

Faculty of Arts & Sciences
March 11, 2014, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Tidewater A, Sadler Center

Dean Kate Conley called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m., despite some technical glitches. Attendance at the start of the meeting: 74 (who are all these people we've never seen before and who simply don't seem to have that professorial je ne sais quois?)

I. The Minutes from the February 4 meeting were approved unanimously:

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

II. Report of Administrative Officers:

Provost Michael Halleran reported the following:

- although using no visual aids, he is delighted to have the universe at his side (projected as a desk top background onto the screen) recalling a talk that he gave to alumni in front of a shark tank at an aquarium, and thinking that nothing could ever top that. This, however, comes quite close.
- hopes that we all enjoyed the glorious weather over Spring Break, which, of course, included (yet another) snow day. He asserts that he is tired of snow and declares the snow over for the season.
- like the Ancients (*and all right-thinking people*), he prefers to mark time not by weekends but by important holidays, to which end he wishes us all a Happy St. Patrick's Day in advance.
- Regarding the budget: the General Assembly disbanded before passing a budget, because the highly politically charged issue of Medicaid had been attached to said budget. Though the House and Senate seem to agree on the amount (roughly) for the general budget they have violent disagreement over the allocation, and neither is nearly as generous as the budget we would have received under the out-going governor who is no longer in Richmond to defend the budget – being rather busy defending himself (apologizing for cheapness of the jab). The current proposal is about one million less, and highly unlikely to reappear. The Provost remains reasonably confident that a budget will be passed (by June 28 or so?). And we shall continue in our budgetary development, knowing roughly what we'll get from Richmond, what the in-state tuition revenue will be... We may not be able to accomplish all of we wanted to accomplish in FY 15, but salaries remain the highest

- priority. Hopefully, when we meet next, the Provost will be able to report “Eugepae! We have a budget, and it is even better than we had anticipated.”
- Regarding the new F&A Policy (Facilities and Administration rates gleaned from external grants) to support costs not directly charged to the grant: e.g., infrastructure, buildings, Grant’s Office, security etc. that facilitates and supports research on campus. F&A is not universally garnered (depending on the source, private foundations – some, e.g., the really really rich and famous Gates Foundation, say “nothing to overheard”; we are at about 28% pre-new-policy), and the proposal is to raise this to 47% across the board. The proposal also attends to how these F&A funds are allocated. Currently, F&A supports SSRL – but this will be phased out, as SSRL will be funded from other sources. In addition to infrastructure costs, much of these monies will be reallocated to the Deans, departments (to support, for example, graduate students), and other deserving entities on campus. Under new model, we pay infrastructure (grant’s office, animal care, etc.) and then distribute remaining money for investments (of remainder: 40% to department, 40% to VPr, 15% to Dean, 5% to PI). Why? A rogue Vice Provost (not Dennis) may say that everything is infrastructure, and then there would be nothing to distribute. See further:
<http://www.wm.edu/offices/sponsoredprograms/preaward/proposalprep/budgetprepguide/facost/index.php>

question and discussion

- Michael Lewis (Computer Science): requests expansion on differences between infrastructure and investment costs. *MH: Infrastructure: bandwidth, animal care, safety, Office of Sponsored Programs contribute to the common good.*

Dean Kate Conley reported the following:

- her welcome back from Spring Break, and her wish that we all enjoyed Spring Break and that we are now ready to tackle the final stretch of the semester.
- the very encouraging news of the strong likelihood of a substantial grant to assist in the development and transition costs to launch the new curriculum, including helping to realize the vision for the Center for Student Academic Success at Swem Library: mathematical and visual skills to expand/complement the Student Writing Center. This new Center is intended to support students in all proficiencies required under the new curriculum and dovetails with plans to revitalize Swem’s first floor to incorporate a new media center, interactive classroom, initiatives for e-learning... Stay tuned for more information from Carrie Cooper, in the Fall.

