

Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Tuesday, October 01, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm

Tidewater A, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 43

I. Approval of Minutes of FAS regular meeting on 09/10

<https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20130910.pdf>

II. Report of Administrative Officers:

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- The Dean already indicated that it's a beautiful day and we should probably be outside; he would do his very best to get us out of the meeting in a timely fashion so we could enjoy the beautiful weather.
- the BoV meeting went happily and peacefully last week. There were no fireworks (unless happening off-line).
- Glenn Close '74 visited the campus (and theater students) for two full days. It is great for students to meet not only someone who is a graduate but also of rare accomplishment and who was very generous with her time.
- the Phase One (of three phases) of the Arts Quarter (quondam "Complex" – we are now out of the Oedipal stage) is complete. The Muscarelle will be separated out to be funded privately. We imagine that the state will underwrite academic facilities. We anticipate monies, but the speed is in question.
- a shout-out to five W&M faculty members nominated for the highly competitive Outstanding Faculty Award: Carol Sheriff, Greg Smith, Ann Marie Stock, Mike Tierny, Janice Zeman – with hearty congratulations to all, and he would like to say that all five will win (although unparalleled, certainly deserved). And thanks to those who served as faculty coaches in this regard (Kate Arries, Heather McDonald, Chris Howard, Dave Luxor, Kate Slevin). The

nominations are on their way to Richmond as we speak, and we should see white smoke sometime in mid-January. Only 12 winners are selected from the entire state, from public and private universities

- an eagerness for us all to move outside into the fresh air.

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- her intent to keep remarks brief as she is eager to return to the curriculum discussion which goes so well, she is happy to say.
- Last week's BoV meeting was upbeat. We had an encouraging report from the new Vice President for Development (Matthew Lambert) who unveiled a national strategy (going beyond the local VA approach) that employs sophisticated data bases to show where our alumni are, how to find them, and how to approach them in a targeted and knowledgeable way, and, in general, how to inspire in them a new spirit of philanthropy – to shift the relationship that alumni have with the college, especially regarding philanthropy towards the college (the tendency in previous generations was to think that because of our public status, that the state would take care of the school, they don't really need to give back to the school).
- Susan Grover (new VP of the Faculty Assembly) reported on the faculty response to section Eight of the W&M promise (more teaching by continuing faculty): Rector Stottlemeyer has joked about how we are calling this portion of the Promise "Section 8", and finds it amusing as though we were trying to get out of serving in the army on the grounds of mental illness Klinger-style. But we are taking this section of the Promise seriously. She wishes to remind us of the statement that is particularly relevant: By 2014/15 the faculty in all schools are to implement policies responding to TE faculty dual responsibilities as teacher-scholars with different balances between these two roles. Grover's report underscored the reality that all the faculty really do a great deal of teaching outside the classroom, and we already teach more.
- last week's chairs and directors retreat was a productive opportunity to brainstorm regarding how A&S will respond to the challenges posed by section Eight.
- our need to respond to the Board's request that we invest in the Promise to which issue Suzanne Raitt (Faculty Assembly) will speak at greater length, regarding the policies and options to propose to the Board in the Spring.
- By the end of the week, the Dean's office will issue the annual invitation regarding replacement hires, including NTEs with a request for information that will assist in assigning the new titles specified by the new NTE personnel policy.
- a long conversation with the new rector, Todd Stottlemeyer, a week before the Board met, who is a responsive and excellent listener with tremendous respect for the faculty of A&S (in particular two of his own professors: Joel

Schwartz and John McGlennon). More broadly, he believes that the matters that pertain to the faculty are the faculty's to decide upon, and he has no desire to tell us what to do. He is delighted to start his tenure as Rector with the awarding by US News and World Report of W&M as 3rd place for best teaching (placing us at the top in terms of public universities). This is something for us to be proud of.

III. Nominations and Elections

Jennifer Stevens reported the following:

- a ballot to open probably next week for PPC-PRC (Michael Daise or Tim Costelloe).
- a reminder of the Committee Volunteer Survey sent out by Monica Potkay last week.
- a request to nominate colleagues for specific committees.

