

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, April 2, 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: 46.

I. Minutes of FAS meeting on March 5 were approved.

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20130312.pdf>

II. Report of Administrative Officers

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- he would be brief, and none would complain.
- Chuck Bailey (Geology) would deliver a public lecture in the Tack Lecture series: “Finding the Faults in Old Virginia” (note, not finding the faults of...), April 17, Kimball Theater, and he thanked Martha and Carl Tack for their generosity in supporting this lecture series.
- the BoV would be in town in 15 days. Items on their agenda include: the budget (they appreciate that the current level of compensation for faculty is inadequate); the hope/expectation is that significant raises would be approved with 6% to enter the salary pool, and that, in the event of a happy outcome, the provost’s office would issue a memo outlining the broad parameters of the disbursement of the additional monies. Provost Halleran will report back at the regular May meeting.

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- the Curriculum Review is moving along nicely and the EPC working groups are doing terrific work. We are having cordial, collegial conversations, are making good progress. There is no need to rush the discussion.
- she will report at the regular May meeting on raises. We are as yet not certain of 6% being added to the salary pool, nor of the Provost’s directive. The Merit Review Committee report will be beneficial in shaping how the Dean’s office responds to the Provost’s directive.
- the working group on interdisciplinary programs is slated to begin over the summer, to better understand these programs as we move forward.
- an e-learning working group has also been proposed. Faculty have expressed interest in practicing e-learning in their own teaching. This working group would be charged with examining models, best practices, and what the faculty think about this.
- the FAC has made progress on the ad hoc committee on faculty prizes, awards, and distinguished professorships, especially regarding fielding nominations. The FAC are close to a charge for the ad hoc committee.
- we are trying to do so much with the curriculum review that we might continue talking past 5:00 pm at regular and special meetings, especially when it is desirable to extend the meeting a bit to complete a conversation.

Questions and Discussion:

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): requested clarification on when the salary raise may be implemented. *MH: this will be confirmed after the board meets, and there is still a veto session coming up, but raises are expected to go into effect in August.*
- Leisa Meyer (History): queries over the nature of the raises (merit rather than compression, equity). *MH: envisions that raises will be based on merit contributions over time (“through this unholy time”), and we will look back further than the last 12 months, taking into consideration faculty who were promoted in a year with no raises, who had published a book in a year with no raises; aut similibus.*
- Will Hausman (Economics): indicated that the last raise was 2008, and since then the CPI has increased more than 9%, arguing that an across the board component is also warranted.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): inquired about the window for merit raises (the previous dean took a three year average for merit). All the faculty are taking a beating: health insurance has increased, there have been no COLA raises. *MH: In theory, the practical limit for merit raises includes both the narrow and cumulative perspective. Five years seems an appropriate window, since it has been 5 years since the last merit raise.*

III. Faculty Awards

Dean Kate Conley announced five faculty awards:

- Faculty Governance: **Silvia Tandeciarz** (Modern Languages and Literatures) for “her commitment to equity, fairness, transparency, mentorship, and advocacy on behalf of faculty (TE and NTE), students, and staff members.” Her extensive committee and administrative service includes work on the Administrative Assistants Compensation Review Committee, which worked to create more equitable conditions for A&S staff members; numerous search committees; and the co-direction of the year-long workshop CADEAU for new chairs and program directors.
- Faculty Governance: **Christopher Abelt** (Chemistry) for his “integrity, thoughtfulness, and broad impact.” His extensive service includes work on RPT whereby he helped guide formulation of post-tenure review policies and phased-retirement program; extensive ad hoc committee work whereby he helped to develop and articulate fundraising priorities for A&S as well as creative approaches for addressing the Provost’s mandated reallocation of 5 percent of the A&S budget.
- Teaching Excellence: **Susan Donaldson** (English) for her excellent teaching at all levels, from freshman seminars to graduate-level courses; integration of her scholarship into teaching; and for her leadership in the developing field of Southern Studies.
- Teaching Excellence: **Elizabeth Harbron** (Chemistry) for her teaching and mentoring that extends into the laboratory; fostering of student research (including directing Honors students and facilitating coauthorship); and the breadth of her teaching, from intro to advanced courses, freshmen to graduate students.
- Teaching Excellence: **Carol Sheriff** (History) for her intense course preparations, the joy she derives from teaching, and her insistence “that her students become sophisticated consumers of history and also that they move toward becoming practitioners themselves.”

IV. Report from Faculty Affairs

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- four meetings of the FAC since the regular March A&S meeting (March 12).
- the letter to the provost and president regarding the EVMS merger has been posted (along with their responses):
 - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/documents/EVMSLetterMar14.pdf>
 - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/documents/EVMSreplyMarch19.pdf>
- discussion focused on:
 - ad hoc committee on faculty prizes, awards, and special professorships. The FAC soon hopes to form a committee, whose tasks will include the development of bylaws for a permanent standing elective A&S committee.
 - meeting with representatives of the merit review committee to discuss their draft (to be presented at May 7 meeting).
 - charge to the Athletic Policy Advisory Committee.
 - nominations to Committee on Nominations and Elections; the FAC provided a list of candidates.
 - facilitating Curriculum Review discussions.
 - see further:
 - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/20130319.pdf>;
 - <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/facultyaffairs/reports/20130312.pdf>.

V. Report from Nominations & Elections

Paul Manna reported the following

- **March 2013 election results**
 - Committee on Academic Status Area I: Elizabeth Mead, Art & Art History
 - Committee on Academic Status Area III: Elizabeth Harbron, Chemistry
 - Educational Policy Committee, Area I: Jack Martin, English
 - Educational Policy Committee, Area II: Hiroshi Kitamura, History
 - Educational Policy Committee, Area III: Heather Macdonald, Geology
 - Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, Area II: Michael Deschenes, Kinesiology & Health Sciences
 - Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, Area III: Henry Krakauer, Physics
- April 2013 election ballots
 - **Committee on Degrees, Area II:** (four-year term, beginning Fall 2013)
 - M. Brennan Harris (Kinesiology and Health Sciences)
 - Peter Vishton (Psychology)
 - **Faculty Compensation Board, Area open** (four-year term, beginning Fall 2013)
 - Carl Carlson (Physics)
 - Melissa McInerney (Economics)

- **Faculty Hearing Committee, Area open** (three-year active and a three-year alternate term, beginning Fall 2013)
- Brian Hulse (Music)
- Martin B. Schmidt (Economics)
- **Nominations & Elections Committee, Area I** (three-year term, beginning Fall 2013)
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures)
- Laurie Wolf (Theater, Speech and Dance)
- **Nominations & Elections Committee, Area II** (three-year term, beginning Fall 2013—select two)
- Kathrin Levitan (History)
- Peter McHenry (Economics)
- Amy Oakes (Government)
- Deenesh Sohoni (Sociology)
- **Nominations & Elections Committee, Area III** (three-year term, beginning Fall 2013)
- Hannes Schniepp (Applied Science)
- Evgenia Smirni (Computer Science)

VI. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- that she thought she might be off the hook for a moment, as FA preceded nominations and elections on the agenda.
- 1 meeting of the FA
- 1 meeting of the executive committee
- 1 meeting of the liaison committee
- and several meetings of “FAPSI” which incorporates “COHAR.”
- discussions included:
 - with Sharron Gatling in EO office.
 - with Brian Whitman regarding the revamped W&M digest. If you have any thoughts about if you like it or if you don’t, you can tell me, or, better yet, you contact Brian.
 - Faculty Survey: awaiting Rick Gressard to complete the long and heroic task of analyzing the results.
 - with Trotter Hardy in the Law School who has rewritten our intellectual property policy, to allow for a more nuanced way of handling intellectual property issues emerging out of electronic property rules.
 - athletic policy advisory committee.
 - retirement incentive policy (because the FA cannot meet without discussing this).

VII. Report from Faculty Research Committee

Ale Lukaszew reported the following:

- this 10 member committee is charged with the internal selection process for several grants and with fielding book-subventions (no proposals submitted this year).
- the committee reports directly to the Vice Provost for Research/OSP. In the case of the summer research grant internal program, a report is made directly to the Provost.
- regarding SRG: the committee strives to ensure that pre-tenure faculty receive two summer grants within their first three years at the college. Hence funding priority is given to those junior faculty members. The committee reviewed 32 applications and recommended 32 proposals. Proposals recommended for Suzanne Matthews award of \$5000 were: Xin Wu, Jaime Settle and Philip Roessler, Harmony Dalgleish and Anke van Zuijlen.
- regarding the NEH Summer Stipend: FRC reviewed three NEH Summer Stipend proposals and recommended the maximum two institutional nominees.
- regarding the Oak Ridge Junior Faculty Enhancement: FRC was prepared to review Oak Ridge Junior Faculty Enhancement applications for a limited submission program, but the college only had two applicants for two possible institutional nominees.
- regarding the Jeffress Interdisciplinary Program: FRC reviewed five proposals for the new limited submission program. A maximum of four proposals per institution was permitted per the solicitation guidelines.
- regarding the NSF-MRI (Major Research Instrumentation): FRC reviewed four NSF MRI proposals and recommended three (two for equipment acquisition and one for development) in this category. This program requires a 30% cost-share so it is closely coordinated with the office of the VPR to ensure funds are available for the institutional commitment. Thus, the review requires the applications meet institutional priorities, has the VPR commitment of cost-share, and meet the prescribed solicitation guidelines.

VIII. FAC Demo of new voting technology for FAS meetings

- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) discussed voting procedures at faculty meetings, usually by voice or hand, which is convenient enough for a small group of 30-40 faculty. But another method may be preferable when the audience is large and a closed ballot is called for.
- John Griffin demonstrated an on-line election module, used by the Dean of Students Office for orientation, to which faculty could send votes electronically by texting or submitting a vote through the website (one vote per device; we are on our honor not to use multiple devices for any given vote). Votes can be rendered by texting or via computers, smart phones, ipads, *aut similibus*. In theory an absent faculty member could vote, but would have to know the texting number and would have to know when the poll was opened for voting.

Questions

- Will Hausman (Economics): it has been our practice that a single person could close a vote.
- Terry Meyers (English; Parliamentarian): confirmed that this has been our practice. In Robert's Rule, a simple majority is required.
- Kitty Preston (Music): inquired about voting without electronic media.

- Barbette Spaeth responded that the old fashioned pen and paper votes would always be an option.
- Paul Manna (Government): inquired who would own the information after the votes were cast.
- John Griffin: text code is sent to the site, but the question remains the same and is deliberately vague.

IX. EPC Motion on creation of Film and Media Studies Program (Kim Wheatley)

The EPC moves that the W&M Literary and Cultural Studies and Film Studies Programs (LCST/Film) change their names and unify to form a Film and Media Studies program (FMST). This change would take effect in Fall 2014.

Discussion

- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): inquired about LCST courses and those cross-listed with LCST whose primary content was not focused on film. What would happen to such courses?
- Colleen Kennedy: responded that it would depend on the level of the course. Regarding core courses, the committee will look over syllabi to see if such courses fulfill the new rubric. Most routinely cross-listed courses fit the rubric perfectly well.
- the motion passes

X. EPC Presentation on and Discussion of sections from document on Proposed New Curriculum (Kim Wheatley) (continued from Special FAS Meeting on Mar. 26).

Kim Wheatley reported:

- the EPC discussion has fallen slightly behind schedule. The wording for COLL 100, 150 and 200 has been approved, but not yet COLL 300/400.
- there still remains the hope that the entire document will be vetted by the EPC by the end of the semester.
- the Domains indicate spheres of knowledge, ways of knowing, analyzing knowledge.
- Courses belong to Domains, but Departments do not belong to Domains, and courses may fulfill multiple Domains (as now courses may satisfy multiple GERs).
- the descriptions have been refined by the working groups and slightly revised by the EPC.
- the Domains are organized alphabetically.

Discussion:

- George Rublein (Mathematics): does the EPC expect that every course will live in one of the three Domains? Could a course be entirely devoted to, say, letters, while disregarding Arts and Values? Are the three nouns separate? *Kim Wheatley: yes, that has been the assumption.*
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): some courses currently fulfill both GER 4 and 5. Courses could fit within one or another Domain. Do departments have to choose? *Kim Wheatley: courses could satisfy multiple Domains.*
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): where does computer science fit into this model? *Josh Erlich (Physics): It depends on the course. "Means by which humans...measure...[the natural world]" would include Computer Science.*

- Will Hausman (Economics): where does Economics fit? What is meant by “statistical modeling?” There is “modeling,” “statistical analysis,” “empirical analysis,” but “statistical modeling” makes no sense. *Michael Lewis (Mathematics): a fair criticism. This is the fault of bad writing rather than bad intent. Perhaps better would be “mathematical and statistical analysis.”* Mathematical modeling and statistical analysis. Professor Hausman moves to refer the description back to committee.
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): In my opinion, the three domains are too coarse for a GE curriculum whose primary goals are to introduce students to a variety of knowledge areas. It looks like GER 5 and 6 are grouped under ALV. GER 3, 4 and 7 have been abridged under CSI with a lot of courses sacrificed (e.g., historical sense, non-Western traditions), and NQR seems to have blended GER 1 and 2. Furthermore, the language describing them sounds too vacuous to me. The CSI domain, for example, overlooks what the core social sciences focus on: groups, classes, institutions and systems. By using overly broad language (cultures, individuals, societies, etc.), we are making the implementation of the GE curriculum flexible but rather unfocused. *Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): suggested focusing the discussion on the proposal at hand, and that the proposed curriculum is being criticized because it “does not look like GERs”.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English): it is hard to argue with the loss of the non-western requirement.
- Lu Ann Homza (History): COLL 300 might fill that gap.
- Bill Cooke (Physics): our current GER system consists of a long laundry list of “favorites.” The new system would be less restrictive, and we are each free to publish/advise a list of what we would recommend to students. There are currently too many rules about requirements, and this proposal simplifies the requirements to get to the essentials of a Liberal Arts education.
- Will Hausman (Economics): the proposal takes a long list and makes it too short. Students can completely avoid Social Sciences. COLL 100 is by far the weakest aspect of the proposal. Would prefer something between 3 and 7 Domains.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): agrees with Berhanu and does not see how COLL 300 would satisfy a non-western exposure (e.g., a year at St Andrews). *Kim Wheatley: when the non-western requirement was implemented, the College had very few such courses. Now there is less of a need for the requirement as such.*
- Will Hausman (Economics): students could opt for a cultural course, bypassing “societies” and “individuals”. This is not doing the students any service.
- Paul Manna (Government): how is this approach superior to the Area approach we already have in place in terms of breadth, simplicity, implementation?
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): the proposed curriculum enables integrative learning, and allows for interdisciplinarity, and creativity – absent from the current rigid Area paradigm. Returning to the Areas does not address Berhanu’s concerns. Areas I, II, and III could have absolutely no non-western component. We are engaged in a long discussion and could decide today to revert to the GER system or the traditional Areas. Our college is evolving, and we need to evolve with the challenges that we face.
- Arthur Knight (English): In Paul’s proposal (Area concentrations) departments are tightly aligned to Areas. GERs don’t align precisely with departments, and this is allowing and encouraging a bit more flexibility. The Area proposal is more rigorous, more boxlike,

more “sort of border patrolling” model than the one we currently have; the current proposal allows for a kind of simplicity, but the kind of simplicity that we want to encourage in our students or in one another intellectually. I heard some colleagues debating about whether certain classes taught by departmental colleagues would or would not fit into the social sciences. In some ways it is precisely that kind of debate, and on-going discussion, that we want this system to encourage amongst faculty and students.

- Laura Ekstrom (Philosophy): suggests refocusing the discussion on the revisions.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): the working group wordings are what we are dealing with and have been approved by the EPC (the Executive Summary versions are included strictly for historic interest).
- Laura Ekstrom (Philosophy): do we need to vote to approve?
- *at this point, votes are only required on amendments.*
- Bob Pike (Chemistry): points out that the creative/synthetic aspect of the sciences is missing. New materials are made; new codes are written. Moves to include such language in the revised description and to return the description to the committee.
- Lisa Landino (Chemistry): Ethical issues get into the integrated level (not necessarily at the creepy Frankenstein level); scientific modeling is not restricted to the natural world. Moves that Domain 3 return to the working group, and include not just the study of the natural world but also innovations in science.
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): We are modeling things that are not necessarily part of the natural world. The description should also include concepts of creation, innovation, and computational world in human endeavor.
- Kate Conley: recapping the discussion: EPC working group should think about the wording of NQR to include concepts like synthetic, creative, making, innovation, not just study of the natural world, but also computational world and human endeavor.
- Diane Shakes (Biology): My guess is that Computer stuff would naturally fit in one of these categories (Natural World/Quantitative Reasoning); rather than take “natural” out.
- Kate Conley: we are looking for additional words.
- John Swaddle (Biology): suggests adding natural and physical world.
- George Rublein (Mathematics): if we return to (his) earlier inquiry about Domain 1, and apply the same algorithm, the current Domain description fits the bill: natural world **and** quantitative reasoning. The natural world is the heart and soul of NQR.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): the Domain names are merely meant to be summaries of the descriptions that follow and indicate which courses might fit the NQR. Prefers not to focus on each word. The current description seems to exclude certain courses that you may want included by virtue of the interpretation of the Domain name.
- Will Hausman (Economics): don’t you find it odd that “science” is not used in NQR? I want “Social Science” to be in CSI; this is a legitimate method of looking at the world. I do not like one bit that “Social Sciences” is not the Domain description and there is no “Science” in NQR.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): There was discussion of the language. Precisely why was the word “scientific” removed,” precisely because of this ambiguity between the social sciences and the natural sciences. The thought was that the language the “natural world” is more specific; that there might be some confusion that the social sciences might naturally belong in the third Domain, when our thinking was that the social sciences might

naturally belong largely in the second Domain. If we don't like the language, I agree we should move to change it.

- Kim Wheatley: “scientific knowledge” is part of the description of the third Domain.
- there is a motion to return CSI and NQR (Domains 2 and 3) to the working groups.
- the question is called.
- Diane Shakes (Biology): EPC has discussed the non-western issue, of making it a proficiency, and certain courses could be designated as such: students would, for example, have to take a course designated “g” (*aut sim.*) amongst the COLL 200 offerings.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): points out that non-western is encapsulated in the language “over time and space” in the CSI. If we add a non-western requirement, then we should also add a history requirement. Some students develop a certain “presentism” if they don't take historical courses that address the whole span of human history. They tend to think that what is now has always been. If we were to add something, I think we should add both pieces. On the other hand, if we leave it as it is and don't add other requirements, it then becomes incumbent on us as advisors to advise students of the necessity of looking at both cultures outside of the ones that they are familiar with and time periods outside of the one that they are familiar with. And that might solve both problems.
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): My concern, again, goes beyond the ditching of the “non-Western” requirement which, of course, was a product of much debate 20 years ago and contributed to making the college curriculum more cosmopolitan. I am really concerned that the proposal is conflating the defining attributes of the three distinct prongs of the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum: Gen Ed (which must be about proficiencies and requirements), Majors (which allows for flexibility beyond the disciplinary/interdisciplinary gateway courses) and Electives (which provides the greatest autonomy for students to choose courses). I can, for example, envision a student interested in the humanities taking both ALV domain-specific courses (COLL 200 plus one course) in Philosophy and take more Philosophy courses that meet the CSI requirement thereby graduating with limited exposure to the full gamut of the liberal arts. The proposed domains are just too broad to ensure that students are required to sample courses from broad but well-focused areas of knowledge. We should perhaps consider splitting them into five or six domains.
- Kim Wheatley: Currently, so many of our students come in with AP credit which are now satisfying GERs, and graduate from the college without ever taking a course in literature, etc. Part of the value of the proposed curriculum is that COLL courses are to be **mainly** taken at W&M. The Domains of knowledge are building on something that we value about the GERs and the strength of the GERs – that they are not dividing knowledge department by department. Different departments have courses covering more than one GER. In a way, the Domains are building on that.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): Let's plan to continue discussing the Domains at the next meeting.
- John Oakley (Classical Studies): moves to adjourn.

XI. New Business: none.

The secretary thanks Steve Otto for compiling a list of faculty who have spoken-up in A&S Curriculum Review meetings, as he has so kindly done for our last several meetings (February 05, March 12, 26). His assistance has been invaluable, and the secretary regrets not thinking to thank him publically, as it were, in the minutes for those meetings. She also thanks Trina Garrison for audio recordings and the texts of the faculty award citations, Professors Spaeth and Lukaszew for copies of their reports, and Professor Abegaz for a précis of his arguments – all of which have contributed to the accuracy of these minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

<http://www.endbearfarming.org/en/>
<http://www.fws.gov/endangered/>