

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Tuesday, December 03, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Tidewater A, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Attendance at the start of the meeting: 62.

- I. The Minutes from Nov. 5 and Nov. 12 meetings of the Faculty** were approved (with one lone smart-alecky dissenter)

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/index.php>

II. Report of Administrative Officers:

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- a hope that we all had a wonderful Thanksgiving, a great opportunity to eat with enormous excess and not feel out of line with everybody else.
- because of the particularly unusual lateness of Thanksgiving (on the last possible day, legally speaking), we are now entering the whirlwind that is the end of the term.
- the governor granted an extra day of vacation (Monday, December 23), surely not because he is an outgoing governor as he cannot turn this boon into votes later on.
- the particularly happy event of announcing this year's recipient of the Shirley Aceto Award to Colleen Kennedy (English) whom he so rarely sees, and whom he relishes the opportunity to embarrass – just a little bit. Professor Kennedy is an energetic faculty leader who has been an active member of the Faculty Assembly – holding nearly office on that committee. She has been instrumental in revising the Faculty Handbook. She has contributed to the University Teaching Project, has served as Director of the Literary and Cultural Studies Program, and is currently the Director of the St. Andrews Joint Program. She exemplifies the ideals of service, excellence and advocacy that are the standards of the Shirley Aceto Award, and the Award's eponym is very, very pleased.
- the success of the panel discussion regarding the Creative Adaptation Awards, strategically scheduled just before Thanksgiving as the next deadline is hard upon us (next Monday or this – depending on your perspective – December 9). The Provost hopes to see many strong, exciting, and innovative proposals.
- that the BoV came to town shortly before Thanksgiving during which visit there was no particular excitement, no issues that galvanized the Board. There is, of course, continuing interest in 25 point 8 (to avoid the potential derogatory connotations of “section 8”), which the Board views as an integral part of the

- W&M Promise. In April, the Provost will report to the Board on “a whole bunch of things”, including 25 point 8.
- Finally, an announcement that Vice Provost Kate Slevin is to retire at the end of the academic year. It is true that new laws had to be established for her retirement: she is much too young and special gubernatorial dispensation was required. She had signed on for a three year term, and the Provost succeeded in cajoling her into a fourth. Though there shall be ample opportunity to toast, roast, and celebrate Kate formally in the coming months, the immediate responsibility is to find someone to fill that role; and this will be an internal process. The Provost invites us all to think hard and give careful thought regarding whom we would like to see in that office, either yourself (*Gentle Reader*) or a colleague who would be terrific in that role (“we can’t say ‘Kate Slevin’ – that possibility is off the table”). A committee is already in place: David Dessler, Mike Deschenes, Debbie Bebout, Sallie Marchello and Todd Mooradian.
 - end of Provost report.

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- a reiteration of the Provost’s wish that we all enjoyed a good break and Thanksgiving, that we are all ready for the end of the semester; she herself actually slept ten hours one night – something which she has not done in a very long time.
- Virginia Torczon (Computer Science) made a successful report to the BoV on the state of graduate studies at the College, emphasizing the purpose of the graduate program as critical to our reputation as a Research I University and our designation as “Public Ivy”. The blend of undergraduate and graduate programs together keeps W&M competitive, and allows us to renew our commitment to maintaining a research active faculty which is how to sustain a vibrant intellectual environment that is shared alike by faculty and graduate students.
- a summary report from Bob Scott, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the BoV, expressing his views of what the BoV expects as a result of the W&M Promise. He directly addressed our commitment to teaching as one of the Promise’s initiatives, which he balanced by saying that our (*increased*) teaching must occur without “any sacrifice to the highest standards of scholarship possible” and that there must be an effort to match teaching with the current level of scholarship. Mr. Scott also expressed desire for recognition of “invisible teaching” which should be taken into account under a flexible merit system. He acknowledged that hiring NTEs will help us accomplish the goal of more teaching, and expressed the hope that these NTEs need to be treated with respect and safeguarded with the good policies. (*The secretary refrains from editorial comment, because her upbringing adhered to the “highest standards of etiquette possible” and because many of her esteemed colleagues expressed opinions in line with her own during the Section 8 Discussion. Don’t despair, Dear Colleagues, “Klinger is not here!” to quote Jamie Farr*).
- an increase in M&O funds (last year we requested 600K but received 89K; this year we requested 500K, receiving 139K, better than 89K) which will be

dedicated to the base fund elements of M&O departments and programs that are frugally funded, relying on annual grants from the Dean's office. Hence, it is hoped that those programs might be strengthened by this enhanced financial stability.