IV. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- since she could not see her notes (light on lectern not working), she would have to make it all up.
- Since the last regular meeting, Faculty Assembly has met once, as have each of the standing committees.
- 1) Faculty Assembly unanimously passed a resolution regarding partner benefits:
 - the Faculty Assembly of the College of William & Mary resolves that all benefits associated with employment at the College of William & Mary should be extended to all employees as appropriate to their employment status, without regard to sexual orientation or gender identity. Benefit equality specifically includes, but is not limited to, same-sex domestic partner benefits.
- VA Tech and George Mason have already issued similar resolutions.
- partly as a result of our contacting them, Norfolk State, JMU, and ODU have approached their faculty senates to consider passing such resolutions.
- we are still working on UVa and VCU.
- And the Faculty Assembly is hoping for a “tsunami” (perhaps an exaggeration) or at least a cluster of resolutions to bring attention to the matter – in the wake of the Supreme Court Ruling.
- 2) regarding the Promise and Section 8: The Business School has developed five general guidelines:
 1. The college should have some general guidelines so that each school can develop their own policy.
 2. The policy should not denigrate the role of teaching.

3. The policy should not use teaching as a punishment.
4. The policy should acknowledge the role of scholarship in teaching.
5. The Committee as a whole disagreed with the idea that the policy should encourage significantly different teaching loads based on research productivity.
 - it is hoped that a best practices template will be arrived at by the end of the month. A&S and Education are developing their principles and guidelines to respond to the Board's Section 8 Mandate, but other schools (VIMS, Law, Business) have guidelines in place.
- 3) a request for greater faculty advocacy in the Provost's office (e.g., someone responsible for keeping the Faculty handbook updated, someone to assist faculty negotiating the process of requesting medical leaves *aut sim.*). The Provost said that when the time comes to revisit the job description of the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, he would share that description with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly so we could have some input and perhaps shift the responsibilities of that position perhaps a little bit more towards faculty advocacy and faculty support than is currently envisioned.
- 4) on the radar: e-learning; NTE representation in faculty governance; retirement incentives; tuition waivers for faculty children; and a request for input in the ways that the faculty handbook might be improved.

questions and discussion

- Josh Erlich (Physics): as a friendly recommendation for the faculty, he suggests that we refer to the BoV mandate as "Proposition 8" because of the negative connotations of "Section 8".

V. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- 4 meetings since the September 10 report to A&S, wherein the following was discussed:
 - plans for implementation of the new curriculum with members of Dean's office.
 - establishment of charges for ad-hoc committees/working groups on Teaching and the W&M Promise and on the Distribution of promised Resources.
 - review and recommendation of purging or archiving old documents from FAC documents website.

- request that all chairs of A&S committees submit annual written or oral reports on committee activities to the faculty. Most committees already do this.
- possibility of amending A&S bylaws to reduce amount of time required between submitting A&S agenda and the meetings. Currently the bylaws mandate one week. FAC proposes reducing this to 72 hours, allowing more time between the FAC meeting (Tuesday afternoon) and A&S agenda submission deadline (currently Tuesday 5:00 pm). FAC intends to present as a motion at regular November meeting.
- formalizing electronic voting for committee elections, implied but not explicit in current bylaws – to be presented as a committee motion at November meeting.
- electronic voting for approval of new curriculum – not to be presented as a committee motion as FAC is divided, but individual members will present a motion.

questions and discussion

- George Greenia (MLL): requests clarification regarding lead time. *BS: regarding the timing of weekly FAC meetings and the window between the meeting and finalizing the A&S agenda.*
- Jack Martin (English): requests clarification about amendment to allow electronic voting. *BS: amendments will be distributed in advance of the November meeting together with a document from our parliamentarian regarding the controversy of electronic voting and why this needs to be done in a certain way – an amendment is in fact necessary.*
- Terry Meyers (English and A&S Parliamentarian): if absentee voting is allowed, it must be recognized in the bylaws.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): if the amendment for electronic voting does not pass, do we then revert to voting for committee members during the meetings? *BS: electronic voting is not improper, it is simply not explicitly delineated.*

