

Faculty of Arts & Sciences

Tuesday, November 05, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm

Tidewater A, Sadler Center

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

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 40.

I. Report of Administrative Officers:

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- a hope that we all enjoyed Halloween despite the fact that none of us look any chubbier than when he last saw us. And why ever not? The entire point of Halloween is to overindulge in candy.
- and more importantly even than Halloween, a hope that we enjoyed our extra hour and did something wise and fun with it (since we'll have to give it back in six months).
- the success of the fourth Tack Faculty Lecture (Debbie Steinberg terrific "From Plankton to Planet Tack Lecture" to a packed Kimball audience). With each lecture the standard bar is raised higher and higher (not trying to build undue pressure, just having fun). He invites nominations for next year's faculty speakers (self nominations are allowed). Bruce nominated Julia. The Kimball theater is a wonderful venue for these talks as they encourage more people from outside the College to attend.
- with \$200,000 in funds ear-marked, a call for applications to the Creative Adaptation Fund, Phase 3, hoping for a superabundance of strong ideas with which he plans to deal in a positive way. A panel of previous recipients will host a forum the week before Thanksgiving – to talk about what they've learned, what went well, and what went perhaps less well.
- a wonderful meeting with his favorite organization in the world, the Foundation Board, whose mission statement makes him so happy: to raise monies for and invest wisely said monies on behalf of the College. Who wouldn't like an organization like that? They met with a panel of faculty talking about engagement with students. Their feedback was positive – what they made clear was how electric they find working with our students, how engaged that process was. They also approved two resolutions for endowments from the Zable estate.
- \$23 million bequest from Walt Zable (class of 1695, well, 1937). \$10 million is earmarked for his eponymous stadium, \$10 million for scholarships for student

- athletes. The remainder (unrestricted) will be divided equally between funding the class of 1693 Program (really, really high-end students) and fellowships for graduate students (the hardest dollar to raise since not everyone goes to graduate school or understands the concept of it).
- Bob Scott, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the BoV recently came to town (Chairs of that committee come to campus once or twice a year on the off-cycle to meet with faculty, administrators), and he talked with the ad hoc committee of “Section 8” (or, as the Provost prefers to call it, “28.5” to avoid the stigma associated with the former appellation). We are making progress and Mr/ Scott is much interested in what we are coming up with.
 - finally, a PSA: today is election day, as many of us proudly wearing our oval stickers already knew. JCC schools were closed, as was the JCC Rec center (as our Provost discovered to his dismay at 10 of seven this morning). Although the NJ gubernatorial election is no where near close (in case you want to know, Chris Christie will win re-election: you heard it here first), the VA election is not so clear cut (we get ALL the media attention this off-cycle), and though he is pretty sure how the election will turn out, he will not say. So, as of the close of the Provost’s address, you will have had 3 hours and 20 minutes to vote. (*secretary: one almost NEVER gets to use the future perfect*)

questions and discussion

- Bill Cooke (Physics, pretending to be Terry Myers): will the \$10million bequest result in a reduction of the student Athletic Fee, which the President wants to convert from fee-based funding to external private gifts? Will this result in a reduction to the increase of this fee, and if so, by how much? *MH: we don't quite know. The increase in tuition necessitates more funds for scholarships. He will try to get us some numbers to give us a better answer.*

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- a successful presidential delegation to China with President Revely, the Deans of the Mason School and Law School, the director of the Confucius Institute, and Steve Hanson (Vice Provost for International Affairs). They visited 4 universities in 3 cities in 5 days (and it has taken 2 weeks to recover from that whirlwind trip). The purpose of the trip was to seek intellectual partnerships and exchanges while emphasizing that W&M is a research university with an international presence – we take research seriously – with thriving graduate programs, and a highly successful Liberal Arts model for undergraduate teaching.
- a new policy proposed to PRC and PPC: that the tenure clock will not necessarily begin immediately for new hires, especially those hired ABD. Under the proposed new policy, new hires would have two years to complete PhD certification, at which point status would change from Instructor to Assistant Professor, whereupon the tenure clock would begin. This policy is intended to

support the success of new colleagues in their efforts to build as solid tenure dossiers as possible.

- a new practice: likewise new hires at advanced levels must wait two years before coming up for promotion. The current practice of allowing promotion after one year allows for only one semester's worth of student evaluations. The two year wait is intended to support the success of new colleagues as they adjust to the teaching environment at W&M and build a solid portfolio of W&M teaching materials.
- a call for applications for a committee of Faculty Fellows to oversee the new Center for the Liberal Arts, whose charge will be to oversee the curriculum (new or current) with greater aspirational attention than we currently do and to encourage greater interdisciplinarity and multi-disciplinarianism. Five Fellows will be appointed for January, an additional three will join them in September. will Serving a two year term, with an annual stipend of \$5,000, Fellows will design and teach one new course. With much-appreciated help and support from the Provost, these Fellowships are funded. The Charter and Call is posted to the Dean's website: http://www.wm.edu/as/dean/center_liberal_arts/index.php

questions and discussion

- a Jennifer, identified only by her given name (¿Stevens of Psychology?): requests further information on the background of the Change in Policy for the tenure clock. *KC: This came out of the Dean's office, motivated by concern and sympathy for junior colleagues who spend up to two years completing their degrees before they can really devote themselves to building their tenure dossiers.*
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): regarding the New Practice for advanced hires, will/how will this affect the Dean's decision to hire new faculty with tenure? The two-year waiting period might put more pressure on hiring at a higher level, as some may be less willing to wait an extra year before coming up for, say, full professor. *KC: This is a Practice, not a Policy, and such cases will be continued to be handled ad hoc. The rationale is that coming up for promotion to full professor after only a year can be a real disadvantage to colleagues who may need some time to adjust to our culture of scholar-teachers.*
- Bob Archibald (Economics): the policy seems not to have come before this body. *KC: language is being drafted to send to PRC and PPC before it is brought before this body, as procedurally mandated.*

II. Report from Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- a summary of what they have done and what remains to be done (though she won't tell us everything that they still have to do).
- in response to confusion regarding benefit and leave entitlements, a hope to reconceptualize, however slightly, the position of the Vice Provost of

Academic Affairs into a Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs. E.g., how many years does one have to wait between having babies. After having twins, she scoured the Faculty Handbook to see if she could have **two** leaves? What is the College policy on babies? *MH: The College is in favor of babies, I am going on record.*

- their aim to shape the Faculty Development Campaign Initiative in ways that faculty will support.
- after securing representation on the BoVs Academic Affairs Committee (for which we are grateful to the Board), flush with success, the FA are now asking for representation on the other standing committees: Development; Administration, Building, and Grounds; Alumni Relations; Financial Affairs; Audit and Compliance – in the hopes of securing a stronger voice for the faculty.
- a conversation with Bob Scott, chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs, regarding the policies that the BoV hopes will be adopted somewhat consistently across all the schools in response to the W&M Promise.
- W&M tuition reduction/waiver for dependents of W&M employees: the FA can pursue this at the state level but cannot make it happen, so they are talking with the Provost regarding options at W&M.
- to do: NTEs now have their own faculty association and have requested representation on the Faculty Assembly – this is to be discussed at the next FA meeting.
- retirement incentive policy.
- brainstorming about the overwhelming faculty survey (by way of proof, the last chair is **still** processing the data from the last one), it is expected to be restructured.

III. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- 3 meetings since the October 01 report to A&S, wherein the following was discussed:
 - charter and call for proposed Center for the Liberal Arts.
 - various workshops on tenure and promotion, the need for additional support for candidates preparing their cases, and the possibility of developing a specific charge in the A&S bylaws for RPT.
 - progress of the working group on Teaching and the W&M Promise (due to report to the Faculty on December 3).
 - implementation of NTE policy, and urgency for departments and programs to submit ASAP guidelines for recruiting and conducting annual evaluations, so the PRC can approve these policies before the end of the academic year.
 - proposed amendments to A&S bylaws that are on the agenda for today's meeting.

IV. Report from Committee on Graduate Studies and Ombudsperson

Virginia Torczon reported the following:

- the full report is online (36 pages!).
- the reporting period has changed to align with the fiscal (academic) rather than calendar year so as to reflect more accurately the activities.
- that graduate programs are an essential component to the academic and intellectual life of the College, and make important contributions to the research infrastructure, as teachers, scholars, mentors.
- that the office of the Ombudsperson heard seven cases (plagiarism, sexual and non-sexual harassment, disagreement over thesis regulations, dispute between advisor and advisee, disputes over dissertation defense). All cases have been resolved.
- See further:
[http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/graduatestudies/documents/2012 COGS Annual Report Final.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/graduatestudies/documents/2012%20COGS%20Annual%20Report%20Final.pdf)

V. Proposed Amendments to FAS By-Laws from FAC to bring the bylaws in alignment with our current practice (Barbette Spaeth)

- Article III of the A&S Bylaws be amended to include the following new section (Sec. 7): The Faculty of Arts and Sciences will conduct votes electronically for the purpose of electing committee members. After the written version of the proposed slate for committees has gone out in accordance with Article V, Sec. 1.2 below, at the subsequent meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Committee on Nominations and Elections will present the slate for committee elections and take nominations from the floor. Within one day of that meeting, electronic balloting for committee slots will be open for a period of one week.

passes unanimously.

- Article III, Sec. 4 of the A&S bylaws be amended as follows: No ~~motion or~~ resolution affecting the educational policy of the College shall be voted on in a meeting unless it shall have been submitted in writing to the Dean of the Faculty **and the Faculty Affairs Committee** and the text thereof transmitted by the **Dean Faculty Affairs Committee** to all members of the Faculty at least one week prior to the date of the meeting. This provision may be waived by unanimous consent of those present.

passes unanimously.

- Article V, Sec. 3.2 of the A&S bylaws be amended as follows: The Educational Policy Committee shall conduct a continuing study of the undergraduate educational program, regularly reviewing the educational policies and procedures of the Faculty. It shall review all recommendations and requests for changes in the undergraduate curriculum. **In consultation with the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty Affairs Committee, it** shall bring proposals involving changes in educational policy before the Faculty, together with its recommendations for action, but shall have authority to approve or disapprove any changes in the curriculum which do not alter existing policy.

discussion:

- Heather McDonald (Geology): queries over the meaning of “in consultation with” and worries that the Dean or FAC may thus be able to prevent EPC from bringing some issues before the body. *BS: cannot imagine a situation in which Dean and FAC would say to EPC “this issue cannot be brought to the faculty.”*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): is this change even necessary since the Dean for Educational Policy sits on the EPC and serves as a bridge between the EPC and the Dean? The EPC cannot bring anything before the faculty without first getting the issue on the agenda, and she cannot imagine a situation where we might be at odds.
- Debbie Bebout (Chemistry): proposes amending this amendment so the language of amendment 3 is brought in parallel with the language of amendment 2.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): reiterates Professor’s Tandeciarz’ observation that this amendment seems unnecessary, the language is cumbersome, and the amendment seems to be trying to do two things: define the EPC’s role and how it brings measures before this body.

Professor Bebout’s amendment is defeated with one lone dissenting “aye” from MLL.

FAC Amendment #3 is defeated with two or three stray ayes.

VI. Proposed Amendment to FAS By-Laws from Suzanne Raitt and Greg Hancock

- Motion to Amend Arts and Sciences By-Laws to Facilitate Broad Faculty Participation on Substantive Motions: In rare circumstances, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may decide that a motion before the body is of such importance that every member of the faculty should be able to vote, including those Faculty unable to attend the meeting at which the motion is presented. On such occasions, the Faculty

of Arts and Sciences may choose to allow an electronic vote on the motion. If a regular member of the Faculty at a meeting feels that an electronic vote on a motion before the body is preferable, the procedure is as follows. Once the question has been called on a motion at a regular or special meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, a regular member in attendance may move to allow electronic voting on the motion before the body. The motion to allow electronic voting must be seconded and is debatable. To pass, the motion to allow electronic voting must receive a positive vote of two-thirds of the members present at the meeting. Within one day of passing a motion to vote electronically, electronic ballots will open and remain open for a period of one week. It is expected that electronic voting will take place only in rare instances and only on substantive issues, and that in-person voting at Arts and Sciences faculty meetings will remain the normal practice.

- rationale: the curriculum vote will affect the entire faculty, and as many faculty members as possible should be able to vote. The nature of the discussion is such that it is impossible to predict when the vote will occur, and many faculty members may already have conflicts when that meeting finally occurs (e.g., one colleague who has been in regular attendance at these meetings will be at a professional conference the first exam week when two special meetings are scheduled). E-voting would allow faculty to vote their conscience, instead of being strong-armed by their chairs. For such an important issue, faculty will certainly “do their homework” in advance of the vote.

discussion

- Gene Tracy (Physics): requests clarification regarding which amendment is before the faculty. *SR: the projected text, admits to a “huge, huge error”—in reading the wrong text.*
- Bill Cooke (Physics): such an amendment that would allow for distance voting on the important issues will result in even lower attendance at these meetings.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): the seriatim curriculum discussion has been very long and very interesting. All the meeting have been scheduled for the same time, and therefore, the same faculty are consistently disenfranchised. The process is making it difficult for well-intentioned faculty to attend the meetings and have their say, and it is foolhardy to adopt a new curriculum that is not supported by a majority of the faculty who will be teaching in it.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): this is the only venue in which we come together for debate. She prefers to maintain the “illusion” that we are a self-governing body. There is a danger of moving to a corporate model of e-governance.
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): the stakes are too high, and this amendment would change the basic principle behind parliamentary law which requires that a deliberative body be present to vote. We are a self-governing body, we debate things, we vote in person after discussing the issues thoroughly. Once we complete

the seriatim discussion, the whole document will be open for discussion, debate, and amendment. At the end of the process, we can revisit the pieces/issues and fully debate them and vote on them in person without violating the basic essence of self-governance.

- Heather McDonald (Geology): admits to being the faculty member whom Greg mentioned during his rationale. She would like to think that she would have the opportunity to vote on something as important as a curriculum review. Disallowing e-voting disenfranchises everyone who, for whatever reason, cannot be on campus for the final vote.
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): while he sympathizes with such points, he remains skeptical of two claims: 1) the lack of attendance is attributable to scheduling conflicts; 2) Chairs strong-arm their faculty to vote in a certain way. Allowing for e-voting will not necessarily urge people to “do their homework” in advance of the meeting.
- Paul Davies (Philosophy): quite likes this proposal as in no way in conflict with having substantive discussion. A week gives interested faculty plenty of time to weigh in on the issues.
- Bob Archibald (Economics): queries about the apparent contradiction. We have just voted unanimously to allow electronic voting, and now we’re against it?
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science): seeks clarification regarding documents being posted a week in advance of meetings. *Terry Myers (Parliamentarian): because of the nature of the seriatim discussion, we can continue to debate and amend the document up to the final vote.*
- Will Hausman (Economics): thought it was a mistake to conduct the discussion seriatim, and observes that the attendance at these meetings has been pathetic. The issue here is one of legitimacy. If the new curriculum wins by 1 vote in an electronic vote of an overwhelming majority of the faculty eligible to vote, then the new curriculum has legitimacy. If it wins by 2/3 of an in-person vote when not all eligible faculty can attend, then the outcome lacks legitimacy.
- Diane Shakes (Biology): since the vote is so important and we can continue to change the document up to the final moment, would it not be far better to say “this is where the discussion ends”? And then we take a week to grapple with the issues. That will be a much more legitimate vote.
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): countering the argument that faculty do not attend because of scheduling conflicts – about 200 faculty attended the February meeting when we voted to proceed with the proposed curriculum. And if she had to miss that meeting (and the vote), she would be sorry, but also would be confident that 200 of her colleagues will have made a good decision. (*another future perfect!*)
- Paul Davies (Philosophy): estimates that the number of faculty eligible to vote is as many as 500-600. 219 faculty attended the February 5 meeting, less than ½ the eligible faculty.

- Lu Ann Homza (History, Dean for Educational Policy): we have 354 full-time faculty who are eligible to vote. *there is general disagreement about the number and the criteria: TE and emeritus faculty, or all teaching faculty.*
- *secretary's note:* Sec. 1 (of A&S bylaws): All persons holding full time teaching or research appointments as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and lecturers in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the College of William and Mary in Virginia are members of the "Faculty of Arts and Sciences" or "Faculty" as these terms are used in these Bylaws, and are entitled to vote in meetings of the Faculty. Faculty members shall retain voting privileges on becoming Faculty emeriti/ae. All persons holding appointments as research associates or post-doctoral fellows are non-voting members of the Faculty.
- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): this seems to be a general amendment to the bylaws to solve a specific problem. In principle, it is a bad idea to change the general rules in response to a specific question. Can we make an *ad hoc* exception for this particular issue and not modify the by-laws? *Terry Myers (Parliamentarian): it is possible to pass a special rule of order. But our bylaws call for a vote in a meeting, and we cannot override our bylaws with a special rule of order. Unless this body deems that "voted on in a meeting" does not mean "voted on in a meeting" – which is quite possible.*
- Bruce Campbell (MLL): expresses unease at making such a fundamental change to our bylaws in the heat of the moment – which may have consequences that we have not considered. This change would be far less problematic if it were being discussed under different circumstances, e.g., had it been passed a year ago, or if we were to revisit it a year from now. This is the wrong time, and this may be the wrong amendment.
- Heather McDonald (Geology): As a general principle, if we are to speak as a body, then it is important to enable a way for every one who wishes to have a say to do so. There is a need to hear from all faculty.
- John Gilmour (Government): calls the question.

the faculty are unanimous in favor of closing the discussion.

the motion is defeated 32 (nay) to 24 (aye).

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 5:01 pm.

The secretary again thanks Trina Garrison and Jeff Herrick for the audio recording.

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia L. Irby, Secretary

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

glirby@wm.edu

Feeling like Lurch in the midst of three consecutive A&S meetings and after perhaps a little too much Halloween candy (one does not want to disappoint the Provost, much less a fellow Classicist!)

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