

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**November 4, 2014**  
**Chesapeake C, Sadler Center**

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:34 PM.*  
*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 54.*

**I. Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes for the meeting of the Faculty on October 7, 2014, were **approved** unanimously by voice vote:

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

**II. Report of Administrative Officers**

a. Provost Michael Halleran

- Reminded the faculty to vote in the U.S. Congressional elections.
- Announced that a revised William & Mary Intellectual Property Policy would be posted on November 6<sup>th</sup> and remain available for 30 days at the following link:  
<https://forms.wm.edu/form/view/17976>  
The policy was developed by an *ad hoc* committee of faculty and administrators and reviewed by the Faculty Assembly's Executive Committee. The policy does not require formal approval by the Faculty Assembly in the way that a change to the distribution of patent royalties would, but faculty are invited to offer their thoughts or suggestions.
- Reminded the faculty that December 8<sup>th</sup> is the deadline to apply for a Creative Adaptation Fund award:  
<http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/initiatives/creative-adaptation/index.php>
- Announced that on April 22, 2015, the next Tack Faculty Lecture will be delivered by Katherine Preston (Music) on the subject of "An American Prima Donna and Apple Pie Opera."

b. Dean Kate Conley

- During the visit of the Foundation Board over Homecoming Weekend, Dean Conley spoke with them about fundraising opportunities in Arts and Sciences. She emphasized to them: the importance of broadly funding faculty innovation through support for faculty research and professorships; the need to increase funding for graduate students; an opportunity fund for undergraduate students so that they can participate fully in the many ways that we offer engaged learning; and various ways to support the new College curriculum through the work of the Center for the Liberal Arts.

- Announced that for the three-year period ending in June 2014, Arts and Sciences departments and programs received \$1.3 million in gifts in unrestricted, spendable accounts; this amount augmented department and program maintenance and operations by approximately 16%.
- Reiterated that the College has initiated a staff hiring delay of four months to address a funding gap generated by the shortfall in state revenues. Faculty searches and research-funded positions are not affected.
- Announced that Kiersten Boyce is the College's Chief Compliance Officer and Title IX Coordinator. Complaints or concerns can be addressed to her at: [klboyc@wm.edu](mailto:klboyc@wm.edu) and 757-221-3146.
- Reminded the faculty that Rector Stottlemeyer and Vice Rector Scott will meet on November 18<sup>th</sup> with the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD), the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Deans. Faculty are invited to propose topics for discussion.
- Announced that she and the Censeo business consultants will be speaking with counterparts at a selection of universities about their organizational structure. Dean Conley will report at the beginning of the spring semester on the outcome of these conversations and on any actions planned as a result of the Censeo survey.

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

Greg Hancock (Geology) reported that the FAC had met three times since the last FAS meeting. In response to the National Endowment for the Humanities' recent decision to remove funding from foreign summer seminars, the FAC discussed measures to lobby for replacement funding or additional funding. The FAC has also assembled an *ad hoc* Best Practices Committee to review the procedures of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee; the *ad hoc* committee is composed of members from the RPT, CCPD, and FAC. In addition, the FAC met with the co-chairs of the Educational Policy Committee, Dean Conley, the Dean of Educational Policy, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and Parliamentarian Terry Meyers to discuss procedures for the previous meetings and the upcoming presentation of the EPC's modifications of COLL 100, 150, and 200 descriptions. Finally, Greg announced that the FAC has a new e-mail address: [as-fac@wm.edu](mailto:as-fac@wm.edu).

### **IV. Motion to codify A&S procedures when voting on Faculty Assembly motions**

Greg Hancock (Geology) introduced the following motion on behalf of the FAC:

“Be it resolved the vote of all members present at a regular meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences will be deemed to represent the vote of three area constituencies on proposed amendments to the Faculty Assembly constitution.”

Greg explained that, although the bylaws currently specify that each of the three area constituencies in Arts and Sciences will vote as separate units, in practice the faculty has instead voted as a whole, and that vote has been taken as the vote of the three area

constituencies. He therefore proposed that the current voting practice of the faculty be explicitly codified.

Bob Archibald (Economics) asked why the voting is not conducted electronically. In response, Greg Hancock clarified that electronic voting is only allowed for elections. Colleen Kennedy (English) proposed that amendments to the Faculty Assembly constitution could be conducted electronically, since they happen infrequently; she raised the concern that faculty who teach in the late afternoon on Tuesdays would be unable to vote in person at FAS meetings. Suzanne Raitt (English) responded that the faculty voted last year to confine electronic voting to elections and not to extend the use of electronic ballots to voting on other issues.