VI. Report from Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee

George Greenia reported the following:

- he was presenting the report for last year's activities on behalf of last-year's co-chairs who will take full responsibility for all mistakes, omissions, or errors:
- of 15 tenure cases reviewed by the committee, 13 were adjudicated favorably, 2 were not.
- of 5 recommendations for promotion to the rank of Professor, RPT gave its imprimatur on 4, the Dean recommended all 5, the Provost concurred.
- on-going issues under consideration:
 - proper use of BB (selective, timely and timed access of documents).

- external letters of recommendation are clear in giving specific guidance about the candidate.
- and that “arms length” status exists for each of the recommenders.
- See further:
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/rpt/reports/20130628.pdf>

discussion

- Mark Sher (Physics): What is meant by “arm’s length”? *GG: there are specific guidelines, and in certain respects a judgment call regarding how closely and recently a recommender has worked with the candidate; does the recommender have a stake in the candidate earning tenure (e.g., joint projects/grants...).* Virginia Torczon (Computer Science, co-chair of the 2012-13 RPT): *if there is a question, contact the Dean’s office. It is important to settle these questions in advance. RPT works under a very tight window.*
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): queries about disclosure of reports and results of votes to the candidates at the various stages. *VT: only the result of the vote goes to the candidate.*

VII. John Gilmour leads continued discussion of COLL 300

- Terry Meyers (English and A&S Parliamentarian): clarifies the procedures for the complex parliamentary situation with multiple amendments to substitute including a substitute for the pending amendment, etc, etc, etc. Amendments will be discussed, amended and voted on in the order in which they were received. “Ask me as it goes along”.
- Paula Pickering (Government): proposes to substitute her “clarified” language for the ISAC amendment by substitution currently on the floor (ISAC is split over how many credits to require of COLL 300 and differing views on including both cross-cultural engagement and engagement with global issues) – seconded. COLL 300 is the only segment of the proposed curriculum that deals with global issues, and is of particular importance in light of principle 7, which commits to enlarging our students’s global perspective, and is consistent with prioritization of internationalism in the strategic plan, pledging to increase global connections and recognized critical importance of the expanded flow of information and cultural perspectives. This commitment merits at least a 3 credit course, and could be drawn from Study Abroad, W&M program in DC, and campus-based colloquia which would bring visiting thinkers to campus. She lists several courses currently on the books that emphasize cross-cultural engagement or

- global issues, including courses offered in Government, GIS, Economics, Sociology, and the Natural Sciences.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): observes that the language of the text foregrounds cross-cultural in many places where it suggests that it has to be cross-cultural – instead of the “and/or” description just presented. The current wording does not emphasize global aspects. *PP: the consensus of ISAC is that we encourage the cross-cultural engagement. Her description is intentionally focused on globalization to show on-campus possibilities.*
 - Will Hausman (Economics): requests clarification on the differences between this amendment and the EPC wording. *PP: EPC separates out cross-cultural only for classes abroad. Campus-based courses would have a global emphasis. JG: the new EPC distinction separates cross-cultural and global, in recognizing the difficulties in creating genuine cross-cultural engagement on campus. The faculty seem to be divided over whether cross-cultural is an essential component of COLL 300 even if taught on campus or whether this is necessary or even at all possible.*
 - Sarah Stafford (Economics): in our guiding principles, as a faculty we endorsed the ideal of a global component (not a cross-cultural component).
 - Josh Erlich (Physics): though not necessarily opposed to the 3-credit requirement, recalls that the justification for the 2-credit limit is that the junior year is a particularly tough one for students – as we heard from various faculty in different departments. Professor Erlich takes issue with the notion that a two-credit course cannot be rigorous. The credit designation provides only some sense of the course load, not the rigor of the material.
 - Teresa Longo (MLL): raises question about what students do and where, since it was her original understanding that COLL 300 was intended to send students away from campus or bring intellectuals and artists in. Does this understanding stay in your proposal? *PP: Yes. Does a course that does bring visiting intellectuals in fulfill the requirement? PP: No, but students could engage with external people through Skype, but they must engage in some meaningful way with someone beyond the professor of the course.*
 - Maryse Fauvel (MLL): will all W&M study abroad programs fulfill COLL 300? *PP: the programs will have to undergo review. ISAC encourages immersion, preventing students from interacting just with each other. e.g., it is hoped that W&M at Cambridge will encourage more engagement outside the classroom. So will it count as long as W&M faculty are teaching the course? JG: It is incumbent upon the approving body to ensure that the course has an appropriate amount of cross-cultural engagement.*
 - Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): queries about “engagement”. Although Study Abroad programs focusing on Ancient Rome encourage cross-cultural thinking, she cannot produce an ancient Roman (despite her research in ancient magic! although she is unwilling to try a Ouija board, she would be interested in

considering necromancy :-)). She can make them understand the culture in a way they would not otherwise have done. The experience encourages them to think about the Romans in cross-cultural ways, about the differences between the Romans and us. Would such programs be valid under this description? *PP: yes.*

- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): how does ISAC distinguish between cross-cultural and global? Are these terms defined when discussing these issues? *PP: cross-cultural is direct or indirect interaction with peoples of different cultures; global crosses national boundaries.*
- Greg Hancock (Geology): the current document emphasizes cross-cultural – reiterating Professor Stafford’s persuasive and sage comments (he cannot do better). On this description, global is satisfied only by the W&M program in DC or W&M colloquia. The proposal needs to be amended to bring the global aspect up to the same standard as the cross-cultural component.
- Teresa Longo (MLL): why amend this document when the previous version already balances global and cross-cultural, hence producing layers of unnecessary work? “Unless I am missing something”.
- Katy Bragdon (Anthropology): global and cross-cultural are not necessarily in opposition. Anthropologists study the impact of globalization on non-western peoples.
- John Riofrio (MLL): “global” and “cross-cultural” are not necessarily synonymous, and notion seems to do injustice to what cross-cultural is supposed to imply. Cross-cultural refers to distinct cultures; “global” does not necessarily discuss cultures. *JG: cross-cultural means engagement with distinct peoples and cultures. Global issues could involve study of subjects that are global in nature but don’t really discuss the cultures.*
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): disagrees with JG’s assessment. *JG: fair enough.*
- David Feldman (Economics): “International Trade” is inherently global, but not necessarily cross-cultural. Such a course would satisfy the “global” aspect, but not the “cross-cultural”. We need to be clear about whether this “either/or” or whether “global” has been subsumed by “cross-cultural”. And this language does not make it clear, preferring the “either/or” option. *PP: the new EPC amendment is closer to the ideas I was trying to express.*
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): what is lost by not including “indirect” from the possible “cross-cultural” experiences?
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): direct only applies to cross-cultural.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): I am trying to avoid producing an ancient Roman. That’s all.
- *JG: suggests moving to a vote*
- John Riofrio (MLL): understands the spirit of COLL 300 as cross-cultural at its center.

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): reiterates “globalization” in the principles that we as a faculty voted to endorse. (“what we all said we wanted, well perhaps not all of us, but a majority of us”).
- Bruce Campbell (MLL): here we have a wide range of ideas regarding the purpose of COLL 300 and what it means to engage with the outside world. Since we do not agree, could there not be two requirements (cross-cultural and global)? *JG: we have an amendment to do that.*
- Paula Pickering (Government): the strategic plan recognizes the critical importance of the expanded flow of information and cultural perspectives.
- Sarah Stafford (Government): the faculty have not ratified that language.
- Rob Leventhal (MLL): describes his pending amendment: 3-credit requirement for “global”; 3-credit requirement for “cross-cultural”. COLL 300 is overburdened and as it stands is not doing justice to our goals. Global is possible without cross-cultural, and it seems best to decouple the two and split the requirement. If not, it will be a disappointment for one group or another, and at best our current solution will be diluted and insufficient.
- Paul Manna (Government and Public Policy): does not the foreign language requirement address the cross-cultural piece? *PP: students can satisfy this requirement before coming to W&M. Josh Erlich: COLL courses cannot be satisfied according to the proposal by transfer credit.*
- *JG interjects that we should not have extensive discussion on the Leventhal amendment before dealing with the Pickering amendment and calls for a vote.*

the motion to replace the EPC description with the second Pickering amendment is defeated.

- Rob Leventhal (MLL): reiterates that global studies ≠ cross-cultural. COLL 300 ought to do both.
- Mark Sher (Physics and currently on furlough): observes that the original 2 credit requirement for COLL 300 has now spiked to 6 – a huge increase in the total requirements. This requirement would be onerous for science majors in their already-swamped junior year.
- David Feldman (Economics): reminds the faculty that COLL 300 is not restricted to the junior year, and the nature of the classes is such that they might be approachable even by freshmen.
- Tom Payne (Music): is it conceivably possible to satisfy both components with the same course? *RL: no, each component carries a 3-credit requirement. The language does not say that to me.*
- Jack Martin (English): the language of the cross-cultural component is highly restrictive, implying that students will have to travel abroad, and it

disadvantages those students who cannot afford travel. *RL: we could alter the language to suggest that cross-cultural experiences be **rooted** outside the U.S. so “cross-cultural” refers to the origin of the people/culture/political system not where it occurs physically.* If we mean to include native peoples, so we cannot even say “rooted outside the U.S.” It just takes a little bit of thought.

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): queries about “direct” disadvantaging students who lack the wherewithal to go abroad. *RL: endorses the introduction of “indirect”.* What about the additional credits? If we are simply arriving at a number to satisfy some oversight board or other, could these credits be substituted for the additional COLL 200 requirement?
- Bill Cooke (Physics): separating the two requirements does disservice. Some global issues are very much cross-cultural. Forcing two separate courses runs afoul of the concept that is behind globalization. Suggests two separate courses, or one really good one.
- Joel Schwarz (Government): opposes the amendment as trying to equate subject matter with pedagogical approach (like apples and oranges), and prefers that one aspect not be defined by pedagogy while the other is defined by subject matter. A course about cross-cultural issues does not necessarily have to provide a cross-cultural experience. It is possible to treat cross-cultural issues as global. And the current language seems to rule out Study Abroad (e.g., Environmental issues abroad, deforestation in Ecuador). *RL: no, if you do one, you have to do the other.*
- Will Hausman (Economics): suggests revising and re-introducing the amendment incorporating the comments that Professor Leventhal has agreed upon, so the faculty understand exactly what the vote regards. “I’ll still oppose it. As someone who teaches global economic history which has a cross-cultural component, you can’t separate the components. You can’t teach global economic history without dealing with China, South America, etc. I don’t like the idea of separating cross-cultural and global. The main point is I don’t even know what we would be voting on, friendly amendments, etc”. *JG: no amendments to this amendment have been adopted.*

the question is called.

the faculty vote to end discussion (the ayes have it!).

- Rob Leventhal (MLL): requests withdrawing his amendment.
- Terry Meyers (English and A&S Parliamentarian): since the motion is on the floor, we should vote on it.

the motion to adopt the Leventhal amendment in lieu of the original EPC wording is defeated.

- Sarah Stafford moves to adjourn, the motion is seconded.

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 4:57 pm.

The secretary again thanks Steve Otto for compiling the list of faculty who spoke on the Curriculum Review, and Trina Garrison and Jeff Herrick for the audio recording.

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia L. Irby, Secretary

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

glirby@wm.edu

<http://www.seaturtles.org/>