- the plans for a steering committee to explore the question of the visual humanities and how it fits into the new curriculum, and the expectation of a new colleague in the Digital Humanities to hold a joint position between American Studies and English.
- the centrality of Digital Humanities to the new curriculum – an emerging field which draws on a diversity of students, faculty, and disciplines (English, Music, History, Computer Science...).
- an announcement/reminder of Dean’s Office and Foundational Development Office sponsorship of the NEH workshop and mock-panel and individual twenty minute sessions with interested faculty (who register and provide one paragraph abstracts) on March 25-26.
- an announcement regarding the Cornell Interactive Theater Group (much involved with diversity issue) which will be on campus on April 8, conducting a brace of two-hour sessions.
- addendum to the CFTAP report (Committee on Faculty Teaching and the William and Mary Promise). Dean Conley forwarded the CFTAP report to the Provost with her own strong endorsement immediately after the February 4 meeting. Provost Halleran requested further clarification on the “different balances between the roles of teaching and research as appropriate”, soliciting a more persuasive response without which the W&M response to the Promise will be compromised (to which are linked faculty/staff raises and tuition increases, resources). “It is essential to have a policy that responds adequately to the requirements of the Promise laid out in 25 point 8. Without it, the plans for strengthening the University and our faculty will be compromised.” As the steward of the College of Arts and Sciences, she took it upon herself to draft the addendum based on existing SSRL policy, after much consultation with faculty, the FAC, other Deans.
 - As a guide to the appropriate balance between teaching and research in each field, Departments and Programs will refer to their existing definition of “research-active” and SSRL policies for reasonable expectations across disciplines. In keeping with Section 25.8 of the William & Mary Promise, starting in 2014-15, any **tenured** colleague whose **research activity** falls below his or her Department or Program’s definition of “research-active” for three consecutive years will be required **to do additional instructional work** (roughly equivalent of a 3-credit course) in the following year. No faculty member will be required to teach an additional course for more than two consecutive years, in order to give them the opportunity to re-engage more fully in their scholarship.
- She stresses that the Policy is expected to affect **ONLY a small amount of our colleagues at the end of their teaching careers** and that the Policy is intended

to work within the context of Departments and Programs, in conjunction with ongoing conversations between mentors, chairs, directors, with individual faculty members.

questions and discussion

- Leisa Meyer (History and American Studies): clarifies/queries that faculty have no input. *KC: yes, for two reasons: expedition (the deadline is upon us, the other schools submitted their Responses on January 21); and recognizing that this component was difficult for faculty to write, she took it as here responsibility—but only with a great deal of consultation.*
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): suggests that the addendum creates more confusion. How does this policy interact with post-tenure review policies? How does this policy address who we are as research-scholars, and how does it address the place of non-research-active faculty at the College? Was not the intention of the flexible merit score to invite faculty to focus on teaching at the **end** of their careers? The addendum seems to turn teaching into a punishment. *KC: this addendum avoids a blanket policy that adds to everyone's teaching load, and it avoids differential teaching loads which would transform us into an entirely different type of institution. With the addendum, she has lobbied for self-determination. Departments and Programs continue to have authority regarding how "research" is defined and what constitutes "research-active". The flexible merit system allows us to take into account the extra teaching that we are already doing **without compensation** and it helps make the extra teaching "visible". This Policy needs to be in writing to show the BoV and the politicians in Richmond that "we are minding the store". Our hallmark is our research-active faculty in the classroom and our remarkable dedication to this joint ideal (these are not just words in a Policy, but something that we all live). Regarding the post-tenure review, this new nuanced policy (and its addendum) are intended to catch the **rare** instances of faculty not doing their jobs, and should make post-tenure reviews even less likely.*
- Bruce Campbell (Global Studies and MLL): the goal seems to be to encourage faculty to be more research-active, but it offers a perverse incentive to become less so. *KC: It is the highest priority for the Dean's office to raise money for faculty research, and to provide incentives to faculty whose research has lapsed.*
- Liz Francis (Biology): finds it difficult to separate these two aspects and doubts that any of her colleagues in Biology would fall into perversity to game the system. In Biology, faculty work with students in and outside the classroom, doing research, co-authoring articles, taking them to conferences. Faculty who are made to teach more would actually create a greater burden on these research-active faculty who would then have to take on additional students. Besides, these faculty who are made-to-teach-more would not be able to get their research back

on track under additional teaching obligations. We are here because this is what we love – the teaching, the interactions with students – we don't do it for extra compensation, we do it because we love it. *KC observes that Liz' response shows that she is an incredibly thoughtful and caring leader of her department, and that such caring would surely result in conversations with any faculty member even remotely in danger of abandoning a research agenda.*

