

**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**Feb. 4, 2013, 3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Chesapeake A, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.*

*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 40 – we have a quorum! (and Mark Sher does not have to count as 5, though he very well could, according to Josh Erlich)*

**I. The Minutes from the December 3, 9, and 12 meetings were approved.**

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

**II. Report of Administrative Officers:**

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- a Happy New Year.
- our first Tuesday of the semester on which snow had not begun to fall at exactly 3:35. Classes would indeed be in session this evening.
- the College would be celebrating its 321<sup>st</sup> birthday this Saturday, and that Charter Day festivities would occur at 4:00 pm on Friday, February 7 with the conferral of two honorary degrees, including our new governor (as per our custom) and our distinguished colleague Emeritus Chancellor Professor of Mathematics David Lutzer (a wonderful decision!).
- rumor of a bonus in the new governor's budget (but no promise of increase in base pay) provided there is a sufficient state-budgetary surplus.
- a bill that would **permit** tuition benefits for faculty children. Will it pass? Not even the all-knowing Provost has a clue.
- bills concerning in/out-of state tuition. But everything is up in the air – as the new governor must now use the old governor's proposed budget as his starting point, and the new Democratic Congress has a *de facto* majority with our new Democratic Lieutenant Governor – except in matters of budget – the old budget would allocate 2 million in new money but 2.1 million in new expenses, including health care and EVMS (*the American way! expenses always exceed income*).
- broader consideration of proposition 25.8 in the context of the William and Mary Promise §25 and the strategic plan of 2008/9 to become a leading Liberal Arts University on the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Our scope and focus are in place, but finances are seriously lacking. Our chances are better with the BoV than with Richmond.
- 25.8
  - Our BoV has approved – to the great surprise of the governor who had appointed all but four of them – increased in-state tuition, but also needs-based financial aid in exchange for 150 in-state students (over four years), increased efficiency in operations, and (modest) increased teaching.
  - new balance between NTE and TE will shift only slightly (even if there were no NTE growth, always a good idea to treat each other with respect in any event).
  - 25.8 also asked that we capture the full range of our teaching – visible and in-

- What grates (“ates”) is the third component of the Promise: different balances between teaching and research – as appropriate. This will not necessarily increase load. It only requires that each school develop policies.
- requiring this policy rests on two motivations: substantive increased teaching power) and chiefly political (essential for the Board to see that we are making the best use of our resources in light of our requests for additional resources).
- the policy that needs to be developed will not undermine the teacher-scholar model but will rather strengthen it by demonstrating our expectations of scholarship, that we want the scholar-teacher model: our preference, our strength.
- Unlike previous Boards, this Board not only wants to bring us up to the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile in salary of our peer group, but it also has a concrete plan to reach that goal – the Board are not our enemy. It’s not even an opponent but rather they are a group with high aspirations for our college and values via the essential role that faculty play in creating this excellence. Our relationship with the Board should be an alliance in a shared mission to strengthen and expand our excellence. The William and Mary Promise strengthens what we can accomplish with dearly needed resources and sets a course with brighter possibilities. The Promise – he thinks – is the best foundation for our College’s present and future.

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- regarding the COLL curriculum
  - the four Fellows have met with the EPC, our Dean for Educational Policy, Lu Ann Homza, and they have begun planning strategy.
  - John Griffin and Dean Homza are coordinating pilot courses with departments and programs.
  - Joel Schwartz is writing grant proposals and planning May seminars to this end.
  - and we will begin scheduling A&S courses a full year in advance by this time next year (instead of semester by semester)
- regarding the CFTAP report (see below)
  - the committee have worked hard to revise their response in the light of faculty reaction. The Dean is impressed with the moderation of the response, its thoughtful detail, and its sincere efforts to reach out to the Board in an important gesture of recognition for their considerable investment of effort in negotiations with Richmond to win the terms of the William and Mary Promise from the governor. The Board have staked their professional reputations and are admirably responding to pressures from the College and external. They are seeking a better understanding of our work while also trying to respond to public pressure for accountability in higher education in light of increasing costs – this public pressure starts in the White House, as we know. The Dean’s understanding is that the Board wants a renewed commitment from us of our dedication to pursue excellence. They want what we all want – to pull together and do our best work as the fine Liberal Arts University that we are.

### **III. Report from Faculty Assembly**

Suzanne Raitt reported the following:

- a flurry of activity since last we spoke (December 3<sup>rd</sup>).
- two meetings.
- a discussion with Matthew Lambert from Development to ascertain how faculty can better support what Development is doing in their efforts to help us. The bottom line – increased faculty giving. The % of faculty who give (as little as \$5) is far more important than the dollar amount that we might or might not give. And this is how we can support them in their efforts to support us.
- the second thing should have been the first, the fact that Bill Cooke has graciously agreed to serve as the secretary of the FA on very short notice, and that he was ominously approved by the Assembly (corrigendum from Professor Cooke: he voted against himself).
- right now the FA are trying to rescue the very long survey that we took a very long time ago that has been languishing for about a year. And the report would be even longer, but they've not written it yet. In any event Susan Grover rescued the survey, and Professor Raitt jumped in as well, thinking that she should also show some heroism. It was so exciting because it was the first survey in which NTEs were invited to participate, though that may not have seemed exciting at the time.
- the FA has begun the conversation with NTEs (and it probably won't end soon) regarding whether they should have representation on the FA and how the bylaws should be amended in case of such an eventuality.
- hopeful that we shall soon have representation on all BoV standing committees, not just Academic Affairs.

### **IV. Report from Faculty Affairs Committee**

Barbette Spaeth reported the following:

- 5 meetings of the FAC since our December 3<sup>rd</sup> A&S meeting,
- wherein the following actions were taken:
  - arrangement for the final discussions and vote on the curriculum revision (which we may all recall).
  - discussed tentative agendas for committee reports for remaining FAS meetings.
  - meeting with the President and Vice President of the new NTE Association (Iyabo Osiapem and Christy Porter).
  - discussion of issues regarding implementation of the new curriculum.
  - discussion of CFTAP response to the William and Mary Promise section 8, which the FAC endorses, and for which the FAC requests faculty endorsement later today.

### **V. Report from Nominations and Elections Committee**

Jennifer Stevens reported the following elections:

- an imminent edited ballot since three faculty have joint membership in FA and FAC.

- Faculty Assembly.
- Procedural Review Committee/Personnel Policy Committee.
- a thanks to all who agree to run for election (knowing how busy we all are and how little incentive they can offer).
- the ballots will be available a week from today (February 4), in accord with the new guidelines that require a week's notice.

## VI. Report from Educational Policy Committee (EPC)

Diane Shakes and John Gilmour reported the following:

- busy, busy, busy – with 9 meetings in the Fall, and as many again expected for the Spring.
- full report is posted online:  
[http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/educationalpolicy/reports/epc\\_2013-14\\_annual\\_report.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/educationalpolicy/reports/epc_2013-14_annual_report.pdf)
- working groups are now meeting to fill out the details of the broader ideas agreed to last semester – dedicated to COLL 100, 150, 200, 300, 400.
- invitation to submit thoughts, concerns, and suggestions.

Bill Cooke (Physics): requests that a list of working group members be posted. *JG: promises a list of all the working group members and their email addresses – as indeed he did the following day – so we can blast all our concerns and vitriol in their direction..*

## VII. Motion from EPC regarding adoption of new description of Honors

The EPC moves to change the language of the senior honors program as follows:

- a) The program that has been known, in the catalog and elsewhere, as the Arts and Sciences “Department Honors Program” be re-named the Arts and Sciences “Honors Thesis Program.”
- b) The department-level designation be changed to “Honors Thesis in (for example) Classical Studies.”  
rationale: the new language is intended to be less vague on the transcript, and to suggest that “Honors” has less to do with gpa and more to do with research and a thesis.

### Discussion

- Mark Sher (Physics): opposes the change in language but is resolved to the fact that it will probably pass and life will go on. The old language is deliberately vague and therefore more flexible. Honors in Physics entails not only the thesis but extra advanced level course work and most students find it harder to fulfill. He will vote against this change from wording that is ambiguous to wording that is wrong.
- Suzanne Raitt (English): queries if the distinction between honors, high, and highest will be retained. *Greg Hancock (Geology, who serves on the relevant committee): assures that the designations will persist, and that the intent here is*

*not to imply that a student is earning Honors in English – for example – but rather in **research in English**.*

- Bill Cooke (Physics): queries if it would still be possible to require extra courses. *GH: it was never the intention to prescribe a change in the Honors process. Most Honors programs do require the thesis.*
- Bruce Campbell (MLL, Global Studies): is the intent here to make it clear to potential employers that the student has done something big? The new language sounds like a step back. Does “Honors Thesis” send a stronger message on the transcript than “Honors”?
- Francie Cate-Arries (Modern Languages and Literatures): suggests change from Honors Thesis to Honors Research.
- Jeff Nelson (Physics): noting grade aspects and course expectations (especially in Physics), suggests that restricting Honors to a thesis is insufficient to capture the full scope of what Honors is intended to do and prove.
- ζ: inquires about variety of approaches to Honors. *GH: assured that the committee was striving for broad language as perhaps not all departments might require the thesis.*
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): suggests “Honors Studies”.
- Josh Erlich (Physics): the outlier in Physics, admits to feeling some embarrassment that Honors in Physics is not stringently restricted only to the very best students. There are other factors in place that should mitigate our concerns (e.g., gpa, additional courses) – *JE then recognizes Mark Sher – “o, sorry, I was out of place, Diane” – Mutiny!*
- Mark Sher moves to return to committee so they can come up with something better.

The motion carries and the senior Honors program language adjustment is returned to committee.

#### **VIII. Report from the Committee/Working Group on Faculty Teaching and the Promise (CFTAP)**

Leisa Meyer (*Hi, there, everyone – silence – I was expecting applause – plaudite! – to which we complied*) and Janice Zeman present the stream-lined response that resulted from a long road of dodging missiles during the December 3 A&S meeting, discussions with the CCPD, RPC, IRT, FDR, MTA, HRBT, JFK, LBJ, and a variety of acronymic agencies on campus:

- documenting engagement outside the classroom (theses, independent studies, &cet).
- flexible merit assessment for tenured faculty.
- compensating continuing NTEs for teaching overloads.
- faculty-student engagement, joint-research (aut sim) through enhanced Charles Center programs and monies.
- re-evaluation for goals and unintended consequences.

The Committee moves that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences endorse its report.

## Discussion

- Josh Erlich (Physics): expresses concern over altering merit scores in favor of teaching or service but not in favor of research. What if Mark Sher wins the Nobel Prize, or someone else publishes some scholarship that is well-received, initiating a series of speaking engagements, student-faculty research, and all sorts of wonderful things that bring greater prestige to the College? It is misguided not to reward that sort of enormous contribution to the College.
- LM: the point is well taken. But the charge was with regard to teaching, not research.
- Josh Erlich moves to amend the flexible merit language to allow research the same span as teaching (3-9-3).
- John Gilmour (Government): a difficult thing to implement as increasing the teaching score demands a commitment to increased teaching. Does one agree to write more articles?
- Suzanne Raitt (English): wrangles us back to the fact that this particular document is meant to find ways to increase (not decrease) teaching but also notes the flexibility in the numbers, and that teaching numbers can go to research (*thus mitigating to some degree Josh's concern*).
- Bill Cooke (Physics): shares Josh's concerns, but supports the document as is since it shows that our careers are dynamic.
- Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): clarifies the range and asks if other ranges were also considered.
- LM: *this document was produced in parallel with the Merit Review report from last year that was well-received.*
- Josh Erlich: withdraws his motion, and – despite not understanding the political climate in which the document was written and admitting that even he did not read that into the response – is now perfectly happy with the document and the merit range.
- Terry Myers (Parliamentarian): the motion was never seconded any way.
- Anne Rasmussen (Music): queries about documenting the hidden teaching. Does this raise the visibility of what we do? How does an extra half point in our merit scores translate to the world that we teach a lot or that'll we'll teach a little more for an extra ½ point of merit? She also tackles the merit distribution – either “outing” her own department's flexible merit base, or about to get Music into big trouble, or observing that they might be on the crest of a *nouvelle vague* – Music's merit system was revised and for several years now they recognize variable merit scales. One of the faculty members is on the merit committee so this should not have been a secret. LM: *Some departments are already employing a flexible merit system.*
- JZ: *merit numbers document the teaching internally. Making invisible teaching visible to the Board is a separate issue.*
- Diane Shakes (Biology): inquires if the full range is **prescribed**. LM: *it merely provides a possible range, departments retain autonomy. Many departments may reject the flexible merit scale altogether.*
- Elizabeth Radcliffe (Philosophy): points out that we may very well want to discuss how to implement the reweighting to ensure that it is done fairly. She also suggests the addition of a modifier to §3: course taught by “NTE” faculty.

- David Feldman (Economics): declaring with glee that he has something to add to the exact same sentence, suggests adding “at least” between stipend and equivalent.
- Bill Cooke calls the question.
- there is a second.
- the vote to end debate is unanimous (*KC: I think that’s a 2/3 vote*).
- the motion to endorse the CFTAP response with small changes carries unanimously.

*KC: with thanks to the committee, asks “Do I hear a motion to adjourn?”*

Seconded!!!

*Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 4:48 pm.*

Respectfully Submitted,  
Georgia L. Irby, Secretary  
Associate Professor of Classical Studies  
[glirby@wm.edu](mailto:glirby@wm.edu)

Three more to go! (and counting). *Eugepae!* And out forty minutes early for good behavior. But here it is, Tuesday night, and not a snowflake in sight. No excuse for hot chocolate or cream of wheat for breakfast (hmm, does one really need an excuse for hot chocolate or cream of wheat? Silly me, I spoke without thinking). I must be going through snow day withdrawal. At any rate, since there is no chance of a third Wednesday snow day in a row, I must turn to class preps. So, signing off for now. Until next month, same bat time, same bat station. *da da da da da da. Bat Man! POW! WHAM! da da da da da da.*

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