

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Monday, December 09, 2013, 1200 – 1350 (i.e., noon – 1:50 pm)
Commonwealth Auditorium, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.
Attendance at the start of the meeting: 126.

Continued discussion of document on proposed new curriculum (Diane Shakes and John Gilmour). The focus will be on the Additional Requirements.

Documents are all available on the Curriculum Review Blackboard site:

https://blackboard.wm.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp?tab_group_id=2_1&url=%2Fwebapps%2Fblackboard%2Fexecute%2Flauncher%3Ftype%3DCourse%26id%3D19341_1%26url%3D

John Gilmour opens what will prove to be another lively and interesting meeting with a reminder that our main purpose is to consider the proposed curriculum. He expresses the hope that we will be able to deal with ancillary issues fairly quickly, otherwise we may be deprived of voting on the curriculum before the end of term, an unfortunate eventuality in his opinion as co-chair of the EPC.

In response to our lively discussion of less than a week ago on the ad hoc committee's response to resolution 25 point 8, **Provost Michael Halleran** addresses the concerns over resources, promising to be **exceedingly** brief so we can quickly turn to our important agenda.

- Provost Halleran wishes to make **exceedingly clear** (if he may) that the W&M Promise does not mandate, require, imply, suggest, or imagine – having run out of verbs, he will restrict himself to those five– that there will be a universal increase in our course loads and teaching (although, to be honest, at least two Board members would like it so). Each school now has the opportunity to respond to that issue, but there is no expectation whatsoever that everyone will “teach more”. In his own view, the **actual impact** will be “modest”. He recalls, on a personal note (*the day is shaping up to be a good one for personal anecdotes*), that it was almost five years ago to the day that he received a phone call from Vice-Provost Slevin to come to campus. He was then attracted by (and continues to delight in) the εἶδος of William and Mary, where we engage students profoundly through a combination of teaching and scholarship. We may not be unique in this regard, but our εἶδος is hardly common. And it is his strong goal to strengthen this model even in an era when there are real budgetary restraints and where the global political climate is not the “friendliest” (*a nice litotes!*).
- regarding the influx of additional students as part of the Promise (150 in-state [VA] students and 50 out-of-staters), a \$400K per 50 students increment will be added to the budget – confirmed with both the President and Sam Jones.
- regarding funding for the proposed new curriculum, there is no point in adopting a curriculum that we can in no way implement; it would indeed be a huge waste of

time and energy and talent. Yet it is still premature to know exactly what the costs will be. However, those costs will be developmental, transitional, and ongoing.

- developmental (estimated at 400K): some existing funds will be repurposed (e.g., for Faculty Fellows) and others are being identified from private sources. The Provost applauds us for not just tinkering “at the margins”. We are proposing something new, and this will require a fair amount of development. The Provost’s office is reasonably confident that the Mellon foundation, presently committed to curricular innovation, will look favorably on our efforts. Our very own Joel Schwartz (Government) has a “frighteningly good talent” at taking such ideas and making them persuasive to funding agencies.
- transitional: we cannot know what the costs will be in the period of overlap. But the Provost is committed to ensuring that this can happen (*smoothly and reasonably painlessly, the secretary assumes*).
- permanent costs: where primarily lay the Provost’s attentions and concerns – “to run the thing in steady state”. For example, it may cost 60K to bring distinguished individuals to campus for the COLL 300 colloquium – sources for most of this expense have been identified. How much COLL 400 (an aspect with which he is most pleased)? 600K? He would love to be able to say that every W&M alumnus graduates with a substantive research experience. How many currently have this opportunity? The Provost will give a mystery prize to whoever (*quisquis*) may know that magic number. This is a challenge to quantify as the definition is ambiguous and how/whence to gather data is fluid. Finally, how many new classes will be required? How many old ones will be cut? We cannot afford to do all the courses we currently offer in addition to the new COLL courses.
- With contrition for speaking longer than he would have liked (*perfect subjunctive!*), and there being no questions, the Provost seamlessly directs us back to our “important agenda”.

Dean Kate Conley, at the invitation of the EPC, also addresses the faculty.

- new costs are linked with the growing student body linked with the Promise for which expenses the Provost has already provided (see above).
- costs are also linked to the proposed curriculum (see above).
- there will be a meeting between the EPC, the ad hoc committee and the Provost tomorrow (Dec 10, 2013 – *will have been, of course*), at the invitation of Barbette Spaeth, regarding resolution 25 point 8 of the Promise (on which there was a lively and thoughtful discussion last Tuesday, December 3). The Dean is committed to keeping this a faculty-driven process (as is the Provost), and the ad hoc committee continues to discuss and fine-tune their resolution.

John Gilmour invites discussion and questions on the statements from the Dean and the Provost. “Silence”. Then he quickly turns to the proficiencies and additional requirements which are not inherently central to the proposed general education curriculum but nonetheless demand our attention.

Additional Credits in Knowledge Domain

- an additional kind of distribution requirement.
- such courses are not purpose-built but are already offered by Departments and programs.
- no course may satisfy more than one Domain.
- Diane Shakes (Biology): clarifies that these courses, unlike COLL classes, can be satisfied by AP *aut similibus* credit.
- passes without discussion.

Foreign Language Requirement

- Bill Cooke (Physics): proposes that this requirement be stricken since “only 20% of our students enter W&M without having fulfilled it already. Unless someone can justify why there is a foreign language requirement when 80% of our students don’t have to satisfy it, what is it that we are actually doing? Is it effective?” His child satisfied the requirement with high school Latin which “does not satisfy the diversity issues that we typically talk about”. (*the secretary respectfully but strongly disagrees*). “I don’t know what it’s doing here and I’d like to strike it”.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): *mercifully says much of what the secretary was thinking and diffuses this delicate situation with a great deal more finesse and calm than the secretary could muster at the time*. Knowledge of a foreign language is a prerequisite of a liberal arts education, and puts students in the position to pursue further study, as in the COLL 300 curriculum, and to prepare them for global citizenship. Ideally, our students should enter W&M with a foreign language, but we cannot require all students to have already met a foreign language proficiency since not all High Schools offer a four year sequence. Until now, we have agreed that foreign language is a prerequisite to a global, liberal arts education. The requirement is important not so much for its own sake or because of the “terribly important” skills it imparts but because it is the gateway precisely to diversity, culturally intense classes, internationalization, etc., that we do consider as core principles in our undergraduate education. In modern languages, the fourth semester must be completed at the College to be consistent with the principles stated for the GER requirements. Professor Tandeciarz is quite willing to bring the foreign language proficiency in line with the Mathematics proficiency which can be fulfilled by high school study, transfer, AP or IB credit.
- *but – your secretary here – high school language courses are not the same as college language courses. For those of you collecting personal anecdotes, your secretary also oversees Latin Placement, and on the day following this meeting, one student – who claims to have completed four years of Latin in high school – sat for the placement exam, placing into third semester Latin, despite the years of high school study clearly lacking the skills to “pursue further study” Q.E.D. Those students who lack a college level foreign language experience leave the institution with a “reduced” experience, to quote another colleague in Physics. And, furthermore, **not** to require a foreign language gives the egregious (and, the secretary hopes, **false**) message that W&M does not value foreign language, that we do not value other cultures and “other ways of*

*doing and thinking". To suggest that studying French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, or Romanian is "diversifying", but studying the parent language is not, is – to the secretary's mind – absurd. Modern romance languages are less grammatically complex and therefore just a beat or two closer to English – and therefore less **linguistically** diversifying, at any rate, than Latin. Besides, Roman culture is far removed from our own and to judge the Romans according to our own narrow prism of prejudices is naïve. Or do we want to suggest that our students only study non-Indo-European languages to have a meritorious or "diversifying" language experience? Arabic, Chinese, Basque, Hungarian, Finnish, Ugaritic? Out of the diversifying mix then, clearly, are Old English, German, Frisian, French (and perhaps now even Spanish) and Arabic which has given us so much **very** common vocabulary – e.g., admiral, alchemy, alcohol, assassin, average, candy, coffee, elixir, gauze, guitar, lemon, magazine, monsoon, ream, scarlet, serendipity, sugar, sorbet, tuna, zenith, zero (Greco-Roman math lacked the concept of "zero") –end of vocabulary lesson which merely scratches the surface. In the light of all of our discussion about cross-culturalism and globalization, it seems (to the secretary) – to use Leisa Meyer's word from the December 3, 2013 meeting – "obscene" to strike the Foreign Language Proficiency. The secretary expresses contrition for her philippic, but, Gentle Reader, she feels better having finally had her say, if not quite in public, at least "on the record".*

- the nays have it.

Mathematics Requirement

- the EPC offer a slight change in suggesting the designation "M" for courses "in which students formulate mathematical arguments and use mathematical procedures in the solution or exploration of problems external to mathematics".
- no fireworks.

Active Learning (AL) Requirement

- Diane Shakes offers the EPC amendment that students be required to take an "active learning" course **outside** the student's Domain of specialization in order that they will be made to explore areas outside the comfort zone. Departments are stretching between Domains, but a student's program should fall within a single Domain.
- Will Hausman (Economics): will double majors be required to take an AL course in the third Domain? *JG: as of now, double majors have to declare a **primary** major, and the AL course can be in the second major.*
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): such courses will likely be taken early in the student's college career, and this restriction may cause problems for students who change majors and then must scramble to take an AL course in another Domain later. *JG: Diane, what would you suggest? DS: emphasizes that many COLL 200 courses will be activity courses "if possible", so it is likely that students who change majors will already have two such courses.*
- Mark Sher (Physics): observes that under this change it may be possible for science majors to take nothing more than labs (e.g., a Chemistry major might take a Bio lab to fulfill the AL requirement). Most science majors are so focused on math/science, math/science, math/science that they are terrified of GER 6. Professor Sher advises

his students to get that requirement out of the way quickly, and then their lives are transformed as one music class leads to joining an ensemble...

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): requests the rationale, suggesting that it opens us up to a bureaucratic nightmare and becomes a box-checking exercise at its worst. If this is a distribution requirement or about “ways of knowing” in some secret disguise, it belongs in the COLL 200 language. If this is about a “way of doing” then there should be no restriction – students should “get their hands dirty” by playing an instrument, doing experiments or working in the community. If the intent is to ensure that students have an engaging AL experience, then we shouldn’t care about the source, and imposing this restriction (“outside primary Domain”) misses the point. Not all departments and programs have courses that might offer AL (Economics majors may not inherently have such an experience). She proposes to remove the restrictions – ~~“must be fulfilled outside the student’s departmental major or, for those majoring in an interdisciplinary program, outside the major requirements”~~.
- John Swaddle (Biology): echoes these sentiments. Students in interdisciplinary programs may find ways around these restrictions – taking the path of least resistance. And it poses an advising nightmare (he advises about 70 majors, for whom it would take a great deal of time to ensure that they’ve all fulfilled the AL requirement in the right Domains). Domains and majors are not so closely aligned. Domains are about general ways of understanding and exploring the world, and some majors may fall within a single Domain, but many may fall into sections of Domains, or it may be difficult to say into which Domain a major falls. *JG: the Registrar has assured the EPC that policing this requirement is not a problem and that it can and will be done by that office.*
- Bill Cooke (Physics): speaking strongly in favor of the change (an extra AL course “outside” the comfort zone), suggests that if it is so difficult for students to accrue a sufficient quantity of AL experiences then “we’ve got a problem that we need to address”. And we seem to be missing an important point by decoupling active learning from the general education curriculum. “This is the time to draft a curriculum that joins together many of the fundamental ideas that we all believe in”.
- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): points out that Professor Stafford’s question has not been answered, that she for one would like to hear the answer, and that she fails to see what is gained by requiring an AL experience outside the major. Is this about distribution or methodology? This requirement complicates the spirit of flexibility that is at the core of the proposed curriculum.
- Catherine Levesque (Art and Art History): hates to think of learning that is not “active”. Are we distinguishing “hands on” practicum experiences from other types of learning experiences?
- Lily Panoussi (Classics): are you asking that the requirement be rewritten?
- Cathy Levesque: I didn’t think I was, but maybe I am.
- Lily Panoussi (Classics): this language is included in direct response to general principle 9 “Provide an active learning experience beyond the student’s area of expertise”. Perhaps not a successful response, but there is no hidden agenda.
- Mike Tierney (Government and International Relations): agreeing with Sarah and John on the substance. But the faculty has voted on a principle to which the EPC is