Bob Archibald (Economics) then raised the additional concern that the current practice of voting as a whole runs the risk of obscuring differences of opinion between the three area constituencies; he proposed that the bylaws should retain a mechanism by which to allow separate constituency votes. Suzanne Raitt (English) suggested that Bob's concern could be addressed by a motion specifying that each area constituency should vote separately at this meeting. David Dessler (Government) clarified that the Faculty Assembly constitution does not require that each area constituency should vote separately, so the current practice of voting as a whole is not inconsistent with the constitution.

Greg Hancock's proposed motion **passed** by a voice vote. Dean Conley added that the question of electronic voting could be revisited at a future meeting.

#### **V. Report from Faculty Assembly (David Dessler)**

David Dessler (Government) reported that the Faculty Assembly had held three meetings this fall and that the Faculty Assembly also participated in the Board of Visitors meeting in September and would do so again at the Board of Visitors meeting in two weeks. He then outlined four main FA agenda items for the year: faculty diversity; the faculty survey; retirement incentives; and gender climate and sexual assault. David reported that working groups had been formed to develop responses in each of these areas and that an update on their progress will be provided at the FAS meeting next month.

#### **VI. Discussion of Faculty Assembly motion to allow NTE Faculty to be elected to Faculty Assembly**

David Dessler (Government) introduced a motion that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences approve the changes made to the Faculty Assembly Constitution by the Faculty Assembly in April, to allow continuing full-time non-tenure eligible faculty with at least five years' service at the College to run in regular elections for seats on the Faculty Assembly. He explained that the proposal had already been approved by the Faculty Assembly and would now require the approval of at least five of the seven constituencies (i.e., the four schools and the three areas of Arts and Sciences). Of those constituencies, he reported that the proposal was approved by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) in May and by the Business School and Education School in September; consequently, the vote of the three

constituencies of Arts and Sciences would decide whether or not the proposal is approved. If the proposal is approved by the faculty and subsequently by the Board of Visitors, NTE faculty will be able to run for election in Spring 2015 and assume office in Fall 2015.

Suzanne Raitt (English) distributed a handout providing information about the community of NTE faculty at the College; the data were taken from the 2013 faculty survey and from the Provost's report on specified-term faculty as presented to the Faculty Assembly in February of 2014. She reported that the Faculty Assembly met with the NTE Faculty Association in October 2013 to begin conversations about this proposal, followed by six further discussions of the Faculty Assembly and four further discussions of the Faculty Affairs Committee; this led to a vote by the Faculty Assembly in April of 2014 at which sixteen members voted in favor with two against and one abstention.

David Dessler (Government) then explained that at present only tenured and tenure-eligible faculty are allowed to run for election to the Faculty Assembly, resulting in a total of 21 voting members, a quorum of eleven members, and a supermajority of fourteen members. The proposed amendment would allow full-time continuing NTE faculty with five years of service to run for election to the same seats for which tenured and tenure-eligible faculty run. He further explained that, if no NTE faculty member is elected, the Executive Committee will appoint in May an NTE faculty member to a non-voting position on the Faculty Assembly; in that case, the membership of the Faculty Assembly would change to 22 members, but the voting membership would remain at 21 members.

David emphasized three restrictions on NTE participation on the Faculty Assembly:

- (1) Only continuing full-time NTE faculty with at least five years of service at the time of their election will be eligible to run.
- (2) NTE faculty may not vote on matters pertaining to tenure and promotion of tenure-line faculty.
- (3) In each constituency, no more than one NTE faculty member may serve at any given time, so that there will be a maximum of seven NTE faculty members on the Faculty Assembly. Consequently, tenured and tenure-eligible faculty will still constitute a supermajority of the Faculty Assembly.

Gene Tracy (Physics) asked whether restriction 2 above applied only to tenure and promotion cases or also to tenure and post-tenure review policy and changes to the handbook. David Dessler replied that NTE faculty members would not be eligible to vote on either cases or policy changes. Dean Torczon then asked whether there were any restrictions upon which NTE faculty would be eligible to vote in the elections, and David Dessler responded that all full-time NTEs would be eligible to vote in the elections, regardless of whether or not they had already completed five years of service. Deborah Morse (English) expressed concern as to whether one appointed, non-voting NTE faculty member would provide adequate representation for the NTE faculty; David responded that the Faculty Assembly anticipates that NTE faculty members will get elected. He also noted that the NTE Faculty Association had formally requested only one seat on the Faculty Assembly, but that the Faculty Assembly had deemed this insufficient and proposed instead to allow as much as one NTE faculty member to represent each constituency. Anne Rasmussen (Music) asked

how the specified-term contracts of NTE faculty would be reconciled with their three-year term on the Faculty Assembly; David replied that those policies are still being formulated, and he added that the same problem applies when pre-tenure faculty are elected to the Faculty Assembly.

David Dessler's motion **passed** by a voice vote.

## VII. Report from Educational Policy Committee

- a. Dean Homza introduced two principles from the Arts and Sciences deans and the University Registrar explaining how the new COLL courses will be scheduled and how they will be credited to departments:
  1. All courses in the new general education curriculum will be scheduled by the department and/or program in which the relevant faculty member has a home. Departments and programs, and thus chairs and directors, will continue to be in control of faculty teaching schedules (and in conversation about the same).
  2. As has been the case with the GERs, all courses in the new general education curriculum will be credited back to the departments/programs to which faculty belong.

Dean Homza reiterated that COLL 100, 150, and 200 courses will be implemented in Fall 2015, whereas COLL 300 and 400 courses will be implemented in AY 2016-2017. At present, there are four COLL 100 pilots and ten more in the pipeline for approval by the Educational Policy Committee. There are currently no COLL 150 pilots and only five in the EPC pipeline, but this number simply reflects that fact that faculty who desire to teach a COLL 150 in AY 2015-2016 must submit the appropriate forms to the Writing Committee. These forms are available at the EPC website:

<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/educationalpolicy/forms/>

There are also currently twelve COLL 200 pilots and 32 in the EPC pipeline.

The number of courses already promised at the COLL 150 and COLL 200 levels should meet the College's curricular needs for AY 2015-2016, but the College still needs at least 22 additional sections to be offered at the COLL 100 level to meet the required total of 68 sections. Dean Homza therefore urged faculty to submit proposals to the EPC for COLL 100 courses.

- b. John Gilmour (Government) informed the faculty of an EPC proposal that would create a COLL 100 Committee to review COLL 100 course proposals in much the same way that the Writing Committee currently does for freshman seminars (COLL 150's). The COLL 100 Committee would serve as an advisory committee to the Educational Policy Committee. Members of the COLL 100 Committee will review proposed COLL 100 courses to ensure that they comply with both the intellectual ("big ideas") and communications expectations of these courses. It will forward its recommendations to the Educational Policy Committee, which will be responsible for final approval.

The COLL 100 Committee would be composed of seven members: two Fellows of the Center for the Liberal Arts (each representing a different area constituency); one member from the Information Technology academic liaison staff; one member from the Swem Library staff; and one member from each of the three areas of Arts and Sciences. One of those three members will also be on the Educational Policy Committee, and the other two will be recommended by the Faculty Affairs Committee. Members of the committee would choose a Chairperson, and only faculty members would have a vote. The EPC is creating this committee based on its authority under Sec. 3.3 of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Bylaws, “to call upon any member or group of the Faculty for advice and assistance.” The EPC has not yet voted on the proposal to create this committee, so they seek suggestions from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences before doing so. In the meantime, the EPC will continue reviewing COLL 100 proposals until this COLL 100 Committee begins its work.

- c. John Gilmour (Government) presented three motions regarding COLL 100 courses:
  1. In order to highlight the first-year experience and to provide continuity with first-year seminars, all COLL 100’s in the new general education curriculum should use the number 100 (e.g. HIST 100, ENSP 100, COLL 100).
  2. There shall be a COLL prefix available for COLL courses, but its use is not required.
  3. For two years (AY 2015-2017), EPC will allow COLL 100’s to be as large as 75 students if they have discussion sections of no more than 25 students, or to be as large as 40 students with no discussion sections. This would allow a pilot study of the effect of class size on learning objectives.

In regard to Motion 1, Anne Rasmussen (Music) expressed concern that the renumbering might be a deterrent to submission of the additional COLL 100 courses that the College urgently needs for AY 2015-2016. Jack Martin (English) responded that the four-credit requirement of COLL 100 courses will likely necessitate the generation of new courses rather than repurposed ones. Heather MacDonald (Geology) emphasized that the consistent numbering scheme proposed in Motion 1 would be especially helpful for freshmen. Francis Tanglao Aguas (Theatre/Africana Studies/Asian Studies) asked whether the numbering scheme proposed in Motion 1 would preclude the addition of suffixes (e.g., 100A); Jack affirmed that the motion would not preclude the addition of those suffixes. George Rublein (Mathematics) asked whether this motion would preclude cross-listing; John Gilmour (Government) affirmed that the motion would not preclude cross-listing.

The EPC’s Motion 1 **passed** by a voice vote.

- d. Barbetta Spaeth (Classical Studies) introduced a substitute for the EPC’s Motion 2 (above). Her Substitute Motion consisted of three parts:
  - All courses to count towards the COLL requirement will be given the call number COLL 100 and vetted by the COLL committee.
  - These courses may also be identified as belonging to a specific department or program, if the department/program in question so wishes.

- COLL 100 courses may also be independent of a departmental designation if they are conceived of as not fitting into current disciplinary structures at the College. Chris Tucker (Philosophy) responded that the Philosophy Department frequently offers “big idea” courses, and thus COLL 100’s would not be sufficiently “special” or unusual to justify giving them a COLL prefix rather than the departmental prefix. He also argued that the pre-existing attribute system should be sufficient by itself to mark COLL 100’s relevance to the general education curriculum, and he proposed that the use of departmental prefixes for COLL 100’s could function just as departmental prefixes have in the past for courses at the 150 level. Mark Sher (Physics) cautioned that the admissions process for medical school counts applicants’ courses according to their prefixes in Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Mathematics, and thus a COLL prefix might do applicants a disservice by increasing the chance that medical school admissions committees could overlook some of their relevant coursework. He added that medical schools requiring applicants to have completed two English or writing courses might overlook relevant coursework in those areas as well, if those courses were listed on the transcript with a COLL prefix rather than a departmental one.

Barbette responded by proposing three ways in which courses with a COLL prefix could be cross-referenced to communicate their departmental affiliation:

- i. Cross-reference the COLL call number with a specific departmental call number. Only one CRN would be used for both call numbers, since this would be one course with two call numbers and one set of seats, not two different courses, each with a separate set of seats. E.g., COLL 100-01 = CLCV 100-01 *Death in Antiquity*.
- ii. Follow the COLL 100 prefix with a suffix to denote that it also “belongs” to a specific department/program. This suffix would behave like the “W” currently assigned for a writing course. E.g., COLL 100CLCV-01 *Death in Antiquity*.
- iii. Add a departmental designation to the title of the course. E.g., COLL 100-01 *CLCV 100-01 Death in Antiquity*.

Courses that transcend individual disciplines would use only the COLL 100 call number. E.g., COLL 100-01 *Witchcraft through the Ages*.

Christopher Owens (Theatre, Speech and Dance) affirmed Mark Sher’s concern about the Substitute Motion by noting that it may be unrealistic to expect graduate programs or employers to search for the departmental designation, if it is not easily identifiable on the transcript as the course prefix; he also noted that a blanket COLL prefix for all COLL 100 courses might make it more difficult for students to find courses of interest during registration. Christopher therefore questioned the necessity of the Substitute Motion and instead affirmed EPC Motions 1 and 2 (above).

Barbette responded that requirement of a COLL prefix for all COLL 100 courses would more clearly signal to students the novelty of the new curriculum and its underlying philosophy of transcending disciplinary structures; Laurie Koloski (History) affirmed that the COLL prefix would provide a similar signal to faculty teaching these courses. Bill Hutton (Classical Studies) added that consistent use of the COLL prefix would not preclude other departmental designations, and it would mark

COLL 100's for students as courses that will introduce them to the liberal arts education. Carey Bagdassarian (Chemistry) further observed that COLL 100's would represent only one course taken during the freshman year, so the COLL prefix would not obscure the departmental affiliations of multiple courses on a student's transcript.

Rowan Lockwood (Geology) countered that the same philosophical argument that would require a COLL prefix for COLL 100's could logically apply as well to COLL 150's, 200's, 300's, and 400's, so the requirement of a COLL prefix for COLL 100's could indeed have a cascade effect on the larger whole of a student's transcript and create problems during graduate admissions as described by Mark Sher.

Bill Hutton (Classical Studies) responded that departmental prefixes could be used on the student's transcript, even if the College uses a COLL prefix for that course during registration. Barbette further explained that the character limit in Banner and on student transcripts could be expanded, particularly if the transcript were printed in landscape mode rather than portrait mode.

John Gilmour (Government) emphasized that course mentoring provided by CLA Fellows and the use of the number 100 for all of these courses should be sufficient to signify their special place within the College curriculum, even without a required COLL prefix for all such courses.

The faculty voted by voice to call Barbette's Substitute Motion to question. The faculty then voted on whether to substitute Barbette's motion for EPC Motion 2. A count of the votes resulted in a majority against the substitution of Barbette's motion for EPC Motion 2.

EPC Motion 2 as described above then **passed** by a voice vote.

Jack Martin (English) introduced a motion to postpone EPC Motion 3 until the next meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This motion to postpone then **passed** by a voice vote.

*The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeremy Pope (History, [jwpop@wm.edu](mailto:jwpop@wm.edu))  
Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences