

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Arts & Sciences**  
**February 6, 2018, 3:30 – 5:00 pm**  
**Tucker 127 A**

*Dean Kate Conley opened the meeting at 3:31 PM.*

*Attendance at the start of the meeting: 75.*

- a. Approval of minutes from meeting of faculty on December 5, 2017  
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20171205.pdf>
- b. Report from Administrative Officers:
  - a. Provost Michael Halleran
    - i. The Provost reminded the faculty that this is Charter day week. On Thursday, February 8<sup>th</sup>, the College will mark its 325<sup>th</sup> birthday, which will be officially celebrated on Friday, February 10<sup>th</sup>. Arts & Sciences had a clean sweep of the Jefferson Awards this year, with Likhitha Kolla, a student in Biology & Computational and Applied Mathematics and Statistics, winning the Thomas Jefferson Prize in Natural Philosophy, Joanne Braxton (English) winning the Thomas Jefferson Award, and Jonathan Glasser (Anthropology) winning the Thomas Jefferson Teaching Award. During this week, the BoV, Foundation Board, and Alumni Board will also be holding meetings and events.
    - ii. In November, we discussed proposed legislation that would have had the impact of imputing as income the waivers that graduate student receive. This did not pass, but at private institutions are being affected by a raise to the minimum tax on wealth (endowment greater than 500K per student) will be charged 1.25% tax on this money. This does not affect William & Mary.
    - iii. Richmond in full session with many bills on the docket. Recently the College lost Fran Brafford as she took on a new role at the beginning of the spring semester of Deputy Secretary of Education for Higher Education. Colin Smolinsky took over fully for Fran with the main role of working to kill legislation. One bill on the table, creating a universal passport dealing with transfer from institution to institution, does not take into account that institutions are different and one that the Provost is not fond of passing.
    - iv. Overall state budget looks seems to be in a satisfactory place with revenues up in the last quarter. The big issue is the Medicaid expansion proposed by Gov. McAuliffe of a \$421mil in Medicaid expansion in the outgoing budget. If this does not happen, state will be in the hole.
    - v. With regards to DACA students, March 5<sup>th</sup> is the day that President Trump has picked to enforce new regulations. Currently, negotiations in Washington still happening.

- vi. The W&M budget for 2018 will be discussed in two weeks during a meeting of the Provost, Sam Jones, and COPAR. At this meeting, the increased demand on financial aid will be discussed. This year most, the College accepted its most diverse SES group of students, which is a positive, but this did put a strain on the financial aid office.
- vii. Question: A question was raised about raises. The Provost indicated that in the last Governor's there was a proposed 2% raise for all employees beginning in December of 2019, but this may not remain.
- viii. Question: A question was raised about the promise and raises being subject to what the state decides to do. The Provost indicated that the promise raises are subject to money being available. A follow up questions of whether there is money in terms of our projections regardless of the state was raised. The Provost indicated that the raises were in the promise but the financial aid situation could affect this going forward.

b. Dean Kate Conley

- i. This year, William & Mary is celebrating its 325<sup>th</sup> birthday, and 50 years of African American students in residence at the College. This year on Charter Day Weekend, three honorary degrees are being bestowed upon women: Trudier Harris, Frances G. McGlothlin, and Hunter J. Smith. Ralph Northam, our new governor will be speaking at Charter Day. The Dean encouraged all faculty to attend. On Saturday morning, February 10<sup>th</sup>, the alumni medallion will be present to 4 women: Jill Ellis, Janet Rollins Atwater, Shelby Smith Hawthorne, and Ellen R. Stofan.
- ii. Two weeks ago, there was a meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in Washington. There was a panel on general education where John Donahue (Dean for Education Policy) presented on the COLL Curriculum. This was also reported on in Inside Higher Ed as a way of revamping General Education.
- iii. There is a new program being initiated with Richard Bland College, who shares the same BoV. Pell Eligible students who want to transfer can be identified as promise scholars. This approach is hoped to be more successful than previous methods. These students will be prepared by making sure they have two COLL classes at RBC taught by faculty shared between the two institutions. Right now, we are in the process of selecting the six faculty members who will travel between the two campuses. The courses will fulfill the COLL 100/150 component of the curriculum. Janice Zeman looked out for this project.
- iv. Tia Brown McNair's (Vice President for the Association of American College and Universities in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Student Success) visit is being rescheduled for the fall. At this point, we are not far enough along in our process here, but we are making good progress. Dean Conley has met with her and was very impressed.
- v. Faculty have been reviewing ideas for W&M 2026, which was presented as a short version of slides shown last fall. There was a town hall meeting

in December to discuss this as well. Before and after the town hall, the Dean sent feedback to rector and vice rector expressing concerns about the enrollment growth that is being discussed. The Dean expressed concern that if not carefully monitored, this could have adverse impact on our advances with diversity, research opportunities for students, and the kind of education that we offer. The Rector came today and spoke with the Dean team. The discussion centered around the fact that success in A&S comes from the ratio that exists. The advances with diversity in A&S were discussed as well. The Rector explained the increasing enrollment is one of the options being discussed in this plan. A consulting firm is doing market research on this topic and the effect on students if enrollments are increased. It was emphasized that no decisions have been formally made regarding this subject matter.

- vi. The Dean's Dinner will be held in the Great Hall on the Friday of Charter Day as a way to say thank you to our supporters and donors. At this dinner, three students will be presenting from Academic Festival from the COLL 300 curriculum.
  - vii. Question: A question was raised about the consultant that is being used. It was mentioned that it necessary to have faculty inform the BOV to help them understand the work that we do. It was also mentioned that we may need to make a comparison among institutions and historicize this information in some way.
    - 1. The Provost indicated that the consultants are mainly being asked to comment on financial aid as we will always have finite dollars.
- c. Update from Faculty Assembly (Cathy Forestell)
- i. The last meeting of the Faculty Assembly was on January 31<sup>st</sup>. At the time, Mark Patterson, the new ombudsperson, visited to remind the Assembly of his role and to answer any questions. Additionally, Dennis Mannos (Vice Provost for Research and Graduate/Professional Studies) visited to discuss the engineering and design initiative.
  - ii. The Faculty Assembly subcommittees have been very busy. One has been working on revisions to the Faculty Handbook. One section of these revisions will be posted for comment. The section regarding paid family leave and disability leave.
  - iii. The WM 2026 committee is working on recommendations and a presentation to share with faculty and the BoV regarding the plan. There was a faculty forum last fall where a robust discussion regarding this topic took place. A second forum will be held when the Assembly has more information to provide. In the meantime, those unable to attend the previous forum may contact Cathy Forestell to discuss these matters.
  - iv. The Faculty Liaison presentations to the BoV were focused on research that we do with students to aid them in understanding that being at William & Mary as an undergraduate isn't just about the classroom experience, but also about the out of the classroom research opportunities.

- v. At the next meeting of the BoV, Nick Villacio (Geology) will be presenting to Board.
- vi. A question was raised by Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) asked if there has been a WM 2026 committee composition change over time, reporting, and the difference in the previous strategic planning process. Cathy indicated that the faculty task group is made up of individuals mainly from A&S, but has individuals from other schools as well. This is due to the fact that growth would disproportionately affect A&S. The committee is only composed of faculty members. This committee reports to the faculty and the BoV. There will be a presentation presented to the BoV due to the fact that this seems to be a better option than a document that would be distributed. This is different from strategic planning, which was conducted in 2008, in that there are less individuals involved. The current thinking is that it would be difficult to have weekly meetings that could include a large number of faculty members. Listening sessions and focus groups have been suggested as a way to rectify the fact that many faculty are not involved in the process.
- vii. Gene Tracy (Physics) made a comment that we may have forgotten the history of the last strategic planning process where the faculty was polled and the wider community was brought into the conversation. In 2008, groups were broken out into smaller task forces with some of that time consisting of weekly meetings. Gene encouraged the Assembly to be proactive in seeking out thoughts in the same way.
- viii. Lisa Meyer (American Studies/History) asked if it would be reasonable to reach out to people who were central members of the last effort and obtain information on how the process worked. The last process involved more of the group than this effort. Cathy thought they had to have the report done by February. The BoV now has a consulting firm that will allow for an extended period to work on this.
- ix. The Provost commented that the 65% 35% law for instate/out of state enrollment is affecting all of these items. There is an effort to see if this can be modified or relaxed which requires political action. Until this happens, the value of growth of the student population is to be determined.
- x. Dean Conley commented that the Rector emphasized that the BoV is research on our financial and operational model to hand over to new president. They are not working towards making decisions for the new president. The strategic planning committee has several faculty members, representing another venue where planning is being discussed.

#### IV. EPC Motion (Laurie Wolf, Chair - EPC):

The motion reads as below:

The line in the catalog that states:

Students may not apply more than eight Military Science credits toward the 120 credits needed for graduation.

is amended to read:

Students may not apply more than twelve Military Science credits toward the 120 credits needed for graduation.

Rationale:

When the limitation of eight credits was imposed over a decade ago, most ROTC students took eight credits (over eight semesters). They now take twelve credits. This modification would allow all of these credits to count towards the 120 needed. At UVA and Virginia Tech, the limit is twelve credits, and the W&M limitation of eight credits is making our program less competitive. Note that the limitations for applied music and dance are each 14 credits.

Marc Sher, the Chair of EPC when this was approved, provided the following information as an explanation for the change:

Prior to 1972, there was no limit to military science credit. After that year, this was limited to 6 credits, in a time in which the military was not popular on college campuses. In 2007, the EPC voted to make the last two years a time when 2 credits could be taken. This was accompanied by a change to accept 8 credits. Now, the students take the 12 credits, but there has been a problem with recruiting as only 8 credits were able to count. Other schools, including UVA, VT and UNC, allow for 12 credits out of the 120 to be military science. This motion to amend is aimed at aligning William & Mary with other institutions. The classes consist of meeting one hour, three days a week, in addition to a lab. These courses each count for one credit.

Motion to amend the catalog to state the change of 8 credit hours to 12 credit hours was put before the faculty.

The motion passed with limited dissent.

- V. Report from Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee (Michael Tierney, Co-Chair, RPT)
  - a. RPT is a 6 person committee elected from A&S that reports to Dean. This committee does not grant tenure or prevent tenure.
  - b. Highlights of the report were presented as follows:
    - i. In the fall, tenure and promotion cases are handled. This past fall, the committee reviewed 14 tenure cases and recommend 12 for tenure, 2 were recommended against, and the Dean agreed with all recommendations. The Provost agreed with 13 cases and overturned the Dean in one case. In the Spring, the committee handles promotion cases only. In the spring, the committee reviews 15 promotion cases with 14 recommended for promotion to full professor. The Dean and the Provost agreed in all cases.
    - ii. Dean has a new memo for the RPT process. This memo is more specific and grounds the policies in the handbook and in the Provost memo, making it easier for candidates for tenure and promotion as well as

department chairs to follow the rules for the process. Dossiers are more well organized now.

- iii. There are two errors highlighted in this report: First, departments fail to upload their department and program standards, making it difficult for the committee to apply the standards. Secondly, departments and programs do not always discuss how they evaluate teaching effectiveness.
- c. Question: Marc Sher (Physics) asked what occurs if the provost doesn't agree. The Provost writes a report but does not come back to RPT. The Provost commented that he takes a recommendation from the Dean and then discusses these with the Dean. The Dean presumably talks to RPT.
- d. Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) asked if it has ever been considered to look at how our peers deal with retention, promotion, and tenure. Barbette has heard of other institutions where the power to grant tenure and promotion rests in the hands of faculty and not the provost. Michael Tierney indicated that in his three years, they have never done research on this. The Provost commented that the BoV awards tenure. Our policy is that if someone is not recommended, the case does not go to the BoV. The Provost informs the BoV of these cases, but they are not formally taken up by the BOV. The Board has not, in recent memory, turned down a case. One person indicated that they remembered the last time was a case in the 70s.

#### VI. Resolution: *Task force for undergraduate instruction* (Suzanne Hagedorn, English)

The proposed resolution:

WHEREAS, there has been a steady decline in the percentage of W&M student course credit hours taught by tenured and tenure eligible faculty members over the last decade,

and

WHEREAS, in 2007, tenured and tenure eligible faculty taught 67% of student credit hours and in 2016, tenured and tenure eligible faculty taught only 59% of student credit hours

and

WHEREAS, to preserve and continue to build the reputation of the College for high-quality undergraduate education, it is desirable to have the vast majority of educational experiences taught by tenured and tenure-eligible faculty who have (or hope to have) a long-term relationship to the College of William & Mary,

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the assembled members of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, ask that the Faculty Affairs Committee set up a task force to study undergraduate instruction at W&M in comparison to other institutions in our peer group and to deliver recommendations for best practices to this body and to the W&M Board of Visitors and Administration by the end of this academic year.

Comments from the floor were made regarding this:

