

**Faculty of Arts & Sciences Special Meeting**  
**Tuesday, March 26, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Chesapeake C, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.*  
*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 37.*

Dean Conely comments that she has had fruitful discussions with the FAC and considers our timing for the Curriculum Review Discussion to be good. The EPC is doing a good job with the working groups, and the faculty are having a thoughtful conversation about the Curriculum Review. We may not complete the discussion by May, and we need to take the time that the Curriculum Review demands of us.

Kim Wheatley (Chair of EPC):

- reminded the faculty that the principles are meant to guide our discussion and will not be published.
- announced that the tentative schedule imposed by the EPC for Curriculum Review working group reports is more or less on track,
- and that the EPC has approved the wording of COLL 100/200.

**We continued the discussion on the Principles and votes on proposed amendments**

**Principle 5:**

- we return to John Oakley's (Classical Studies) motion to reinstate this principle as with Bill Hutton's (Classical Studies) revised wording (the principle was stricken on March 12)
- Josh Erlich (Physics): expresses disappointment at the principle's rejection since this is one of the very few places where we refer to own research. He stresses the importance of making clear to the public that we value our research.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): had supported dropping the previous language and could not support the revised language since only certain faculty would be able to teach such courses to satisfy the principle.
- Kim Wheatley: suggests that the language is enthusiastic, in that we can **bring** our research to our teaching
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures, Dean for Curriculum Review): suggests that the principle allows us a way of bringing the kind of work we are so heavily invested in with our majors to all of our students.
- Noah Lemos (Philosophy): believes that this language, too, should be stricken, that most of his research has little to do with what is going on in Ancient or Medieval Philosophy (the areas in which he teaches many of his 100/200 classes), and that it would be a waste of time to try to structure courses in such a way.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): what kind of curriculum would we be interested in teaching where faculty are not able to bring their best research into the classroom?
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): observes that the revised version is better, that it implicitly allows us to be better interdisciplinary teachers.

- Lu Ann Homza (History): argues that we are going around and around on literal and non-literal readings of the principle. The issue is one of bringing our scholarly methods and our energies and efforts to the classroom.
- Kitty Preston (Music): ‘methodologies’ or ‘approaches’ would make more sense than ‘work’. We don’t always teach in our areas of research.
- Greg Hancock (Geology): argues for striking since we want to teach courses that often don’t involve topics that focus on our best scholarly work. But we also want the opportunity to teach classes in areas that don’t actually present our best scholarly work, because that allows us to challenge ourselves, to do new things and to participate in interdisciplinary courses where we may not know the material that well. “I don’t think it says what we want it to say, and that is more like Lu Ann’s comments to illustrate how we as scholars learn.”
- Lily Panoussi (Classics): these are two totally different things. No matter what we teach, of course we teach the scholarly process. What is new in this principle is that we are able to use our expertise in a particular area in those more introductory courses.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): reminds the faculty that the principles are supposed to shape the curriculum and are not meant to be general statements about how our work plays out. It seems that some people are saying “yes we do this” and we don’t need the principle in order to shape the new curriculum, and it may be best just to take it out.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): this principle is a way of highlighting that our own expectations and roles are equal parts scholar and teacher, and may help to answer questions about how/why we spend our time.
- Jaime Armstrong (Music): the structure of the principles is rooted in the courses, and this is like sticking a square peg into a round hole. The principle may not necessarily apply to the courses, and it would be best to strike it.
- Mark Sher (Physics): calls the question.
- the motion passes

final language: Be structured in such a way that faculty are able to apply their best scholarly and creative work to all undergraduate students.

### Principle 6:

- George Rublein (mathematics): principles 5 and 6 look as if they contradict each other.
- Lu Ann Homza (History): the best scholarly and creative work is, for example, introducing students to the text of Dante, etc. The course is intellectually curious, judicious, rigorous.
- Kim Wheatley: the principle has to do with the goals of Liberal Arts education, thinking about skills rather than content. to encourage clear thinking and communication. What if this course is the only course in a particular field that the student will take?
- Joel Schwartz (Government): queries about the meaning of “Liberal Arts”. A specific menu of disciplines (the trivium) or a way of knowing?
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): the pov of the Curriculum Review Committee was, how does this fit within the whole?
- Bill Hutton (Classical Studies): Liberal Arts here means the same thing as it did in the strategic planning discussions.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): would it satisfy to add ‘education’ after “Liberal Arts”?

- Joel Schwartz (Government): laments that there seems too much focus on content and not how the courses are being taught.
- Kim Wheatley: the skills might be more important than content. “Liberal Arts” does not imply to me a set of content to be learned.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): the principle speaks to the ways in which fields contribute to knowledge; it’s about the process, about the ways in which and how we know.
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): this principle repeats #4; moves to strike.
- the motion is seconded
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): a point of clarification: is this principle related to the role of the Liberal Arts viz-a-vis society in the sense of how we are interpreting Liberal Arts as something questioned, its significance and validity?
- Kim Wheatley: the phrase liberal Arts implies a Liberal Arts education as opposed to a practical job-centered education.
- Michael Lewis (Mathematics): “Liberal Arts” refers to education as present on campus.
- Mark Sher (Physics): calls the question.
- the motion to strike the principle fails.
- no change to language

**Principle 7:**

passes without discussion.

**Principle 8:**

passes without discussion.

**Cooke-Bailey Amendment:**

- Chuck Bailey (Geology): moves to add Cooke-Bailey Amendment: **Provide an active learning experience outside the lecture/seminar format beyond the student's area of expertise.**
- motion is seconded
- John Oakley (Classical Studies): the principle is not needed as students already spend most of their time outside the classroom.
- Rowan Lockwood (Geology): argues for the near universal efficacy of “hands-on” learning as supported by educational research. This is something that standard LA schools do not do, but something that we are already doing, and doing well.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): why should we specify “outside the lecture/seminar format”? Some of us already do this within the context of the traditional classroom. What we really want is that they do active learning in their coursework, so that it is incorporated into either lecture or seminar or lab or discussion. Moves to adjust the language: **Provide an active learning experience in their coursework beyond the student's area of expertise.**
- Bob Archibald (Economics): what is this all about? that humanities students have to take a lab science, and do the science students have to take liberal arts, and physics and music majors would be stuck? How does this work operation-wise?

- Chuck Bailey (Geology): intent is to encourage students to do something beyond their areas of comfort. How it is implemented is not the question today. Is this important enough to go into the guiding principles?
- Mark Sher (Physics): some people seem to think that this requires physics students to take music, and music students to take a science lab. It just says “active learning experience”. We have a freshman seminar on astro-photography—that is a doing, an active learning experience, and that would be enough.
- Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures): supports the principle and describes the Practicum required of students in her department.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): requests clarification regarding internships, or is the principle strictly limited to coursework?
- Chuck Bailey (Geology): internships are a possibility, and there may be other avenues included. Francie’s Practicum, for example, is certainly in the spirit of the principle.
- Rowan Lockwood (Geology): some courses could be tagged as “active learning”.
- Kitty Preston (Music): we are talking about a “doing thing”. We do it here, and we do it well. This principle is a way of setting us apart.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): supports the principle and understands how it could be implemented. Why can’t active learning courses occur within the student’s area of expertise? What is the impulse?: the doing? or beyond the area of expertise? or is it both?
- Jeff Nelson (Physics): the issue here is broadening the active learning experience. Further, we are talking about the COLL courses, we are talking about providing the resources to provide and assess active learning experiences. This puts a value on these core courses that all students should/will experience.
- Chuck Bailey (Geology): the hurdles here do not mean that the principle is not good.
- Matthew Allar (Theater, Speech, and Dance): having a hard time imagining a course that does not involve active learning.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): supports a doing component, also concerned about resources, as some Active Learning experiences do not fulfill the principle; e.g., labs often don’t significantly increase the way students understand physics. Active Learning is more resource intensive.
- Rowan Lockwood (Geology): the resources question dogs the entire curriculum discussion.
- Mark Sher (Physics): had spoken against the amendment to introduce GER 6 to the curriculum 20 years ago, imagining that it might devastate some physics students. He now advises those students who are reticent just to get it over with. But the GER 6 has become a transformative experience for many students, and this is the one class that often sticks with them.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): What do we mean by the Active Learning experience?
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): strongly supports the amendment. we seem to be bogged down by mechanics. We need to decide if this is a good idea, and can then send it back to the EPC and let them work out the implementation.
- Jaime Armstrong (Music): sees the advantage of sending music students to Physics to study the acoustics of music. Admits he would be remiss not to send students to modern

languages to study languages, for a hands on mastery of language, and so it goes. Seems that the tangents from music (and other fields) reach broadly.

- Anne Rasmussen (Music): it is important to distribute different kinds of activities, part of which involves being outside of one's comfort zone. Not so much about getting the students out their comfort zones but also about ensuring that they continue being creative and broad.
- Laura Ekstrom (Philosophy): though understanding the need to postpone the resource question, seeks to understand the principle. Gul's question is a valuable one. Does study abroad fulfill the principle?
- George Rublein (mathematics): why do we need either component? How can an instructor know if has an expert student?
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): the principle applies to the core courses (COLL).
- Bill Hutton (Classical Studies): theoretically, this principle could also be fulfilled with the proficiencies.
- Lily Panoussi (Classics): the EPC is already thinking about how to express this principle as a requirement.
- Diane Shakes (Biology): must the 'doing' be outside the area of the major?
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): supports students having this experience beyond the area of expertise. Chances are that they will have such experiences in their majors. Worries that students won't have such experiences outside their majors, and that is what is really transformative.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): The issue with referring to the major is that students in Interdisciplinary programs don't necessarily fit neatly into 'majors'. Areas of expertise might sound a little grandiose but it capture the notion of the principle's goal.
- Matthew Allar (Theater, Speech, and Dance): calls the question.
- the motion passes.
- much indiscriminate discussion about whether there is a need to vote on adopting the revised Cooke-Bailey Amendment as a Guiding Principle.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): moves to strike "in their coursework."
- Kim Wheatley: a good idea since the principle refers to the courses (courses providing something in the coursework makes no sense), and also addresses a question about whether doing theory fulfills the principle, but theory does not satisfy the spirit of the principle.
- Mark Sher (Physics): calls the question.
- motion passes.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): argues against the amendment as a principle; not clear what "area of expertise" is. Queries about whether the principle needs to be voted on.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): point of order: we have been debating the wording, but this amendment was not in the original and we will be voting on the entire document. Therefore we must vote on whether to include the amendment as a guiding principle.
- question is called.
- motion passes.

final language: Provide an active learning experience beyond the student's area of expertise.

*The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.*

Respectfully Submitted,

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

<http://www.seashepherd.org/seals/seal-hunt-facts.html>