

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, October 29, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Chesapeake B C, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 45.

John Gilmour: reviews the current status of the discussion of after a somewhat “lengthy” hiatus. Three amendments are in play concerning COLL 300 – the EPC’s September COLL 300 language; a revised EPC amendment proposed as an alternative to the September language, and an amendment to the revised EPC version.

- Jack Martin (English): presents the revised EPC amendment – in reaction to the two divergent trajectories of our on-going COLL 300 discussion: as a cross cultural or global requirement. The language is intended to clarify that COLL 300 could have cross cultural experiences or deal with global issues or both. Coll 300 can be fulfilled through Study Abroad or credit-bearing programs on campus (so the programs will be vetted by EPC). This document allows also for W&M colloquia (plural now instead of singular – in anticipation of multiple proposals for colloquia topics).
- Bob Archibald (Economics): queries about the “and” connecting global issues with cross-cultural reflection as inconsistent with the verbal proposal *JM: perhaps we should just change that to an “or”.* Diane Shakes: *the EPC wants the “and” for W&M colloquia which are envisioned as global with cross-cultural elements.* *JM: The **whole requirement** is “global OR”. The **colloquia** are “global AND.”*
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): queries if the EPC has considered whether the courses should be 3 credits instead of 2. Why not 3? *JM: considered yes, but 2 credits have been retained because of concern from some faculty regarding onerous obligations for some majors in their junior year.*
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): requests clarification regarding Study Abroad **OR** courses. *JM: yes, these courses offered at W&M would be designated as fulfilling the COLL 300.* TL prefers the September EPC language as successfully fore fronting two significant aspects in the spirit of COLL 300 – 1) getting students off campus; 2) or bringing intellectuals (etc.) to campus.
- *JG: this new language does nothing to discourage students from going off campus; it simply opens up additional venues for fulfilling COLL 300 on campus.*
- Bill Fischer (Anthropology): COLL 300 is significantly different from other components of the curriculum under consideration in that it implicitly involves

more than an analytical approach or style of thinking or interdisciplinarity (centering on the professor's approach) but rather an engagement (centering on the student's approach). With this comes a moral imperative to set the terms with which students are expected to engage with "what's out there". What is required is a different kind of accountability than students have to their professors, but rather to the people in the community.

- Jenny Kahn (Anthropology): Study Abroad does not necessarily ensure engagement with the community, as many of these experiences are in fact closed if not managed in a particular way. Allowing for a cross-cultural alternative on campus draws upon campus strengths.
- Jack Martin (English): such a criticism applies to both of the EPC proposals.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): at the risk of "sounding like a broken record" reminds the faculty that as a body we endorsed global (not cross-cultural) as among our guiding principles.
- Maryse Fauvel (MLL): observes that "global" is lacking from the first paragraph of the EPC September amendment.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): The EPC amendment is more in keeping with the principles. If we remove "global" from COLL 300, then "global" will be missing from the curriculum; and our curriculum will be inconsistent with our principles.
- Maryse Fauvel (MLL): COLL 300 would be a revolutionary thing on campus, because it would allow all students to address ways the world is governed in a cross-cultural way. If we want to keep "global way" as a synonym for cross-cultural she suggests adding "in a multi-cultural fashion" *aut simile*. We already offer many courses on global issues. And COLL 300 is really a new thing which could contribute to the internalization of our campus.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): But the proposal allows for global only. The EPC amendment clarifies that global alone is still a reasonable way to meet this requirement.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): expresses concern over the amendment. According to the current structure of this amendment, most of the courses in global studies or MLL at the 300 level (emphasizing global engagement) would satisfy the EPC revised version. Although such courses are not "bad courses" and are in fact incredibly vital to a Liberal Arts education, this current language represents a dilution of the intent of COLL 300 and the strength of the September proposal – where internationalization (the global) can happen in two very interesting ways: 1) appropriate study abroad programs; OR 2) facilitate vibrant on-campus opportunities that internationalize our campus through rigorous and rich colloquia. Resources are limited, and if we allow almost anything to count for COLL 300, there would then be no incentive to develop special and exciting colloquia. Let's make the requirement 3-credits and create a colloquium track that satisfies those

faculty who are concerned about overburdening their juniors. Bring this in line with the other core requirements in the general education proposal. Let's be creative. Global is very much at the core of COLL 300, but as she understands internationalization and global and cross-cultural, they are not to be viewed as mutually exclusive but rather as complementary.

- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): point of order – requests clarification on **which** amendment is being discussed. *JG: the revised EPC version.*
- Suzanne Raitt (English): wishes to offer a little tiny amendment to the amendment, *TM: not procedurally permitted*, and she hands the microphone back.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): calls the question.

the EPC revised amendment is defeated.