- ¿Mike?: How do we get the BoV to “get it”? Even when they were students here, they didn't “get what we do”. Their Promise is not a “done deal”. They operate in a different world. Since we define “research-active”, we could easily – and strongly – urge lapsing colleagues to “give a paper at a conference, even a regional conference”.
- Gul Ozyegin (Sociology): we hardly want to lower our standards to achieve this goal.
- Suzanne Raitt (English): reiterates the Dean's point that in every department, all faculty members are active in research and teaching. We could count the affected faculty “on the fingers of one hand”. Professor Raitt suggests that affected faculty could easily take on more students in their labs – thus increasing their teaching and not “overburdening” research-active faculty.
- Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages and Literatures): reiterates her earlier question – what happens after two consecutive years? These merit scores seem to shield faculty from post-tenure reviews. There is nothing in the Policy suggesting what the ultimate fix might be and in how many years of additional teaching this might result without addressing departmental ecosystems. *KC: the Policy is not about the exceptions and the Policy occurs within an established context. This Policy should affect only a very few faculty who are approaching retirement. Here we hire and tenure people who simultaneously **want** to teach and to do research. Most faculty hired at W&M share the institutional value of bringing their research into the classroom and their teaching into their research.*
- Elena Prokhorova (MLL, Global Studies): We are working at cross-purposes with the BoV. They want to increase teaching, we want to maintain the balance. Will this come back to us? *KC: Probably not, this policy/addendum is a means of showing good faith.*
- Phil Daileader (History): this addendum (and Policy) have powerful negative affects, some already described. This Policy will have long-term repercussions, making the College less attractive to potential hires, given the uncertainty of the teaching load.
- Mike (*¿which one?!? again I ask*): although we've not been asked to weigh in on the addendum, he would support it whether tied to the request from the BoV or not. Those of us who are serious about the teacher-scholar model will have 2-2 teaching loads. This will come into play **only** for those of us who are not doing

our jobs. Just stay research-active. This seems hardly onerous. Those whom the policy will affect will know it *ex ante*.

- Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): though agreeing that the Policy is hardly perfect, reminds us that we have to supply **something** to the BoV, and the CFTAP document specifically calls for re-evaluation in three years at which point we can then address the deleterious and unintended consequences of the Policy. While she regrets this necessity, the BoV does not fully understand our work, and she issues a plea that we move on to other parts of the agenda.
- *Professor Spaeth's plea is utterly disregarded.*
- George Rublein (Mathematics): queries if the BoV wants to see "blood on the floor". *KC: no, they just want to see a policy.*
- John Delos (Physics): recalls a state council study on how many hours faculty work each week – expecting an answer of 10-12. The study reported 55 hours on average, though the committee added that one must be careful about the data since faculty may claim to work so many hours a week, but for some of that time they might just be thinking. *(laughter)*
- Professor "*from the back of the room*": This puts in writing that what we are concerned with is research **activity**, not **achievement**, and that a stream of mediocre articles is more valuable than a great book after ten years. The Policy also puts in writing that teaching is not a reward for being good, but is to be used as a punishment for being bad. The Policy challenges our core mission as a teaching-school. As a parent or student, I would feel aggrieved. The Policy degrades the status of the tenured faculty. After enduring and surviving an horrendous tenure process – which establishes a degree of motivation and achievement – we should be treated like professionals who know best how to allocate our time for ourselves (some three-year periods we may emphasize teaching, other years research, or administration or service, or developing new courses, ...). We should be given considerable latitude to do that. The Policy establishes a constant, recurring three-year potentially punitive supervision which is not appropriate for what we are trying to do. We should think of ourselves as professionals who come together to constitute the College and have considerable room to maneuver rather than as employees of an Institution that is somehow separate from us. We should aggressively defend our achievements over the past ten/ fifteen years; we should emphasize that we have done extremely well without this Policy; we should not change what we've been doing – given the results of what we already have accomplished. *(Professor "From the Back of the Room" receives an ovation).* *KC: We exist in a national environment where accountability is on the front page of the newspapers, one in which the President invites college professors to the White House to discuss accountability.*

III. Faculty Governance and Teaching Awards

Dean Conley reported the following awards:

- 2014 Arts and Sciences Faculty Governance Award to Janice Zeman (Psychology) for her stellar record of service including her leadership in the Virginia Consortium Program in Clinical Psychology, Graduate Studies coordinator, chair of her department, as well as extensive committee work in Arts and Sciences (Committee on Graduate Studies, Provost's strategic planning committee on Leading Liberal Arts University, working group on transfer students), and her dedication to addressing the needs of marginalized children, families, and college students.
- 2014 Arts and Sciences Faculty Governance Award to Sibel Zandi-Sayek (Art and Art History, Global Studies, Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, currently doing her job during a visit from the Prince of Turkey, so accepted by her colleague Gul) for consistent and extensive leadership, in helping to shape and direct programs in Middle Eastern Studies and Asian Studies and in facilitating the merger of those two programs into Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, as well as serving on the advisory committee of European Studies and on the Executive Committee of American Studies, numerous A&S committees, departmental search committees, and chair of the departmental Personnel Committee.
- 2014 Arts and Sciences Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence to John Linneman (Sociology), recipient of the 2005 Thomas Jefferson Teaching Award. Professor Linneman has worked hard to shape new course formats and find ways to integrate technology in the classroom and consistently receives exceptional course-evaluation scores from students, who describe his courses as both "difficult" and "engaging."
- 2014 Arts and Sciences Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence to Paul Mapp (History) whose students rave about his knowledge, enthusiasm, and ability at all levels from introductory survey to advanced lecture course to upper-level colloquium. Recipient of the 2010 Phi Beta Kappa Award for Excellence in Teaching, Professor Mapp values "teaching students how to think and how to do" through an analysis of primary sources
- 2014 Arts and Sciences Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence to Debbie Bebout (Chemistry) for her mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students in research. As "one of only three faculty members in the Chemistry Department teaching a Freshman Seminar, a mode of instruction that does not always come naturally to those in the physical sciences", Professor Bebout is dedicated to the College's Mission. Further

she incorporates current research into her advanced courses and making the students responsible for presenting this research through in-class presentations.

IV. Report from Nominations and Elections Committee

Monica Potkay reported the following elections:

- four for the Committee on Nominations & Elections (Areas I, II, and III)
- two for the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (Areas I and III)
- three for the Educational Policy Committee (Areas I, II, and III)
- two for the Committee on Academic Status (Areas I and II)
- one for a member from Area II to serve simultaneously on the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Assembly.

There is a motion to adjourn.

Seconded.

Dean Conley adjourned the meeting at 4:59 pm.

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

Herewith are my Antepenultimate Minutes! (not every day one gets to use that word in casual conversation). The Accent falls here! (Stayed tuned next month to learn what we call the accent that falls on the second to last syllable). *Eugepae!* But I am still amazed that we spent forty-five minutes discussing an issue that we have already discussed *ad nauseum* on an Addendum that is a “done-deal”, a *fait accomplis*, as it were (ah, but you haven’t been reading the Minutes, have you, dear reader?). Yes, the Board may not “get” what we do, and yes, many of our students also do not “get” what we do (and these swabs are, sadly, potential future Board members). But plenty of our students do “get it”, and they more than make up for those who don’t. I’ve been teaching for more than a few years, and those scallywags are nothing more than distant, impressionistic memories who fade closer to oblivion with each passing semester. But the gems (and there are many of them), the special students, who challenge us, who take interest in our research, who ask about our latest projects, who politely listen to rehearsals of conference talks. I may not keep all their names in my RAM, but their faces, which classes they were in, what contributions to class they made, what spectacular projects they completed for my classes – these are my treasures. Teaching a punishment?

Hardly. Teaching at William and Mary is a privilege. But our Ivory Tower is not impervious to the real world, and I – like all of my esteemed colleagues – resent the constant demand to justify what we do, to answer to those who lack imagination or grace or the wherewithal to see beyond arithmetic and basic reading skills. (I'm not talking about the Board here, I'm talking about family, and family friends, we all have them). Will American students be better off going to trade schools? Do we really think we can compete in a global economy with a nation of blacksmiths, glass-blowers, weavers, cobblers, haberdashers, seamstresses, paralegals, hairdressers? (all noble and useful occupations, to be sure). I think not. Did the Wright Brothers succeed because they received a practical education? Hardly. Many a plumber or mechanic (with no offense to those very useful occupations– my father, who would wax philosophical on Plato and Fermat's theorem, among other mathematical esoterica, was rightly proud of the fact that he was a master plumber, and I in my turn am rightly proud of the fact that my father was able to coach **me** – of all people – through simple mechanical repairs on the family car when he was just too weak to change that alternating belt himself), many a plumber or mechanic goes through life with nary so grand an accomplishment as Wilbur and Orville. The Messrs. Wright had imagination, and that comes from a less than practical approach to life. How can we accomplish anything **new** if all we can envision is what has already been done? *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*, *James Bond*, *Star Trek* – yesterday's science fiction (what some have imagined) is today's science fact (tablets abound in *Star Trek Enterprise*, a full decade before they became a standard part of every digital arsenal) – and none of this would be possible without imagination, without reading about the robots in the *Iliad*. They thought Aristarchus was crazy for his harebrained idea – that the earth revolved around the sun (pretty crazy if you ask me!!!) – and Aristotle and Ptolemy, for all their brilliance, adhered to the geocentric model despite the fact that heliocentrism explained so many things without that convoluted system of hippopedes – which rendered the same solution in all cases – and retrograde motion (those little planetary vagabonds). Great ideas inspire further great ideas.

And now, come on guys, I know that the secretary is supposed to be omniscient. But, seriously, this one is only human, and an over-extended one at that (yes, by my own choosing, I freely admit – but untenably overextended, nonetheless). To say that I am socially awkward would be a textbook litotes. Have you noticed that I don't usually go to the parties? Beyond the Ivy Tower that is the south Wing of the third Floor of Morton Hall, I know, maybe, half a dozen of you. Perhaps you recognized the futility of commenting on the Dean's addendum to the CFTAP response, and that may be why so many of you chose to go incognito. Well, I managed to foil most of you! A first name, a department, I can be clever when I want to be. And I learned at a very early age to find answers for myself – not many clues are needed, but ¿Mike? Which one? All I can say

for certain that it was not Michael Lewis, whose voice I recognize from his role in shaping the initial new Curriculum Proposal and whose syntax tends to be a little more formal than the one or two ¿Mikes? who spoke at this meeting. Michael Lewis's first name is not even "Michael" (to quote the great Richard Irby, "look it up"). Thirteen possible "Mikes" turn up in the W&M Directory – and, yes, I eliminated the "Mikes" from different schools, Mike Blum, and other Mikes who are clearly not part of the instructional faculty in A&S. But the Directory does not allow one to search by "Middle Name". Hm. How many Michaels/Mikes are on the instructional faculty in A&S!?! The world may never know. *Au!* Besides, do we really want to be known as "Professor-at-the-Back-of-the-Room", especially after receiving an *ovatio*?!?! (I regret to say that it's too late, buddy). I suppose we could adopt a culture of assuming indigenous proper names awkwardly and long-windedly translated into English. That might be fun, actually.

~Frau-Professor-She-who-loves-maps-and-all-things-ancient-and-scientific-and-Latin-and-Greek-and-nautical-and-ursine-and-feline-and-testudinal-and-chocolate-and-spicy

p.s. just blowing off steam as this difficult school year starts to wind to a close. No offense is intended, especially not to "Herr-Professor-at-the-Back-of-the-Room". Besides, my students have been reading the minutes – *salvete*, Latin 102! – , and I would not want to disappoint!

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