countermanded.
- and that we should consider eligibility for merit after five years

Discussion:

- David Armstrong (Physics): queried about language added to recruitment section (open searches), that it might hamstring the administration, and suggested adding “generally” to the language. *Suzanne Raitt assured that any faculty conducting a search could request exemption from the EO office (in case of spousal hires, etc.); Provost Halleran reiterated that exemptions are periodically sought and granted.*
- The motion is passed.

**VIII. Report from Committee on Degrees**

John Griffin reported the following, that in 2011-12

- COD approved 77 of 86 petitions (10 semester rule, 48 hour rule, dual enrollment, GERs)
- the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, on behalf of the committee, considered 86 petitions in the fall of 2011, 106 petitions in the spring of 2012 (senior residency, retroactive transfer credit, pass/fail, overlapping major/minor courses, transfer credit to satisfy major requirement, courses abroad for GER 4 and 5). Most were approved

- see further:  
[http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/degrees/documents/COD\\_report\\_11-12.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/degrees/documents/COD_report_11-12.pdf)

### **IX. Motion from John Griffin (Dean of Undergraduate Studies)**

This motion proposes the following wording and scale for the common question on overall course evaluation, to be used on all course evaluations forms across Arts & Sciences.

How would you rate this course overall?

Scale: Poor, Below Average, Average, Above Average, Excellent

Discussion:

- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): the question is problematic since students have no guidelines by which to consider the questions, and there is often a disconnect between the specific questions (did the course cover the material) and the open ended questions posed to the faculty, which is in essence a question about the popularity or likeability of the course.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): was concerned that the question might invite gender bias. E.g., women professors receiving inappropriately directed comments (wardrobe, etc.—but men also admitted to receiving inappropriate feedback regarding clothing).
- John Griffith admitted the merit of these observations and emphasized the temporal constraints. Such issues could (and should) be revisited later.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): inquired about the rationale for the second common question. “How do you envision it being useful to us?” *John Griffith: commented on the advantage of common data across A&S, that might, for example, provide quantitative data for SHEV reports; Kate Slevin added that the common questions allow us to paint a larger picture as to what is going with the curriculum.*
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): Computer Science curriculum dictated by profession and the department does not currently use the question because of concerns of negative feedback from students who resent having to take certain courses (C++ a terrible programming language).
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): expressed concerns about who has access to the data and how it would be used. *JG assured the faculty that the data are returned to the departments, and no has any desire to use the data in any other way.*
- (\*) inquired if there was any way to delink the two required questions. *JG: currently departments report to RPT only what they want to report/ There is only a requirement for **quantitative** data, but the shape of that data is not dictated.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English): the questions seem to invite students to compare the faculty with each other. would feel more comfortable with a standard of teaching than a comparison of teachers.
- Heather McDonald (Geology): why are we being asked to include the second question? *JG: an attempt to standardize the data we collect.*
- Debbie Bebout (Chemistry): Chemistry also does not include question #2 since the department teaches a number of service courses required by other departments and are anxious about FCQs being unfairly weighted as the result of requirements from other programs.

- Kay Floyd (Government): calls the question.
- *Dean Conley interjects that to accrediting agencies the answers to the questions are less important than the fact that we are asking such questions, which shows that actually care about what we are doing. Why these questions? They ask essentially the same thing, and students unwittingly reveal something that they do not realize they are revealing.*
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): would object less if the wording were changed to something like “did you learn something in this course?”
- the motion is rejected.
- Leisa Meyer (History): suggests that revising the wording might render a positive vote.
- *JG rejoins that the issue can be revisited.*
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): suggests that some departments might need time to consider the question and language as merit is often based on these two questions.

**X. EPC Presentation on and Discussion of section on Principles** from Document on Proposed New Curriculum (Kim Wheatley) (continued from Special FAS Meeting on Feb. 26)

Discussion:

- Greg Hancock (Geology): moves that principle #5 be removed—implies situations wherein we would not bring best scholarly work to classroom; many of these interdisciplinary COLL courses may cover areas in which we do not research.
- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): doesn’t recall voting on previous principle.
- Josh Gert (Philosophy): recalls only votes on language principle #4.
- discussion returns to principle #5.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): requests EPC justification for principle #5. *Kim Wheatley: assumes a sense that General Education tends to be the poor relation as faculty focus more/exclusively on majors at the expense of general education. The idea is not to dismiss general education courses as mere service courses.*
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): views the principle as encroaching upon faculty freedom to structure their own courses. *Kim Wheatley sees the wording as allowing for more freedom.* The principle creates problems rather than solves them, as a significant amount of preparatory work is necessary for many specializations> Accreditation agencies may ask how we fulfill this principle. The principle makes it sound as if we routinely do a bad job in general education.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): with abstruse specializations, impossible to bring research into lower level classes. the principle implies that the faculty **must** “routinely bring their best scholarly and creative work” in the 100 and 200 level courses. At 100 and 200 level, we need to do things that are accessible to the students. I’d like to think that I do my best work as a teacher wherever I can, but best work as a teacher at 100 and 200 levels is not necessarily what I wrote my dissertation on and what I publish on.
- Matthew Allen (Theater, Speech and Dance): If we don’t feel we need to state it, then we should state it because it’s incredibly important. this is why we have principles to begin with. I can’t see why we would not want to bring our best scholarly and creative work to all undergraduate students, can’t see why we wouldn’t want to do this, have a broader

sense of what that means in terms of methodology, exploratory pathways, a larger way to use our individual expertise demonstrate that just because we are a specialist in one thing we can't apply that to something else.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): Essential reason to develop a curriculum is to try to define our existence. Our goals should be consistent: why do you have Tenured and TE faculty teaching this course as opposed to HS teacher, or online course? This speaks to one of the crucial arguments that we make repeatedly to the BoV, administrators, and hopefully our students—that they should be thrilled to be at such an institution where research and learning go hand in hand, guided by the faculty. And if we are going to give up on bringing our best scholarly and creative work to all undergraduate student, then we've given up the ghost.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): the COLL curriculum should be structured in such a way as to make this possible, sees the emphasis of the principle on the first part: "Be structured in such a way..." that makes this possible. Wants a College Curriculum that **enables** faculty to bring their best work to all students.
- John Delos (Physics): the best scholarly and creative work in Physics is totally unsuitable for general education, and the principle ought to be removed. What we should do for our beginning students is very different from what we should do for advanced students.
- Paul Manna (Government): I would agree if this were a principle that applied to the entire A&S. The preamble says that this applies to the COLL courses specifically. I that we can—and we do—probably more often in major, upper level courses. If we take it out here, we're just saying that in thee particular courses we don't expect this; but students will get that—when they do their majors and upper level courses.
- Josh Gert (Philosophy): suggests the wording to include a negative "faculty are not prohibited from.."
- Bill Hutton (Classical Studies): suggests replacing "routinely" with "are able to".
- Mark Sher (Physics): the principle is untenable. Calls the question.
- the motion is rejected.
- John Oakley (Classical Studies): moves to reinsert Bill Hutton's version of the principle: "Be structured in such a way that faculty are able to bring their best scholarly and creative work to all undergraduate students."

**XI. New Business:** there was no new business.

*The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm.*

Respectfully Submitted,

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

<http://www.endbearfarming.org/en/>