- *JG: returns the microphone to Suzanne Raitt whose amendment is no longer valid.*
- Maryse Fauvel (MLL): moves to amend the September EPC motion to increase the COLL 300 requirement to “at least 3 credits”.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): inquires about the resistance to a 3 credit requirement.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): some science (and other) programs are very demanding especially in the third year, and an additional “onerous requirement” in the standard curriculum would be a hurdle to those students.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): in support of a 3 credit requirement, observes that COLL 300 cannot be fulfilled in any meaningful way with only 2 credits.
- Lu Ann Homza (History, Dean for Educational Policy): speaking on behalf of Joan Gavalier (Theater, Speech, and Dance – not present), reminds the faculty of that department's concerns over the 3 credit requirement as excluding TSD from offering courses to fulfill COLL 300. All Dance classes are deliberately set at 2 credits each to allow students to repeat courses without violating the college's 48 semester credits rule.
- Ron Rapoport (Government): since so few faculty are present (14%), and some departments are heavily over-represented. It would be a mistake to continue this discussion wherein we are casting a curriculum that will be binding on everyone, and we risk alienating the absent faculty. Moves to adjourn.

the motion to adjourn is defeated.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): reminds the faculty that this is merely a seriatim discussion. Absent faculty are free to bring amendments to the floor at any point. The process is designed to be inclusive, so faculty have as much of a voice as possible but need not attend every meeting. The real vote, the important vote, will occur at the end of the process when we have a final and complete document.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): point of order – requests clarification about when amendments can be brought – e.g., could we amend COLL 200 at the next meeting?
- Will Hausman (Economics): are not major motions supposed to promulgated a week in advance?

- Terry Meyers (English): amendments can be proposed from the floor; otherwise we'd be paralyzed if every motion had to be circulated a week in advance.
- *JG reminds the faculty that we are not adopting anything, we are perfecting a proposal that will be subject to further discussion, amendment, debate and a **final** vote in December (hopefully).*
- Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures): speaks in support of the 3-credit minimum. Since most of our classes already bear 3-credits, aligning COLL 300 to this paradigm more easily allows for faculty participation (e.g., faculty can teach in the colloquia as part of their regular teaching obligations). She also expresses concern over those programs that argue against a 3 credit requirement because of major-demands on the junior year. Quoting from the proposal: COLL 300. "**Typically** takes place in year 3. ... Students may take the W&M Colloquium **at any time.**" This language reflects the current culture of students opting to study abroad during the junior year – but Study Abroad is just one of the ways of fulfilling COLL 300 but not the only way. Science students need not wait until year 3 to fulfill a requirement that they could easily complete during their sophomore year or even freshman year.

the motion to increase COLL 300 to "at least 3 credits" passes.

- Anne Rasmussen (Music): proposes to add "The Colloquia are organized around a series of lectures and smaller group meetings with W&M faculty, and visiting scholars, intellectuals, and artists," in a syntactically appropriate way to the penultimate sentence of the EPC September amendment.

the motion passes.

- *JG again offers the microphone to Suzanne Raitt who avers – "my amendment has gone away".*
- Josh Erlich (Physics): proposes to change the singular "colloquium" to the plural "colloquia".

the motion passes.

- *JG observes "We're moving along really fast. That's good."*
- Paula Pickering (Government): proposes adding "and smaller group meetings" whereby the quality of the experience will be enhanced.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): observes that such a proposal now makes COLL 300 highly resource intensive. Are the colloquia envisioned to be large classes with discussion sections that meet on a regular basis? Professor Pickering seems to be proposing a different model.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): reminds the faculty that we are simply setting out guiding curricular principles, and later – if the curriculum ever comes to a vote – then we design the courses for the curriculum based on these principles. On-campus colloquia should provide a course context in which students who cannot go abroad are engaging with cross-cultural issues in ways that think outside disciplinary constraints about global issues. One possible way to do this that

may be less resource intensive would be to provide a series of visiting intellectuals (etc.). And the faculty will work in opportunities for those visitors to meet with students in smaller groups. Not all visitors will meet with all students. This will be labor intensive for the faculty. But what's new? This is what we do.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): Our focus is on exposing students to international views. Nor is it wise to include "smaller groups" as a mandate at this point. This opens us up a bookkeeping nightmare, and the small(er) groups will likely occur in any event. We may want to mandate this later.
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): speaking from her experiences with the Curriculum Steering Committee. The intent of COLL 300 is to design opportunities for many faculty to come together as a community. Bringing in high-profile visitors to, say, William and Mary Hall provides synergistic opportunities for faculty. The visitor(s) is not the Colloquium but rather a highlight.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): what is important is not the size of the experience but the type of engagement. These opportunities afforded by distinguished visitors should create dialogues, and inspire curiosity. What is important is not necessarily that all the students interact with e.g., the Dalai Llama, but rather what happens after the visitor leaves campus – hopefully sustained dialogue and real engagement with the visitor's ideas, music. etc.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English, incognito): suggests that we can utilize the new curriculum as a fund-raising tool, and bringing in distinguished visitors is precisely the sort of thing that donors may support.
- Jaime Armstrong (Music): calls the question.

the motion regarding "smaller groups" is defeated.

- Leisa Meyer (History and American Studies): moves to adjourn.

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 4:38 pm with a reminder of the Tack lecture (tonight: October 29) and next week's regularly scheduled A&S meeting (November 5, election day).

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Georgia L. Irby, Secretary
Associate Professor of Classical Studies
glirby@wm.edu
<http://www.seaturtles.org/>