- a. Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): The email sent to the faculty and staff was not sent with the intent of disrespect for the NTEs, who she respects for their teaching, research, and service, although they are only rewarded for their teaching role. Barbette's concern is the general trend in higher education that there is a two-tier faculty. In this arrangement, the top tier faculty focuses on research, are well paid, instruct in graduate education, and has tenure. Second tier faculty, in this arrangement would be the "underclass", which is the concern that she hoped to express in her email. As a tenured faculty, Barbette is concerned that the load of two courses per semester with service does not leave time for research. NTEs are under a strained load but are hired due to the fact that these hires save money through teaching more and are paid less. The overall effect on instruction is that the institution is over burdening a certain segment of faculty unfairly, in her opinion. This does provide for more courses, but Barbette expressed a concern for the quality of instruction if the instructors are overburdened. She expressed that she is of the opinion that the College needs to find a better way to handle this situation. Additionally, Barbette read a statement that was cited from the Provost's presentation to BoV that in order to maintain a student/faculty ratio as we have now means that the College would have to hire 8.3 new faculty for every 100 students. This is a minimum of \$915,000. The savings to move the ratio up by 2 students to 14:1 at current enrollment is estimated at \$8.2 million savings, through a movement away from tenure eligible faculty.
  - a. The Provost responded to that that the quoted numbers and values were not a part of a presentation that he presented. The BoV asked for calculations, as he stated in December. The Provost emphasized the ratio is essential to what we accomplish. The Provost does not think we are out of balance TE/NTE but stated that he thought were could shift even more towards higher NTE numbers without any issue.
- b. Michael Lewis (Computer Science): Michael indicated that the wording of the current resolution does not reflect Barbette's thoughts, but rather, is insulting to the lecturers.
- c. Marc Sher (Physics): Marc indicated that he is opposed to this resolution as it is written but thinks it could be altered. Marc stated that the third whereas clause is insulting to a large number of colleagues as it is written. Marc also highlighted a few NTEs: The Jefferson Award in 2017 was given to an NTE Sharon Zuber who has been at the College for 32 years and who practically created freshman seminar and writing seminar courses on campus. The Graves Award was given to Bev Sher for teaching excellence in 2017. Iyabo Osiapem has served on almost every committee at this college, demonstrating the definition of service. Christy Porter who has been at the College for 15 years and is currently teaching at least 510 students a year (8% of student body). The third paragraph relates to those who have tenure and do not have to worry about the job the way NTEs do. The resolution is truly for the task force. As written, this leaves FAC 6 weeks to complete, which is not a realistic feat. Marc indicated that if the time was realistic and the third paragraph was removed, he would not object to the resolution.

- d. Bill Cook (Physics): Bill indicated he will vote against this resolution. The issue is that there are terrific NTE faculty. He acknowledges that two separate classes exist due to the rate of pay. If there was a motion for NTE to be paid equivalent for the value of their contribution, he would support it, but the administration may have issues as this would negate saving money. Bill stated that if the College values teaching the way that we say we do, we should pay teaching at the same rate.
- e. JC Poutsma (Chemistry): JC asked for clarification of who makes up our peer group. He made the statement that we may look better in terms of our teaching percentages than our peers.
  - a. Provost Halleran: The Provost indicated that we have a SCHEV peer group made up of 15 private and 11 public institutions that were chosen due to being similar to us structurally. This group was formed as a Salary Peer Group. We developed a different peer group in 2008 as a benchmark peer group.
  - b. Dean Conley suggested that there could be an FAC subcommittee to look into this issue of peer groups.
- f. Francesca Sawaya (English): Francesca explained that she is pretty new to W&M. She emphasized that the history of tenure is about free speech and that the erosion of tenure leads to concerns. At her previous institution, this was vital to protect faculty. She sees this resolution as part of the emphasis to protect free speech, a right and responsibility protected by tenure.
- g. Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages & Literatures): Silvia emphasized that she does not want to speak in favor or against but sees this as a response to the concern of erosion of tenure, not value of the lecturers. As chair of Modern Languages & Literatures, her department has 30 TE lines and over 50 faculty, therefore approximately 20 full-time continuing positions. The ratio is not what is being cited in this resolution. Silvia expressed concern that as we think about adjustments to this that we think carefully about the ecology, not simply college-wide, but in terms of different programs and departments and the effects that this could have, including the effects on morale. We value the work that we do as teacher/scholars. The vast majority of NTE hires do research but are not supported to enhance this.
- h. Greg Smith (Applied Science, Neuroscience; Chair of FAC): Greg stated that it would take more than a semester to accomplish what is being proposed in the last portion of the resolution. Greg indicated that he would not vote for this as it is currently written, but voiced concerns about erosion of tenure. At this institution, he sees a large amount of faculty service but is concerned about the lack of faculty governance. Greg expressed that he has difficulty seeing the faculty involvement in the key decisions of the institution through governance.
- i. John McGlennon (Government): John thanked the faculty for their attendance at this meeting and thanked Suzanne for bringing the resolution and providing the faculty with a good discussion. He also voiced that he did not want to bring this to a vote due to the possibility of misinterpretation, but rather wants to table motion indefinitely and have the FAC look into a way to reinvigorate faculty governance and how we are involved in the policies of the university. He also encouraged everyone to join the



American Association of University Professors, the greatest defender of the tenure system and its First Amendment protections.

John McGlennon (Government) made a motion to table the resolution presented indefinitely AND to ask the FAC to create a subcommittee to study the question of the ecology (balance/composition) of the faculty and faculty governance.

The motion passed with one nay expressed.

Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) recommended that instead of a subcommittee that his be an ad hoc committee.

VII. Resolution: *Shared governance* (Suzanne Hagedorn, English)

Suzanne, prior to reading the following resolution apologized for any misinterpretation of the previous resolution and indicated her concern was for the hollowing out of the TE faculty at the College and nationwide.

The proposed resolution:

Resolution on Shared Governance

WHEREAS, the Board of Visitors retreat began discussing strategic planning and the W&M 2026 Plan in July 2017;

and WHEREAS, the W&M faculty as a whole was invited to participate in an open forum to discuss the W&M 2026 Strategic Plan in December 2017;

Be It RESOLVED

that we, the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences at William & Mary affirm the concept of shared governance,

And BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

that we respectfully request that the Board of Visitors and W&M administrators work to include a wider range of faculty voices in the W&M 2026 Strategic Planning process as it moves forward by holding additional open faculty fora and by taking a survey of faculty views on the various options the Board is considering to solve W&M's long-term funding situation.

Suzanne provided the following rationale: She feels that the current process differs from what happened in 2008. Currently, faculty were largely unaware of this process. The BoV needs to be reminded that we are involved in the academic workings of this institution.

Comments from the floor were made regarding this:

- a. Greg Smith (Applied Science, Neuroscience; Chair of FAC): Greg asked if anyone from the Faculty Assembly was present who could address how this was unrolled over the last semester. He also asked if there had been a connection between the BoV and the faculty in this process.
  - a. No one in attendance from the 2026 committee. Rex Kincaid (Mathematics; Faculty Assembly) stated they first heard in September about the 2026 plan, which was put forward as a brainstorming endeavor as opposed to a true planning process. Following this, the Executive Committee met in October. Rex is now on the strategic planning committee.
- b. Marylou Zapf (Mathematics): Marylou asked if anyone knew about the timeline of this entire process. She inquired as to whether this had been stretched out, regarding when the BoV will act.
  - a. Dean Conley indicated that she was under the impression that this was open ended and more of a brainstorming process.
- c. Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages & Literatures): Silvia asked if there was downside to voting in favor of the resolution presented.
- d. Marc Sher (Physics): Marc called the question after a technical correction. The name of the W&M 2026 plan is not consistent throughout the document, as pointed out by a separate faculty member.
- e. Bill Cooke (Physics): Bill indicated that there was no specific plan, making this resolution confusing, and leading him to vote against the current resolution.
- f. Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies): Barbette indicated that given the PowerPoint on the BoV portion of the website. Her impression was that the ad hoc committee was formed to have a faculty voice with regards to the W&M 2026 plan.

The question was called and seconded. The vote did not pass, the discussion continued with the comments below from the floor:

- a. Provost Halleran: The Provost indicated that there is no plan and that the BoV is thinking about the future. He also emphasized the need for a faculty voice, via the ad hoc committee. A true strategic planning process is longer, more inclusive and more in depth.
- b. Paul Manna (Government): Paul indicated that he would vote against this resolution, citing the need to be informed before we vote on anything.
- c. Suzanne Hagedorn (English): Suzanne moved to strike the whereas clauses and leave the be it resolved clauses.

The motion to amend was made. This was voted on a passed by the faculty.

Barbette Spaeth (Classical Studies) suggest to further amend the resolution to say in the “be it further resolved” section that the wording be changed to read “work to include a wide range of faculty voices in any strategic planning process.”

The motion to amend the wording of the resolution was voted on passed.

The motion to approve the reworded resolution (seen below) was voted upon and passed.

Resolution on Shared Governance

Be It RESOLVED

that we, the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences at William & Mary affirm the concept of shared governance,

And BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

that we respectfully request that the Board of Visitors and W&M administrators work to include a wide range of faculty voices in any strategic planning process as it moves forward by holding additional open faculty fora and by taking a survey of faculty views on the various options the Board is considering to solve W&M’s long-term funding situation.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Marc Sher announced an update on the diversity requirement of the curriculum. In the next few days, emails will be sent to the faculty regarding forums to be held. There will be three faculty fora and one student forum to discuss this portion of the curriculum. The new portion will be identified as COLL 199, an attribute that can be shared with any other course within the curriculum

*The meeting was adjourned by Dean Conley at 5:06 PM.*

Respectfully submitted,

Ashleigh E. Queen (Kinesiology & Health Sciences, aeverhardt@wm.edu) Secretary to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences