

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, April 30, 2013, 12:00 – 2:00 pm
Tidewater A, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 117

I. Opening remarks by Dean Conley

- reiterates the standard request that speakers identify themselves.

II. Review of current status of document on proposed new General Education curriculum.

Kim Wheatley reported the following:

- the principles have been discussed and some have been amended as the result of spirited faculty discussion.
- a 9th principle on Active Learning in an area beyond student's expertise has been added.
- the domains and their descriptions have been edited, and wording has been improved by EPC.
- confusion persists regarding courses and domains: each course in the catalogue is intended to belong to at least one domain, but not all courses are meant to count as COLL 200.
- all components of the original EPC motion have been vetted by working groups and approved by EPC.
- thanks to the working groups and the indefatigable members of EPC.
- clarification of COLL 100/150: these courses are meant to be taken in no particular order, one each semester of the freshman year, giving a full year of introduction to college level work.
- COLL 200 is intended to cover significant knowledge, which EPC had previously thought could be taken for granted, and this intent is spelled out more clearly in the current EPC description.
- COLL 200s in the NQR domain are to be taken in the natural sciences; courses on math, logic, computer science can be taken to fulfill additional departmental credits.
- COLL 300/400 are no longer conceived of as P/F.
- COLL 300 is intended as cross-cultural requirement and can be satisfied through various ways including study abroad. Study Abroad may be P/F but College Colloquia fulfilling COLL 300 are not.
- COLL 400 is not approved as a P/F course.
- The current wording of COLL 400 is a significant revision of the original document. No longer conceived of as a liberal arts capstone, but rather envisioned now as a major-specific capstone experience, such as research seminars. Capstone projects can further general education goals: "developing the skills and habits of

critical thinking and creative expression” (to defend major-specific capstone requirement as part of general education).

- EPC has approved the wording of additional departmental requirements and credits. Clarifies proposed mathematics requirement and adds an Active Learning requirement outside the student’s major.
- AP/IB cannot be applied to COLL courses but can be applied to additional departmental requirements.
- transfer students are not required to take COLL 100/150.
- the Curriculum Review Steering Committee executive summary appendix not included in the February EPC motion: the 72 hour rule, 10 semester rule, credit hour and residency requirement, and major writing requirement. These are to be dealt with by next year’s EPC and will be brought to the faculty after the seriatim discussion and final vote on the EPC motion.
- the amendment by substitution currently under discussion regards splitting the domains into two sub-domains each, with COLL 200 taken in one sub-domain and additional departmental credits taken in another. This raises questions about whether we want to split the domains and how we might want to split them.

II. Continued Discussion of the Amendment by Substitution to split the domains into six sub-domains

- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures, Dean for Curriculum Review): suggested that whereas the faculty agree that breadth is a very valuable thing, breadth is being envisioned in different ways by different faculty members. The Dean’s Office has been thinking about implications should the proposed amendment be passed. Looking at numbers and making some assumptions, following the Curriculum Review Committee and EPC assumption that there is a relationship between COLL 200 and departmental domain requirements. What happens if we consider where students go, following the paradigm of the feasibility study, how can we map the GERs onto the proposed curriculum? It is important to think about what credits students bring in, and what this means if the amendment passes. For some domains, AP credit is not as hugely significant factor as for others. Many students transfer in AP lit, and those credits would be placed in departmental domain courses. Students would need to take the other COLL 200 of the ALV in the COLL curriculum. Subdivision of the domains will trigger other questions and changes. There are ways to address the impact of the amendment, and our memo includes some ideas about how to address those changes.
- John Griffin (Dean of Undergraduate Studies): reiterated Teresa’s warning about understanding the implications of passing the amendment. As the Deans charged with implementing and sustaining the new curriculum, we did this exercise to try to understand the implications of implementation. While respecting Prof. Haug’s proposal and response, different sets of assumptions are at play. In the current framework of the EPC proposal, AP/IB pre-college credits can be controlled and balanced as they are only being applied to departmental domains requirements.

Hence we can create a stable set of courses, the COLL courses. In essence, we will be in charge of creating that breadth. Whereas if we look at the proposed amendment, these courses/credits will dictate which COLL courses we teach here, as they will dictate where the need is, as we currently do under the GER system, which is on the verge of failure. The amendment would dictate what we teach, according to the needs of the students after AP/IB credits have been applied. Given the economic climate (and other factors), the trend is for students to transfer in increasing credits and apply those credits to the GERs.

- Matthew Haug (Philosophy): I'd like to try to clarify, and elaborate on, a few points that have sometimes been obscured in the discussion of my substitute motion/amendment.

First, to be clear about exactly what we will be voting on today: this substitute motion would *only sub-divide the domains*, with the *intention* of moving toward greater breadth in the general education curriculum. If it is approved, subsequent motions will be introduced to establish the details of how to implement the goal of requiring students to take at least one course from each of the six sub-domains. I initially suggested that the three "additional departmental courses" would have to come from the sub-domains in which COLL200 courses were not taken. While I believe that that proposal is still workable, I would be very happy to entertain more flexible alternatives, such as the one in my email sent to the faculty list-serve yesterday. These more flexible implementation systems may indeed have more advantages.

Second, my substitute motion *cannot affect the interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum*, for the following reasons:

- (i) The main domains are left exactly as they are; they are merely subdivided.
- (ii) The domains themselves do not have any interdisciplinary content, *even in the current EPC proposal*.
- (iii) The interdisciplinarity in the EPC proposal, with respect to the domains, comes entirely from the COLL 200 requirements. These COLL 200 requirements are also left unchanged by my proposal.

As I understand it, the domains were originally defined to provide a basis for COLL 200 courses. However, as the current EPC proposal stands, they also are supposed to provide a basis for "rounding out the liberal arts," with an additional course coming from each domain. How well do the domains serve both of these two roles? Let's consider the first domain, ALV. On the current EPC proposal, a student could take a COLL 200 course on, say, the ethics of biotechnology (grounded in ALV looking out to NQR), and that student could take a course on, say, contemporary moral issues or a survey of normative ethics to satisfy the "additional departmental course" requirement for ALV. I think that

allowing a student to complete the “distribution” requirements for ALV by taking two courses not merely based in philosophy, but *based in a single sub-field of philosophy*, is misguided. The same point holds for the other two domains. Thus, a student could easily satisfy the “domain requirements (i.e. COLL 200 plus the three additional courses) by taking three pairs of courses, where each pair is on a fairly narrow topic or in a single department or program.

In short, because the domains are so broadly defined the “additional department credits” together with COLL 200 do not require students to adequately “round out the liberal arts.” My substitute motion is intended to fix this problem, while leaving the interdisciplinary COLL 200 requirement *exactly as it is*.

Regarding interdisciplinarity itself, I happen to believe that philosophy is an ideal discipline to contribute to interdisciplinary endeavors. A former chair of the philosophy department at Stanford, Ken Taylor, once told me that he would always tell administrators that philosophy is the “and” in “arts and sciences.” I really like this idea, as it captures, in a pithy way, how philosophy straddles (unifies? Brings into conversation?) the humanities and sciences. For what it’s worth, my own research and teaching is fairly heavily interdisciplinary. (1) In the course of my career, I’ve had two major grants from the National Science Foundation. (2) I’ve taught an advanced seminar on philosophical methodology and so-called “experimental philosophy,” which, among other things, applies methods from social and cognitive psychology to investigate questions about the use of intuitions as evidence, among other things. (3) I regularly incorporate research from psychology and neuroscience into my 300-level “Philosophy of Mind” course.

So, as all of this shows, my motivation for this substitute motion is not “territorial” at all, is not to maintain the status quo, and does not involve a lack of interest in developing new and innovative courses. I am in fact excited by the additional avenues for interdisciplinarity that the new curriculum will encourage.

Now, are we simply arguing about how much, or what kind of, breadth is ideal? I think the answer is “no;” the EPC proposal does not require adequate breadth on any reasonable understanding of the term. The example I used above regarding ALV is not merely an exceptional case; it could (and I believe would) regularly occur, with different combinations, for particular students, of what is unduly emphasized (for the purposes of *general education requirements*) and what is left out, of course. This is because the “rounding out the liberal arts” requirement does not really “round out” a student’s education, given the coarsely defined domains.

Now, Laurie Koloski made the comment at the last meeting about different notions of "breadth." I think it was suggested that the EPC proposal encourages "exploratory" breadth. I think this is true, but note that, as I showed above, my proposal *contains just as much of this kind of "exploratory" breadth as the EPC proposal*. I am in favor of this kind of breadth, but I believe this breadth alone (especially in the amount required by the current EPC proposal) is not sufficient for a genuinely liberal education for the reasons given above. It needs to be complemented, extended, or enhanced along the lines I propose.

To sum up, if you believe that the general education curriculum should ensure that our students take a moderately diverse range of courses, then I urge you to vote for the substitute motion. It takes steps toward accomplishing this goal, with only minor changes to the current EPC proposal, changes that leave its innovative, interdisciplinary elements unchanged.

- Joshua Gert (Philosophy): The first point I'd like to make is that on Matt's proposal, it would remain true that there are three domains, and that the COLL 200 classes would have to be anchored in one of the three, and look outwards to one or more of the remaining two. So it is simply no argument against the proposal that it would diminish the incentive of the existing proposal to have dialog across the domains or to create new courses. This objection was raised so many times that I would just like to repeat that: Matt's proposal would have **absolutely no effect** on the interdisciplinary emphasis of the current proposal, or the challenge it poses to faculty to think in new ways. Matt's proposal continues to include COLL 200 classes with **precisely the same** inter-domain structure.

A number of faculty offered descriptions of their own very interesting and interdisciplinary courses, as part of objections to Matt's proposal. But these courses would be just as appropriate as COLL 200 class on Matt's proposal as on the existing proposal. So the power and interest of these classes, though great, cannot be **any argument at all** against Matt's proposal.

Some other faculty suggested as an argument for the existing proposal, and against Matt's, that the world is changing, and that we should change with it or be left behind. I would like to say that this is **no argument at all** in favor of the existing proposal, unless the ways in which the world is changing are good ways. Maybe they are, but in that case the arguments should not be appealing to the bare idea of change, but to what is good in the change. And in any case Matt's proposal is not opposed to the spirit of the change. Matt's proposal is nothing but an effort to ensure some minimal breadth in the education that our students receive, by minimizing the chances that the courses they take in each domain huddle together in one small corner of it.

Some faculty suggest that the superficial appeal of Matt's proposal is that it allows us to stay in our comfort zones, and to continue to teach the same old classes we've always been teaching. (Currently I am very far from my own comfort zone – eliciting laughter). I think it is true that some people do like to stay in their comfort zones. **That is precisely why I support Matt's proposal.** That is, I am concerned for the students of William and Mary, and worry that they are not going to be well served by a curriculum that allows them to stay in their comfort zones, taking, for example, not even one class that could be regarded as history, or social science. I should also add, though, that I do not think my own support for Matt's proposal is that I myself want to stay in my comfort zone. I routinely develop new classes. This semester I am teaching philosophy of color, which is a new class, and which is also quite interdisciplinary.

It may also be worth stressing that Matt's proposal does not allow faculty to stay in their comfort zones any more than the existing proposal. Since basically all courses will belong to one or more of the domains on the existing proposal – and this is something that I have confirmed time and time again with members of the EPC – no faculty need make the least change to their courses in order to fit into the proposed new curriculum. So if considerations of comfort zones favor one of the two proposals, they clearly favor Matt's, not the existing proposal.

Despite all these arguments, I expect that people who are opposed to Matt's proposal will continue to oppose it. One idea behind the opposition might be that it looks a little like a return to the GERs. For those who disliked the GER system, this involves guilt by association. But Matt's proposal is a compromise between the existing proposal, with its three domains, and the GERs with their ten designations, and it is much closer to the existing proposal than to the GER system. In the case of the GERs, since not all courses had a GER designation, students had difficulty checking some of the boxes. But since Matt's proposal is simply a division of the three domains, and since basically all classes will belong to one or more domains, students will not be at a loss for courses to satisfy the breadth requirement.

The final thing I'd like to say is that if you like the descriptions of the domains that are part of the current EPC proposal – which I do – and you like the idea of the COLL 200 classes spanning the domains – if, like me, you want to preserve all of that – but if you are concerned about students not being pushed to take classes outside their comfort zones, so that they might graduate without taking a single history or social science class, then you have very strong reasons to support Matt's proposal.

- Bill Cooke (Physics not Philosophy, although we used to be Natural Philosophy, so maybe I am from the Philosophy department): speaking against Matt's proposal. As an old-timer who does not anticipate being at the college for the long-term implementation of the new curriculum. He hopes that by "new curriculum", we mean "new", something that looks radically different from the current system. He observes that the GER system is broader and more course specific than the Area sequence system that it replaced, and also that the GER system mapped very well the blossoming of IB/AP courses in HS. Many students come to college having already satisfied many of the requirements. General Education, however, should not be about another course in the discipline. This is one way to get breadth. How much do any of us remember of lecture courses taken in disciplines other than our majors – two years down the road, three years...? Too many times, General education courses have served a dual function: satisfying a GER and finding majors. Both goals are laudable. He would like to see General Education that is really about general education, and not just an introductory course that introduces students to an area of study, and seeks to recruit majors. He wants to see something more exciting. Matt's proposal simply yields another checklist/punch card. We'll end up with the same situation that we have now, with kids racing through to complete GERs without really having a general education experience that he would like to them to have. Regarding students who get out of here without history classes, his own son (a junior) has been trying to enroll in a history course every semester but has been frozen out by registration... 150 students graduated last year without taking a science or math course. The GERs are not working in the way we had originally envisioned they would. We want to do something new. Let's push our faculty to develop those courses that are not just a way to suck in majors but a way to really give a general education. I think that the proposal as it stands now will help us move in that direction. I think subdividing it will hurt.
- Elizabeth Radcliffe (Philosophy): Matt's proposal does not change COLL 200 and the interdisciplinary nature of those courses. Comments have been made about concerns about students getting a range of courses under the EPC motion, that students will naturally distribute themselves among different areas/departments. If the Dean's assumptions about Matt's proposal are true (regarding demand for classes to fulfill GERs), then there will not be enough seats under the EPC proposal for students to take a range of courses.
- Lu Ann Homza (Dean for Educational Policy; History): queries where the faculty want the coercive thrust of the new curriculum. Accepting AP/IB credit for general requirements will dictate which courses we teach. Regarding ALV, many such courses are taught by adjuncts and this raises a whole new set of problems. Nor does she want her own courses to be divided on the basis of someone else's common sense approach of what that division should be.
- Paul Manna (Government):
 - (1) Breadth
I disagree with Teresa Longo's comments on her point that we disagree with how to

think about breadth. I think the main disagreement is about how we believe people will respond to incentives.

Matt's amendment is superior to the EPC endorsed domains for ensuring the dual goals of breadth and opportunities for interdisciplinary learning: Two things endorsed in the principles.

The memo from the deans (Griffin, Homza, and Longo) argues that the EPC proposal "implicitly invites breadth." That invitation may be implicit, but explicit invitations are better. What evidence is there in the Ewell Hall memo that such implicit invitations have worked in other contexts? Lots of policies exist that implicitly try to invite good behavior. Often that does not work.

If we consider the incentives that our students are responding to, rather than our own theories about implicit invitations or what we would do if invited to have a breadth of experiences, these incentives facing our students will undercut breadth.

- Need to complete their major: In the past, students have been drawn to some GERs to complete majors (political theory, for example). The EPC proposal has affirmed that COLL courses can count toward a student's major. Given that students are facing increasing costs of attending W&M (tuition increases), there are incentives to try to double-up to graduate early.
- Need to prepare for undergraduate research. This is W&M's calling card. It is what makes us distinct. Undergraduates with the opportunity to sit at the table of discovery or generate their own creative projects, ahead of graduate students, typically, as at other R1 schools. Much undergraduate research only works when students have deep grounding in a discipline, so there is an incentive to take narrow band of courses. If you want to do research in German or physics, for example, you better take a lot of German and physics classes.

(2) Resources

Both the EPC proposal and Matt's proposal raise resource issues. People have discussed their enthusiasm for the EPC proposal because it will encourage new courses or team teaching. Those are costly things. Doubtful they can be funded to the extent that people believe they will be funded. So cost is not a reason to reject Matt's proposal in favor of the EPC proposal.

(3) Process

Regarding the vote on Matt's proposal, let's do it by electronic device—the system that John Griffin introduced us to. To get an accurate count and to ensure that people can vote their conscience.

- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): requests that we consider the courses and curriculum not from the perspective of faculty, that courses should be taught not as the GERs define them or as defined by three domains or six domains, but rather as they ought

to be taught. These courses ought to be well-designed, and it is a challenging thing to design such courses well. We should consider the educational experience from the perspective of students. With the GER system, each and every W&M student cannot graduate without having taken a course in political science, or physical sciences, or history or a course in the non-western tradition or a course in the three distinct areas of the humanities. Good advising would solve the problem for some students, but I can no longer tell parents with confidence that this will be the experience of each and every W&M student. We won't be able to say this with the EPC proposal. And that is worrying. Students will not take courses in areas that are strange to them or hard. The whole purpose of the GERs is about proficiencies, about leading students to various areas of knowledge and this process of discovery. The EPC curriculum is incredibly flexible but it fails a large number of our students. In a world of financial constraints, when you are pressed to have a large number of courses that are demanded by students, the EPC domain definitions being so broad simply means that students will have to take courses that are available, not the courses they want. Supply drives demand. Departments that are overstaffed or wish to grow will end up supplying a good number of these courses. And that's not necessarily good for our students. A well-designed curriculum is supposed to drive resource allocation. It is troubling indeed that a graduate can be considered "well-educated" with not a single course in the social sciences, psychology, or sociology. This troubles me greatly. Therefore the division of three domains into six sub-domains will simply provide adequate foundation for the COLL 200 courses.

- Laurie Koloski (History): I don't have the data, but I do have the personal experience with freshman advisees who come in with AP credit counting towards science, towards math, towards social sciences, towards humanities; under the current GER system, we do indeed have students graduating without taking courses in many disciplines. Breadth means to think broadly, and there are different ways to work with students to help them think broadly. I think about breadth in a different way than envisioned in this proposal.
- Cathy Levesque (Art and Art History): the division is problematic; e.g., separating creative expression from criticism and norms. It also seems that the divisions for the humanistic approach and scientific approach might also be problematic. Isn't there more overlap; isn't there a more efficient way to cut to a mechanism that encourages students to open themselves up within the ways the domains are framed without minute mechanisms?
- Joan Gavalier (Theater, Speech, and Dance): speaking in a highly subjective way. While understanding and appreciating both proposals, she finds the six sub-domains reassuring, and she likes the structure to help contain the undergraduate experience in a structured way. And these six sub-domains would push students and faculty to work together to create space in a reassuring way. And she is frightened by the loss of GER6. Three domains are scary, and worrying. Three domains force her to think in ways she usually does not think when conceptualizing how she might teach from the perspective of three domains, about connections to faculty with whom she does

not usually interact. Six domains make her think about faculty she knows really well. Despite the feeling of reassurance, three domains are more challenging, more invigorating, and she is ready to take a risk.

- Brian Hulse (Music): Students remember about 5% of the material outside their majors. We should want to create an educational experience that students will remember, an experience that will change their lives, their vision of the world – not biology over here and physics over there – but all connected. Regarding the original discussions and the posited the DaVinci course, those are the kinds of courses students will remember.
- Anne Rasmussen (Music): adds her voice to the departmental chorus. Her position in ethnomusicology was created as a result of the last curriculum review in the early 90s. Most of the courses she teaches fall under the GER 4B rubric (cultures outside the western tradition). Categories are useful to understand what categories we live in and how we uphold them, useful for the creation of knowledge, for the challenge of working in new ways. Six divisions will keep her straddling these categories. Three are more challenging. One student remarked to her “when I was uncomfortable in your classes, then I began to learn something.” Gene Tracy even proposed one category, and she argues for fewer rather than more.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): every course will exist in one domain; some will exist within more than one. Similarly with the subdivision of the six domains. Any course could fall under one or several (even four) sub-domains. Any course that would have been taught under the EPC proposal, can still be taught under Matt’s proposal. A course that currently straddles several categories/domains will not be rejected because it “covers too much”. Much of the discussion is missing the point of the subdivisions. It will not change student opportunities or incentives, nor does it hamper creativity.
- Gene Tracy (Physics): thanks Matt for the care and thought that went into his proposal. The proposed revision, and the original EPC design, both have a lot to recommend them, and I can see building a strong curriculum around both designs. But, between the two of them I prefer the EPC version.

I would point out that the EPC proposal is already a compromise: after more than a year of effort, open fora, focus groups, petitions, and significant revisions in light of faculty input, the current EPC proposal already reflects a moderate centrist proposal. In the landscape of American liberal arts education, it's part of the community, not some radical outlier. The CRSC was charged to research the national conversation and bring that knowledge into our deliberations, and they have done so. They are certainly nice people, but they are also very smart and talented people, and they did their job well.

What I have heard in the faculty discussions is that we all believe in breadth, and are committed to a liberal arts type of model. We disagree in how to achieve the breadth. I would have preferred even fewer requirements, and a stronger call on

the faculty to innovate than is reflected in the EPC proposal before us. There are a variety of reasons why I think this:

* I believe in breadth.

* I believe in intellectual rigor, diversity, and interdisciplinarity.

* I believe a university education should expose students to great ideas. We should challenge them and change them.

* I believe some ideas can be dangerous, and our students need to learn how to play with fire so they don't burn themselves or others. They need to learn how to be decent human beings in a society that will likely change beyond recognition during their lifetimes.

I believe *every single course* that satisfies a COLL requirement should be broad, intellectually rigorous, diverse in outlook, and interdisciplinary, and that each COLL course should play with fire. If that means the faculty who will teach them are challenged to stretch, then that is part of what makes teaching an exciting and creative profession.

I believe the breadth in a liberal arts education should come from a teaching philosophy that informs every single COLL course, not by a list of requirements that is longer. Liberal arts values should be something the faculty live through the way they teach, not just something we inflict upon the students because it's good for them. There is a values disconnect there that the students pick up on. It's like telling them to eat their vegetables while the faculty eat the fun food at the adult table.

A curriculum design reflects who you think your students are, and what you think they are capable of. I believe our students are outstanding and they should be treated like intelligent adults. I don't think they need to be forced into doing things, but they should be advised well, and we can design courses that appeal to their curiosity and sense of intellectual adventure. For example, Astronomy is a physics class that appeals to many students who are curious about the night sky. We teach them physics along the way, but they don't take it just because they are forced to. And in all the years I've been here, only once has that course been taught by a professional astronomer. All of us who teach it have had to learn a lot of astronomy along the way. It's been fun.

Whatever we decide today, the faculty will come together and do good things. I just think the original proposal does a better job of getting us there.

- Bob Archibald (Economics): the discussion has gotten off-track. The question is not about COLL 200, but about the other courses that fill out the requirements. Matt's proposal changes the options for the additional course, and that is what makes it valuable.

- Gary Defotis (Chemistry): out of sympathy with the whole conception. When I went to school, the focus of knowledge was departmental. It seems that departmental disciplines are no longer an entity. Colleagues have been lulled into the fashionable references in talking about interdisciplinarity over and over again. There are obvious virtues, but I do not believe that twenty year old minds are prepared sufficiently in knowledge or experience to think about these grand intellectual questions in a broad and interdisciplinary way. I would far rather that they focus on details here, there, and everywhere. Many have raised objections to the “checklist”. Yet, checklists are useful things, whether they include 3-20 items. The issue is the quality of the items on the checklist. Breadth means as many courses as possible in as many departments as possible. And we cannot know what will register 10, 15, 20 years down the road, whether it is 5% or a lot more. That only 5% of the material is retained is disappointing. but courses in art, philosophy, literature, economics, led me later to follow up with the benefit of further knowledge on many of the larger questions. In favor of moving towards as much breadth as possible. I was exceedingly impressed with the quality of the arguments from colleagues in the department of philosophy and Paul Manna.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): calls the question
- the vote is 61 in favor of adopting Matt’s amendment; 75 opposed to adopting Matt’s amendment.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): requests clarification regarding additional departmental credits which are to be discussed after the COLL issues.
- Rowan Lockwood (Geology): asks if we as a faculty really want to go forward with the abbreviation CSI.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): moves that we never have any abbreviations. Abbreviations are limiting, excluding and shut out new faculty. We can use words, instead.
- Paul Manna (Government): reminds the faculty that a certain illustrious alumnus has an association with a certain comedy network and would probably love to make fun of such an abbreviation.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): requests that the domains be called by their names, and put some context to the requirements, to help reduce the “checklist” tendency.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): these will have to go into the computer somehow, acronyms exist for practical purposes, and that EPC could further refine the acronyms, and we should move onto to more substantive issues.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): not true that there has to be an acronym. the system could be coded so the whole name comes up (not an acronym). The debate is not one of levity.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): the course catalogue will need to refer to the domains in some way.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): since the catalogue is now digital, there is no particular need to squash the domain names.
- Kitty Preston (Music): arguing for the use of names, do students really know what a GER 4 is? We use these shortcuts, as if we are trying to be broad, but the shortcuts are circumventing that.

- Leisa Meyer (History): whereas the acronym issue is a good and important question, it is not a substantive discussion that should occupy our time at present, but be a concern of the implementation process. she moves to postpone indefinitely.
- Bill Cooke (Physics): calls Bob Archibald's question to refer to domains by their full names.
- the faculty vote to postpone indefinitely.

III. COLL 100/150

- Kim Wheatley provides an overview of COLL 100/150— intended to introduce students to the rigors of college level work, and to give freshmen a full year of general education (to college resources and methods, etc.): the two courses are intended to be taken in different semesters, and possibly under different domains (further information can be found on the Curriculum Review BB site).
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): who owns these COLL courses? An earlier version stated that no department owned COLL courses. Are these courses newly designed? Who is responsible for designing them? How do you plan to ensure that the topics that they cover are focused and balanced? Will introductory courses to various disciplines be re-designed as COLL courses with one additional credit? What are the guidelines for the COLL courses?
- *Kim Wheatley: courses will be either newly designed or adapted from existing courses. COLL 100 in particular is supposed to be about big ideas/themes/topics such as: America, Justice, the Good Life, Intention, What is Evidence, Utopias, Dystopias, Saving the Earth. Most of the COLL 100 will be newly designed. COLL 200 will be mostly newly designed courses or those redesigned to look outward to another domain. We imagine a similar process to the one currently in place: faculty propose new courses or petition existing courses to acquire GER accreditation to the EPC, which then evaluate the proposals to determine if the courses are suitable. A similar mechanism will be in place for COLL courses. There will be further working groups to iron out the criteria for those application forms for new COLL courses.*
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): regarding COLL 100, which is described as exposing students to college resources, this seems also a great opportunity to institute a two week unit (or somesuch) coaching students on how to write emails to professors, how to ask for reference letters and when (not the night before the letter is due). These issues are on one level on matters of decorum but on a deeper level are about teaching students who might not have particular training about how to negotiate the university in terms of unwritten rules.
- Bruce Campbell (Modern Languages and Literatures): is disturbed by the projected class size of COLL 100 (between 30 and 50 students or more). Smaller classes would be preferable.
- *Kim Wheatley: I agree; but this is a nod to resource practicalities.*
- John Gilmore (Government): speaking as a member of the EPC and chair of the working group on COLL 100. Communicates a desire for smaller courses. This is a resource issue.
- Bruce Campbell communicates his desire to have smaller classes (and he also wants a raise).

- Mark Sher (Physics): by his calculation, this looks like 40 new classes a year, and this also raises issues with resources. What are the COLL 100s supposed to be? How are we going to get 40 new courses up and running before implementation?
- Kate Conley (Dean): the Dean's office is discussing implementation. Dean Conley describes a graduated system of implementation and May seminars sponsored by the Charles Center for course and syllabus building, to be led by alums of working groups, etc., whose alums in turn would lead future May seminars on the same topics.
- Teresa Longo (Dean of the Curriculum Review): by way of example, a department has several (4) sections of introduction to X (History of the Arts); one of which becomes COLL 100 framed around big ideas (in the History of the Arts); the others stay as they are.
- Heather Macdonald (Geology): how would a COLL 100 be labeled on a transcript if, say, offered as an introduction to Geology? as Geol. 101 or COLL 100?
- *Kim Wheatley: these courses would be cross-listed* (secretary's note: but when a student enrolls in a cross-listed course, a choice has to be made; the student receives credit for CLCV 317 or THEA 461 but not for both; e.g., only one course designation shows up on the transcript; something else must be meant by cross-listing).
- Victoria Costa (Philosophy): queries about the transitional period, courses counting towards COLL or GER.
- *Kim Wheatley: conceivably, yes, for the transition year, we still need to think about how to implement the transition.*
- John Griffin: we will have to think about implementation, and we will have students under both systems for a number of years.
- Adam Potkay (English): finds the last bit of discussion disturbing, because COLL 100 are supposed to be big idea classes. Geology, Geology, Geology, Big ideas in Geology – that is really just Geology. I would think that they should be very different. to use a slogan here, I thought we were moving forward, not backward, new not old. Brit Lit I, Brit Lit I with big ideas, but so is the other one.
- Teresa Longo: trying to describe how a department might incorporate COLL courses without increasing the number of courses they offer; such courses will be transfigured (Adam: as long as they are really transfigured, a good word, indeed).
- Laurie Koloski (History): speaking as a member of the COLL 100 working group, she cites a number of courses that might fit our COLL 100 under the *Introduction to the Humanities* (IHum)/ *Thinking Matters* (ThiMa – no longer restricted just to the humanities) rubric at Stanford University: Voyages and Visionaries; the Good Life; Breaking Codes, Finding Patterns; The Science of MythBusters; Rules of War; Ultimate Meaning; Why do we like to read about Vampires; Technological Views of Utopia; Sustainability and Collapse; Networks; Race Matters... (see <https://explorecourses.stanford.edu/search?q=THINK&view=catalog&page=0&academicYear=&filter-term-Autumn=on&filter-term-Winter=on&filter-term-Spring=on&collapse=&filter-coursestatus-Active=on&filter-catalognumber-THINK=on>). If anyone would like to team-teach a course on walls (Laurie's personal obsession), just let her know.

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): COLL 100 seems still to be asked to do too much in terms of pedagogical goals. Why not shift some of this to COLL 150? e.g., library resources? She can see taking 15 students to the library, but not 50.
- Arthur Knight (English): COLL 100 and 150 are meant to work together, but 150s overburdened right now. For 100, it is thought that a librarian would visit the class. Approaches and exposures are doubled in different settings during the first year.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): moves to adjourn.
- Lily Panoussi (Classical Studies): COLL 100 treats more general resources. COLL 150 focuses on discipline specific resources.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:02 pm.

The secretary again thanks Steve Otto for compiling the list of faculty who addressed today's special A&S Curriculum Review meeting. She also thanks Trina Garrison and Jeff Herrick for audio recordings, and Professors Gert, Haug, Manna, and Tracy for sharing written versions of their meeting comments – all of which have contributed to the accuracy of these minutes,

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

<http://www.captiveanimals.org/birds>

http://soe.salsalabs.com/o/1/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=299&track=2013_0502_Wolverines_alert_nohighlight