III. Report from the Faculty Assembly

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- FA met on November 19
- Chon Glover gave an intriguing presentation on the state of diversity at the College, especially among faculty. The Assembly agreed that one meeting was not long enough for such a complex issue and that they would resume the conversation at subsequent meetings.
- the Assembly's response to Resolution 28 point 8 – outlining principles and best practices, amended slightly and approved – has been distributed to the Deans, some senior executives, and members of the Board (distributed also to us from Leisa Meyer's own hands at the beginning of this very meeting).
- further consideration of the NTE Assembly request to amend Faculty Assembly bylaws to allow for NTE representation (one or two sitting members) – this discussion will continue in January.
- future discussion with Matthew Lambert on how faculty can assist (or hopefully help to shape) faculty development campaigns.
- several imminent amendments to the Faculty Handbook that have not yet come to the FA:
 - aligning the FH with our current practice the date that salary letters are sent out.
 - aligning the FH with SSRL document on the Provost's webpage.
 - a change in one phrase in the description of appeals to the RPT from "inadequate consideration" to "violation of procedure".
 - automatic extension of probationary period for junior faculty who take unpaid medical, disability, infant, family, newly adopted child, parental care leave of 120 days or more ("WISE" proposal makes the extension automatic, without approaching chair to activate the entitlement).
- going forward on the FA agenda, consideration of:
 - the new intellectual property policy.
 - uniform complaints procedure.

questions and discussion

- Colleen Kennedy (English): requests rationale for changing the language from "inadequate consideration". *SR: Hello, Colleen. Congratulations! MH: two years ago, the PRC concluded that contextually "inadequate procedures" is in fact "in violation of procedures (not, i.e., "you didn't count my NSF grant enough", but rather, "you didn't even look at the damned thing!"). The change is more by way of clarification, though the Provost is not altogether certain that it is absolutely necessary.*

- Debbie Bebout (Chemistry): requested clarification on the cascading effects of the extension of the tenure clock. E.g., if a faculty member takes a 120 day medical leave but returns to work after two weeks, is the clock automatically extended? *SR: this entitlement is now policy, and the faculty member would then have to request the regular (e.g., non-extended) tenure clock.* Professor Bebout respectfully requests that this issue be given due consideration.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): requests an explanation of the Assembly's rationale. *Jennifer Stevens (Psychology): some junior faculty may not be aware of the entitlement, may not want to request it from their chairs, or feel comfortable doing so, this changes the mechanism for extending the tenure clock as a result of a medical leave with a bias towards not jumping through hoops.*

Dean Conley also extends congratulations to Professor Kennedy who waves to the Dean.

IV. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- 3 meetings since the November 05 report to A&S, wherein the following items were discussed/accomplished:
 - an invitation to the co-chairs of the NTE assembly to meet with the FAC to discuss their concerns.
 - new overhead policy for grants.
 - policy that requires chair approval for summer research grants within a department.
 - arranged for sources of internal research grants to be advertised to the faculty through the Office of Sponsored Programs
 - possibility of developing a website in the A&S section with links to sources of internal faculty research funding.
 - proposed recommendations of the Committee for Teaching and the W&M Promise – to be presented later in this very meeting.
 - reviewed the new Terminal Degree Policy for TE faculty hires.
 - discussed the WISE amendment (described by Professor Raitt a moment ago).
 - the process for bringing the Curriculum Revision document to a vote (a much anticipated conclusion) at the special faculty meetings of December 9 or (**more likely and very hopefully**) December 12.

questions and discussion

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): requests clarification regarding discussion of the overhead policy. *BS: concerns regarding the overhead policy. Greg Hancock (Geology): compilation of a list of questions for the Provost.*

V. Report from Nominations & Elections

Jennifer Stevens reported the following:

- the first slate of elections in the changing of the guard: Faculty Affairs Committee (two openings) and one replacement on ISAC.
- there were no nominations from the floor.

- Monica Potkay, our trusty *magistra cooptationum collegiorum*, will have the ballot available immediately after the meeting (as indeed she did!).

VI. Report from the Committee on Academic Status

Jenn Mellor reported the following:

- the committee's purpose is to vet petitions from students seeking exceptions to academic rules and regulations outside the degree requirements and to review the academic progress of struggling students.
- for 2012-13: 823 petitions, including 205 petitions for late adds, 167 petitions for overloads ("our students are apparently working hard to get out quickly"), plus petitions for underloads and late withdrawals.
- stable trends in total number of petitions and suspensions over the last three years.
- slight increase in late add and late withdrawal petitions (she encourages the faculty to check their rosters to assist in this regard).
- slight decreases in retroactive medical withdrawals.
- plea to submit grades by the deadlines (as **we** – at the meeting – likely will), and a request that we urge our absent colleagues, especially visiting faculty who may not be aware of the exigency of timely grade submissions.
- see further:
http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/academicstatus/reports/2012-13_annual_report.pdf

VII. Report from the FAC Working Group on Faculty Teaching and the Promise (*which was distributed as an attachment with the agenda of today's meeting*).

Introduced by Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies). After the report, faculty will have an opportunity to discuss and make suggestions to the committee which the committee will then take under advisement before sending the report to the Dean and Provost who will provide their own feedback. We, then, the faculty, will have the opportunity to consider administrative feedback and respond to it (at the February meeting). The complete report is due to the BoV by April.

Leisa Meyer and Janice Zeman thank their working group members for their diligent work: "a big topic, a big job". As Professor Meyer prepares to summarize the report, she gleefully exclaims "We have a PowerPoint!" While waiting for the projector to engage, she thanks all of us for coming to the meeting and then introduces the committee who have been hard at work since September ("which seems like a very long time"), all of whom seem to be sitting on the front row ("like a human shield").

Here follows the summary of the report:

The BoV's Promise (section 8):

- tuition increase.

- planned series of increase number of in-state undergraduates enrolled in the College by 150 over the next four years (in addition to increase enrollments already in place).
- planned series of raises for faculty and staff bringing us up to the 60th percentile of our SCHEV-defined peer group.

The *quid pro quo* (yes, lots of Latin in today's minutes):

- the raises are contingent upon our response to the challenge of meeting increasing enrollments – with a largely static faculty.

Professor Meyer's observations (after five years without raises):

- the charge of the committee was to draft a response to section 8.
- as a faculty going through five years without raises, we have managed to maintain our commitment both to our students and to our scholarship.
- we remain the top ranked school for undergraduate teaching (we did not lose that).
- since the BoV seems to want more teaching from the faculty, the Working Group's intent was to draft a response that incentivizes teaching (an approach also adopted in the best practices document distributed at the beginning of this meeting). Given the commitment of our faculty to our students, our research, and our teacher-scholar model, they felt it would be "obscene" (Leisa's word) to draft a response that might use teaching (extra teaching) as a punishment.
- the response will be most successful if it has the support of the faculty.

Janice Zeman's highlights of The Report:

- Documenting engagement outside the classroom (e.g., "invisible teaching") – research collaboration, service learning, study abroad, supervising honors theses and independent studies. Such courses have been steadily rising over the years, and little credit has been awarded for these time-intensive experiences. The full range of teaching, including Summer School and Study Abroad, should be included in merit evaluations.
- Flexible Merit System –allowing for an increased teaching component in the merit score for faculty who teach more, only for tenured faculty who have strong teaching evaluations for the past two years (up to 7.5 on our 15 point scale)
- Compensated Teaching overload – e.g., higher compensation for faculty who take on an extra course regardless of readjustment of merit weighting (a salary supplement of up to \$6,000; also with an allocation of matching research funds to the departmental budget **not** to be drawn from the salary pool).
- Teaching Excellence Chairs – to reward the best teachers with salary supplements and funds to develop and teach new courses, etc.
- Promoting Student-Faculty Research Collaboration – student collaboration in faculty research has been steadily rising, and this incurs considerable costs in

materials and travel. The Charles Center program of faculty-student research support should be enhanced through additional funds provided by the Dean's and Provost's offices as well as specific Development initiatives.

- Matters for further consideration:
 - graduate students as a resource for faculty and undergraduate students.
 - these proposed changes should be re-evaluated in three years.

discussion:

- David Armstrong (Physics): praises the wonderful report, many aspects of which he heartily endorses, but considers one provisions as ill-advised and as setting a bad precedent: allowing a teaching overload (for extra compensation) in conjunction with a research underload strongly suggests (to the BoV, junior faculty, and to the rest of the world) that research is worth less to the Institution than teaching. By this logic, NTEs who carry a 3-3 load should expect to be compensated more. These two proposals should be decoupled: a true course overload would involve teaching additional courses while maintaining expectations of research productivity. As a side issue, service also seems to be privileged over research, since there is no option to reduce the service merit score. *LM: the document was not created in vacuo hence the proposal to add matching research funds for faculty results from earlier discussions along these very lines. The working group is hardly suggesting that teaching should be valued more than research.*
- John Gilmour (Government): the working group were concerned that simply reweighting the merit score without a salary supplement might not provide sufficient inducement. Quite possibly no one would avail himself of this "opportunity".
- Joel Schwartz (Government): with a complementary view to Professor Armstrong's, but with no desire to comment on the optics of the BoV—*LM: despite not wanting to interrupt, she does anyway, to add that the Committee did meet with Bob Scott to discuss what he sees as the charge regarding section 8* – Professor Schwartz observes overlap between this report and the work of the Merit System Working Group which he co-chaired last year. Overloads tend to occur at schools we'd prefer **not** to emulate, and it is essential that we retain a proper balance between research, teaching, and service as provided by our 15 point scale. Additional monies should go into the salary pool rather than be used to turn TE faculty into glorified adjuncts. And the merit evaluation system should not be allowed to exceed 15 total points. This proposal seems to offer double compensation.
- Suzanne Hagedorn (English): sharing these concerns but wishing to bring up another issue. Faculty who agree to summer teaching or to leading study abroad programs are already receiving extra compensation (thus it is a cause of concern that this teaching be included in the merit score), and this disadvantages faculty who cannot participate (because of family obligations) or will not participate (because of logistics – e.g., being uncomfortable with

carrying 4000 euros around your neck because the program lacks a bank account). Although such teaching should be considered in promotion cases as service to the institution, this proposal seems to offer an opportunity to “double-dip”. *LM: such teaching is not meant to be considered in addition but as part of the teaching we already do.*

- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): also thanks the Committee for all their tremendous hard work and observes how important the issue is by the population that has gathered here today. Professor Riofrio observes that service has been completely eliminated from the discussion, a worrisome situation, and that the document suggests we either do teaching or research – he is “blown away” by our level of service to the College, this is the work that keeps things moving (though the same handful of people seem to pop up on all the committees). How are we expected to handle all of this, and then, on top of it, add an extra course? Where is this supposed to go? Service must be part of the discussion. *LM: assures that the report calls for service numbers never to fall below 3.*
- Jonathan Glasser (Anthropology): assures the faculty that he will probably not be storming out when he has to leave in a few moments. Professor Glasser observes many things of merit (pun intended) in the document, but notes that what brought the document into being is a great example of hutzpah (“*adrogantia*”). A raise contingent on increased teaching is not a raise. (*applause*) A forced increase in teaching is a strike worthy issue.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): also with kudos to the Committee for their hard work, suggests that a better way of addressing some of the issues behind the BoV’s *quid pro quo* may be to adopt a model of four credit courses as part of the regular course load (discussed before, and perhaps not the most popular suggestion). Four hour courses would result in more contact hours with the students and more teaching, and may enable us to do more of the teaching that makes us truly unique. And we might even be able to address the issues that the additional growth in the student body presents. From the perspectives of some disciplines and programs, this may be difficult, but it is worth considering, “particularly when we are faced with something like this”. *LM: “something like this’. thank you for that vote of confidence.”*
- Bruce Campbell (MLL and also European Studies): joining the choir of praise for the Committee’s hard work, suggests that if we are to attach a price tag to overload teaching, then we should also consider doing so for Honor’s Theses and Independent Studies, as a mechanism to make “invisible teaching” visible. As a faculty, we have gone “around and around” on this issue, and should continue “to go around and around” until we find some way of compensating for this kind of overload. Although directing an honor’s thesis is not the same as teaching a four-credit course to 100 students, independent studies and honor’s theses constitute overloads, are critical to what we do, and are part of what makes us different from other institutions. *LM: observes the echoes in the comments as balancing what we already do against what the*

BoV is asking us to do (to teach more). “Personally, I’m with Jonathan on this one”.

- Bob Archibald (Economics): we need to think carefully about these incentives since the departments control minimum enrollments. What if five faculty members in a department ask to teach overloads and the Chair agrees (aiming for the extra \$30,000), setting the enrollments not at 20 but rather at about at three? “We won’t necessarily end up with more students, just more courses. This constitutes a conflict of interest.”
- ζ: the curricular interests of the departments will be balanced against the curricular needs of the College. There is an additional step regarding compensation requests for overloads (through the Chairs to the Dean to the Provost), and this will not turn into a free-for-all to take money from the Provost.
- LM addressees the fact some courses naturally have lower enrollments – e.g., advanced Latin and Greek – because of the intensive study.
- Suzanne Raitt (English): observes that we cannot teach students who are not here nor those who are uninterested in enrolling in our classes. We are reacting to how to manage additional enrollments. “I don’t know what I will do with this information, but I am proud that I figured it out”.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): observes that this *quid pro quo* was made without our consent. For the last ten years, we as a faculty have been doing a lot to make sure that the hardships hoisted upon us have not affected our students as much as perhaps they should have been. Instead of thanking us for our dedication, the Board are now going to punish us by making us work even more. Regarding the *quid pro quo* “agreement”, if our salaries are not increased to the 60th percentile, then do we still have to do this? As a body we need to respond.
- John McGlennon (Government): we need to change the discussion. The BoV does not seem to be very clear regarding what it wants. They are supporting the hiring of NTEs to do more teaching, but they are also demanding more teaching from TEs. We must demonstrate that TEs are responsible for a higher portion of student education and the importance of exposing the students to the permanent faculty, the teacher-scholars of the University. If we are serious about putting forth a model of education that will create a lifelong connection between our students and the institution, this will only happen through our tenure eligible faculty. This does not necessarily mean **more** courses, but rather **more time** with the students on a **more personal** basis, and Professor McGlennon thinks we can make compelling arguments. (*applause*)
- Adam Potkay (English): assumes that the Board would eventually like to cut back on faculty lines as a long-term method of cutting costs. Weaker teachers may attract fewer students and eventually none.
- LM thanks the faculty for these terrific comments. The BoV seems perfectly willing to have everyone teach one or two more courses, across the board, with the research stars enjoying reduced loads as at UVa and Columbia Law School.

Bob Scott's wishes are better than what he conveys as the desires of the rest of the Board— just increased teaching. There is, however, a practical reality regarding how we respond to the Board who believes that this quid pro quo is fair and who happen to be our boss in many ways.

- Gene Tracy (Physics): also observes that our discussion has been fruitful and that the Committee has done a great job in responding to a Board that does not send clear signals. quoting Bob Scott “The Board will never tell you what to do, they’ll just reduce your budget”. During his time in Ewell, when students were having trouble getting into second, third, and fourth choices for classes, he asked the faculty to increase the number of available seats by 10% (which we did). We are already teaching more, and now they want even more yet. This is simply to fund one piece of the Strategic Plan – to attract and retain the best faculty. It is particularly worrisome that we are resetting the culture in A&S to a new normal where the balance between teaching and scholarship is broken. Rhetorically the report emphasizes the balance, but programmatically, the policy clearly values teaching more than research. There is no countervailing, an extra \$6,000, for finally publishing that monograph. *LM: we can add that to the report.* The BoV should be reminded of how we increased the number of seats available **for free** from their perspective. In the following registration period there was **one** complaint from a student who could not get into a preferred course—**one** complaint – “Michael, you reported that at a faculty meeting. I would like to know if the Board remembers that”. It is worrisome that we seem to be buying into this view that we are not teaching enough, that we should somehow all become quasi-adjuncts. More teaching will equate to being paid for service. This undermines the sense that we are teacher-scholars. We are all in this together. And it is preferable to set a global target of providing x% more seats available over the next few years, with some idea of how we are going to do it, and leave it at that. “I am worried about the incentives built into the proposal that undermine the research program, and am particularly worried about the fragility of the research program in Humanities”. (*applause*)
- Kathleen Jenkins (Sociology): suggests that the narrative needs to be switched, that we must quantify and narrate what we do (research, teaching, invisible teaching, service), take charge, and collect more data. *LM: counting what we already do does not equal teaching more to the Board. The Board wants us to make the invisible visible and then they want **more** teaching. “Now I see Barbette, so we are going to have to wrap this up” (to which your secretary responds “yes, please” after frantically scribbling 28 pages of notes and trying to keep up with the breakneck discussion).*
- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) moves to adjourn the meeting.
- the motion is seconded.

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 5:02 pm.

The secretary again thanks Trina Garrison and the cheerful staff at Technical Services for the audio recording.

Respectfully Submitted,

Georgia L. Irby, Secretary

Associate Professor of Classical Studies

glirby@wm.edu

Still not quite recovered from the Thanksgiving tryptophan hangover (but thankful for so many things, including my wonderful department, fabulous colleagues, creative students, a recovered paternal heirloom feared to have been long, long lost, and even these squalls that are our faculty conversations – like any good sailor, I’ll take a gale over the doldrums any day), and buoying up for the frenzy of next week’s review sessions, exams, and brace of special curriculum discussion meetings – a double whammy! “Mamma mia”, to quote an Italian friend – in other words, vulgar Latin. *Vivo ut servem*.

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