trying to adhere. The requirement seems to be an effort on the part of some faculty members in some disciplines to ensure that students take courses in areas where the demand might not otherwise exist in the market (such as music, e.g., his own son, a history major, takes “tons” of courses in music – though we should not base policy “on anecdotes”). Yet students are also allowed to choose the Domain which they feel best represents their academic plans and interests (a sophomore in college and perhaps even some college professors can figure out how this is going to be “gamed”), and those students might choose a Domain whose requirements they have not fulfilled in spirit (*again, the path of least resistance*). *JG: it is incumbent upon advisors to reject the specious declarations of deceptive advisees.* Faculty out of sympathy with the requirement may nonetheless support such declarations. As a friendly amendment the language needs to be changed to require the distribution. *JG: I had not counted on the duplicity of the faculty!*

- Colleen Kennedy (MLL & Film and Media Studies): in support of Professor Stafford’s Amendment, the Registrar’s assurance that requirements can be policed does not lift the burden of advising, especially for interdisciplinary students. No one has spoken against AL (including Economists). This is a complicated and overly restrictive requirement.
- ¿Chris Tucker (Philosophy)?: Some of the discussion seems based on the assumption that majors are more specific than Domains. In philosophy, one could do one AL in moral stuff and the other in “sciency” or “quantitative” stuff (Philosophy of Science or the Philosophy of Probability). The current wording does not guarantee that students in some of the majors will fulfill the spirit of the AL distribution outside the area of comfort/expertise.
- David Armstrong (Physics): notes that among the advantages of the present curriculum is the requirement of both a creative/performing arts experience (Area I = GER 6) and an analytic/data-driven/lab (Area III) experience. “If we abandon this model, then we allow our students to leave with a **reduced experience**”. If the students are required to have only **one** AL experience, then an additional two-part requirement is advisable: 1) collecting and analyzing/processing data; 2) creative/artistic experience.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): the AL requirement privileges Areas I and III to the exclusion of Area II. And collecting data in area II (“talking to people”) is a very different experience from collecting data in Area III. If we think it valuable for students to have an AL experience in each Domain, then we should put it in COLL 200. This requirement seems like an attempt to recreate the GERs. Putting this in additional requirement will make this a “check off box”, and we all said that we did not want check off boxes (*secretary’s note: as long as there are **requirements**, the “check off” boxes are inevitable. Her own students were quite excited to hear that the faculty are discussing a new curriculum – until they learned that there would still be **requirements***).
- Rob Leventhal (MLL): AL experiences can cross various Domains. The very meaning that the AL experience would have to be in a different Domain is itself problematic. In 2008, on a 9-day trip to Munich, 5 of his students engaged in active learning in Social Science, Cultural Studies, intensive language, History – where would such an

experience fall within the terms of the different Domains? He urges the separation of the two issues, and that the AL experience be opened up to the general education requirement, “which is really what it ought to be”.

- Joan Gavalier (Theater Speech and Dance): notes that she initially thought that the AL requirement would be redundant because “surely we all teach in this way”. But our concerns that students will do so little of it that they won’t even be able to change majors strongly suggests that AL be an **essential** component of the general education expectations. Perhaps we should revisit COLL 200 to decide whether we value AL highly or “if it’s ok if some students do it and others don’t”. She personally wants to see students try the things that “scare them” and observes that her dancers become better choreographers after taking physics labs. She hopes that we are doing more of this than is apparent from the trajectory of our current conversation.
- Tim Costelloe (Philosophy): inquires if Professor Stafford’s amendment includes the suggestion of restoring the additional AL experiences to COLL 200.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): the amendment is just to strike.
- *JG: the EPC did not want to require all COLL 200 courses to carry an AL component.*
- John Riofrio (Modern Languages and Literatures): admitting to being more confused now than at the outset of this debate. He clearly and accurately sums the argument thusly: on the whole, we are supportive of AL experiences; on the whole we are in favor of encouraging AL experiences outside interdisciplinary comfort zones; but the arguments against hinge on the fact that the requirement seems complicated and constraining. Now, his procedural query: What happens to the AL component if we vote this down? He would prefer the complications and headaches to no AL component.
- *JG: we have three choices: 1) AL outside major; 2) AL outside Domain; 3) AL anywhere. Are we ready for a vote? All in favor...*
- of what? (raucous laughter)
- EPC motion (~~This requirement must be fulfilled outside the student’s departmental major or, for those majoring in an interdisciplinary program, outside the major requirements.~~ **When students declare a major, they choose which domain best represents their academic plans and interests. Their active learning experience must be in a different domain.**) is voted down.
- Sarah Stafford formally offers her amendment to strike: ~~This requirement must be fulfilled outside the student’s departmental major or, for those majoring in an interdisciplinary program, outside the major requirements.~~
- Professor Stafford’s motion carries.

Other Proficiencies

- EPC endorses all existing proficiencies **except** major computing requirement (no longer required by SCHEV, and there is no reason for curriculum and catalog to direct departments to have such a requirement).
- no discussion.
- the motion to strike the major computing requirement carries unanimously.
- JG announces triumphantly: “It’s passed, and the major computing requirement is gone.”

Overlap (or “double dipping”)

- Sarah Stafford (Economics): since COLL 400 will likely be filled by major capstone experiences and many COLL 200 courses will be revamped from courses required of majors, this two-course limit will be overly restrictive, will likely pose a challenge to departments to offer a sufficient number of courses, and perhaps should be increased to 3 or probably 4.
- David Armstrong (Physics): inquires about the motivation for the restriction. COLL 400 will likely be drawn from required courses that may already exist, and COLL 200 will, he imagines, be versions of courses we may want to require of our majors. What does “toward the major” mean? These cannot be included in the number of credits a major requires? Or specifically that such courses cannot be **required** as part of the major? *JG: the intent is to prevent students from piling up COLL courses in their (intended) majors, and perhaps we should change the document to exempt COLL 400. The number of credits for a major is sufficiently high that this should not be unduly restrictive.*
- Bill Cooke (Physics): objects to the restriction on the basis of the same arguments above (COLL 400: senior project; COLL 300: Study Abroad, surely these courses **should** be allowed to be counted to the major; COLL 200: courses we may want our majors to do anyway). “Sorry, Sarah, but I have to support you on this one”.
- Will Hausman (Economics): proposes to strike the last sentence: ~~“A maximum of two courses may be counted toward the COLL requirements and toward the major.”~~
- John Swaddle (Biology): not wishing to contradict himself, recognizes that COLL 400 will likely be within the major. By putting a restriction on how many COLL courses can count toward the major, we might actually force students to take classes in other areas that they might not necessarily do. Without the limitation, students in pretty much any major track could be able to fulfill about 1/3 of the college curriculum in their majors. “I’m not comfortable with that”.
- Kitty Preston (Music): observes that we seem to be eliminating the requirement for diversity (breadth), but we are not discussing the need to be educated. Students are hearing about getting jobs after graduation (and, yes, that is important), but they are not hearing about the need to be educated. We are gradually chipping away at the breadth/diversity that is the hallmark of a liberal arts education. Even if we exempt COLL 400 – three courses is still a lot of double dipping. She would prefer that we not eliminate so many of the requirements intended to get students out of their comfort zones.
- David Feldman (Economics): detects a timing problem. COLL 100 and 200 should be completed **before** students choose areas of concentration, times of intense study when students are trying out lots of different topics. We can alleviate the problem by striking COLL 300 and 400 from the list.
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): is it possible to take more than one COLL 100/150? *DS: a moot point since relatively few departments count 150 towards the major. JG: COLL 300 does not matter in this regard since there is no course labelled 300 that they will take.*
- Josh Erlich (Physics): calls the question on the Hausman amendment.

- debate is ended.
- the vote is 62 to 47 in favor of eliminating the restriction. ~~“A maximum of two courses may be counted toward the COLL requirements and toward the major.”~~
- ¿can an unlimited number of COLLS count toward the major?
- David Armstrong (Physics): moves to add the following sentence: “a maximum of three courses may be counted” and that COLL 400 will be stricken from the list. 150 rarely counts towards the major. This should satisfy distribution concerns without being overly restrictive.
- John McGlennon (Government): regarding freshman seminars not being eligible for major requirements, clarifies that some departments (including his own) offer freshman seminars that are equivalent to introductory courses. Professor McGlennon would not want to see these freshman seminars eliminated as a possibility for Government majors.
- Kay Jenkins (Sociology): inquires further about COLL 300 not counting towards the major. *JG: Study Abroad courses will be designated ENGL or HIST aut sim., but not COLL. The registrar will record that COLL 300 has been satisfied via Study Abroad. Only W&M Colloquia will be designated COLL 300, but these will not satisfy major requirements in any event, and these courses, it is imagined, will not in any way intrude on satisfying major requirements.*
- Joan Gavalier (Theater, Speech, and Dance): there is no difference between the amendment now under consideration and not having the language about that final sentence in any form: students can take COLL 100, 150, a 200, 400 is off the list and 300 isn't on the list in the first place, the maximum has been ratcheted up to three, so what are we talking about? (applause and some laughter) *JG: regarding multiple COLL 200s – in government it is possible to take a course in ALV and CSI.*
- Kim Wheatley (English): does the original intent of restricting the overlap between General Education and the Major requirements represent a response to SCHEV or SACS mandates? *No restrictions.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): regarding freshman seminars, what about the ramifications that 150 is specified in one place, 150W in another? What about 151, designating freshmen seminars taught in another language? *JG: under the new curriculum, all freshmen seminars will satisfy a writing requirement, currently some do not. Will 151 count for the writing requirement? Interesting question. I'd like this to be clear in the curriculum. And it should be. Lu Ann Homza (History, Dean for Educational Policy): it was intended for courses in foreign languages with powerful writing components to count for COLL 150. She suggests that the 151s simply be renumbered as 150s.*
- Elizabeth Radcliffe (Philosophy): inquires if the “double-dipping” applies to both primary and secondary majors. *JG: preferring not to answer so complicated a question without having first had an opportunity to think about it punts the question to Diane.*
- ¿Arthur Knight (English? – incognito, as were so many of our colleagues today in their Clark Kent disguises – did I spy a slip of red silk under that coat as Professor X rushed off to administer a final exam?): Somebody will no doubt figure out how to count three COLL courses to two majors. *JG: students who are that creative should perhaps*

be allowed to get away with it. For the most part, it would be difficult to line up course selection in such a way as to enable that much double counting.

- the question is called.
- debate is ended.
- and the motion carries – 51 to 48: (someone calls for a recount! *laughter*). The sentence is restored with the Armstrong changes: “A maximum of three courses may be counted”, and COLL 400 is stricken from the list.

Ten-semester rule and 72 hour rule

- George Rublein (Mathematics): does the 48 hour rule remain by default? *JG: there has been some discussion about relaxing the 48 hour rule and not counting Honors under this rubric, but the EPC considers this an issue that should be addressed separately.*

Miscellaneous discussion and the Writing Proficiency – or “English-only” – debate

- Teresa Longo (Modern Languages and Literatures): if all 150s are now to be writing intensive, should we strike the “W”? *JG: a good point, the “W” becomes superfluous.*
- Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures): if the 150 is in a foreign language, will it still satisfy the college’s writing requirement?
- Kitty Preston (Music): requests clarification about 150s versus 150Ws. *JG: they will all be writing intensive.*
- ¿Jennifer Taylor (MLL)?: will all 150s still have to get approval from the writing committee?
- Rowan Lockwood (Geology, Faculty Director of Academic Advising): eschewing the microphone, asks how we will determine which courses merit the “M” designation? *JG: if the curriculum is approved, all the faculty are called upon to step forward to form a committee to further clarify what kinds of courses will satisfy such kinds of requirements. An on-going committee to ratify courses for the M designation makes a lot of sense.*
- Josh Erlich (Physics): argues that there is a difference between 150s and the “M” designated courses, the 150s are a spectrum of courses that changes frequently, with new offerings every semester. We should not expect the same for “M” designated courses. He can imagine a set of courses established once and for all by recommendation from the EPC. There is unlikely to be a continuous new generation of courses meriting the “M” designation. We can think about it, but this is a different beast. *JG: a handful of Social Sciences courses may also satisfy the requirement and will have to be qualified at some point, but that may be the end of it.*
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): posits that a student might possibly get through W&M without ever taking a writing intensive course in English (e.g., a non-native speaker may take a freshman seminar in the native language and then might major in the literature of that language). Is there a SCHEV issue at play here? *Apparently not.*
- Colleen Kennedy (MLL): also eschewing the microphone, one of the keys of our abiding standard for what satisfies the writing proficiency is that the writing occur in English. Courses where the writing is not in English should **not** satisfy the W requirement, nor will the writing committee will approve such courses for W credit.

- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): in writing courses, we are to teach the mechanics of writing, and, in her experience, bilingual students are naturally much better writers because they learn to pay attention to details, mechanics, and the stylistics of writing. English language proficiency is a separate issue altogether and she is not concerned about it. She is confident that we are able to teach the mechanics of writing in Spanish, French, Chinese, etc. as we are able to do so in English. The writing committee's charge is to look for a certain number and type of assignments, quantity of pages written, opportunities for revisions and peer editing, etc., to determine whether the course satisfies the spirit of the W designation, and the members of the writing committee are clearly capable of doing so even for courses in languages in which individual committee members may not be proficient.
- Colleen Kennedy (MLL): announces that she wrote the standard that the College uses for writing proficiency. The standard is very much intended to be **in English** to rout the Mathematics department who wanted to use mathematical formulae as their standard for the writing requirement (*and why ever not? – your secretary here again – what is more beautiful, more concise, more elegant, more eloquent than a subtly crafted proof in Integral Calculus? Mathematics is, after all, the only truly universal language. Read Carl Sagan's Contact. Mathematics is at the core of music, and it is the key to unlocking the mysteries of the natural world*). Another vote is necessary if the faculty wish languages other than English to count for the writing requirement.
- Leisa Meyer (History and American Studies): there should then be no real struggle regarding fulfilling the language requirement in a foreign language if the intent is simply to distinguish between “characters/words” and mathematical formulae.
- Colleen Kennedy (MLL): may I respond to that? *LM: NO!* (laughter) apologizing for being so English-centric, suggests that this is not a debate for the moment, but one that the faculty need to have.
- J.C. Poutsma (Chemistry): would be shocked if there was not a SCHEV or SACS requirement for ENGLISH proficiency in the commonwealth.
- George Greenia (MLL): we have the expertise in modern languages to develop high-level, high-quality writers in the target language by the time a student graduates. The freshman seminar is not where we help students acquire this facility. Students need an introduction at the college level to writing effectively in English for the sake of their entire curricular program, and we will then build writing skills to full strength in the target language by the time they graduate. This issue can be tackled during the implementation process.
- Sarah Stafford (Economics): COLL 150 does not really tackle this issue, and it does not mention English versus other languages.
- *JG: observing that this is a complicated issue, suggests that we go home to think about it and craft the appropriate kind of amendment.*
- Bill Cooke (Physics): observing that several members are leaving to administer their finals, moves to adjourn.
- *JG: requests that Professor Cooke suspend his motion for just a moment (merrily done) and reminds us that we will continue this discussion in a mere short 70 hours. He urges*

that faculty with broader amendments to the whole curriculum document come forward with them promptly. And we will try to move forward to a vote to adopt the proposed curriculum.

- Bill Cooke (Physics): moves to adjourn. "All in favor stand up!"

Professor Gilmour adjourned the meeting at 1:46 pm.

The secretary heartily thanks Taylor for hitting "record" on the audio player, and, once again, Steve Otto for compiling the list of faculty who spoke on the Curriculum Review (hopefully for the penultimate time!), Trina Garrison and the cheerful staff at Technical Services for processing the audio recording, and John Gilmour and Diane Shakes for reviewing these minutes.

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

Too tired for any further personal comment. At any rate, I probably exhausted my allotment on pages four-five and again on page eleven. Nonetheless I sincerely hope that I did not try your patience exceedingly much, Gentle Reader. Besides, I get another chance in just about 50 hours, as of my writing this note. Can you believe that we've survived eight meetings this term so far, including four special curricular meetings? Only one more to go (and hopefully the last Special Meeting). What will I do with all that free time?!? Ah, yes, write those two books ☺

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