

MINUTES
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
March, 13, 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: 30.

- I. Approval of minutes from meeting of faculty on February 6, 2018.
<http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20180206>.
- II. Report from Administrative Officers:
 - a. Provost
 - i. The Provost commented on the new president, Katherine Rowe, who is a full-fledged academic, indicating that he is delighted that she will be here. He also offered his thanks to Suzanne Raitt, Iyabo Osiapem, and Paul Heideman, who are three members of Arts and Sciences who also served on the Presidential Search Committee.
 - ii. The Provost commented on the status of DACA students, which was first brought up back in September when President Trump indicated that in 6 months the program would no longer be in place. After over 6 months no deal has been reached in Washington, and the Supreme Court has not taken a case, meaning the intervention of the lower courts continues for some period of time. This is a terrible situation for our students who continue to experience uncertainty. William & Mary's commitment to these students has not changed. The university is committed to seeing these students complete their W&M education and will take necessary action to ensure it.
 - iii. The Provost also provided an update on the General Assembly. It was through that by March, we would discuss the bills and decisions but they have not made any decisions, instead being involved in a fundamental policy disagreement on the expansion of Medicaid. As a result, the House has more money to allocate to other things, but the Senate has said no to this, resulting in a gap of \$600mill between the house and senate budgets. At this point, it is not clear how this will be resolved. This is not up to Gov. Northam's to call special session as, by law, a budget must be in place by July 1st. At this point, we are unsure of how this will affect the university. The House budget passing would be better for us. Additionally, in April, we have to present a budget to the Board. The historic impact of recruiting the most diverse SES class in the last year has drastically impacted our financial aid budget in the past year. This will impact next year, in addition to the fact that the College must annualize salaries, which began in August and account for the increase in healthcare costs. We also have commitments that are outstanding that need to be honored. There are also requests to the Planning & Budget Request (PBR) process. The Provost also met with COPAR a couple of weeks ago and will meet again next Thursday to work on the budget that goes to the

President for formal recommendation to the Board. FY 2018-19 does not look good. Three weeks the Provost sent out a memo to the Deans and Vice-Presidents asking what they would do if they had to cut 1-2% from their budgets.

1. Suzanne Hagedorn (English) – asked about the last meeting where there was mention of the consulting firm that was hired with respect to strategic planning/ finances and instate/out of state ratios.
 - a. The Provost indicated the discussion is around language that would give institutions more latitude on instate/out of state ratio. Currently, we have no idea what the Governor will do now. The consulting firm will report back in April, with one focus being if we can increase the size of class through out of state and what would that require. This would relate to our recruiting and financial aid processes.
 2. Suzanne Raitt (English) – asked about the prospects for merit raises.
 - a. The Provost indicated that right now it does not look good.
- b. Dean Kate Conley
- i. The Dean provided an update on the Campaign for the Bold. As of March 1st, we have raised \$86.8mill towards our goal of \$143mill. Since Gerald Bullock joined as Executive Director of Development in the summer of 2016, we have raised \$16mill. The Dean spent a week in the northwest and secured promises for contributions to A&S, making 13 visits in 4 days.
 - ii. The Dean will be attending a Richmond campaign celebration this month at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts to inform donors and alumni on our progress, solicit interest in our program, and allow for these individuals to ask questions about the campaign and program.
 - iii. Gerald Bullock & Steve Otto have been generating stories for the William & Mary committee about how we use the annual fund for critical student and faculty opportunities. For example, we were able to send 10 graduate students in American Studies to a conference in Denver, where they were able to present their work. Additionally, we were able to support a faculty member in traveling to Senegal to present a paper.
 - iv. One Tribe One Day is coming up on Tuesday, April 10, 2018. We will participate in the Gerdelman, Unit and School Challenge for most new donors, most new donors, and largest increase in donors from last year. If we win, this money will be divided between the programs and departments with the highest percentage of donors. There will also be an open house in Ewell Hall that day.
 - v. The Dean provided an update on searches. As of March 8, 2018, 17 searches have been conducted, we have 10 signed letters, 1 written offer extended, 3 hiring proposals in the verbal offer stage, 2 searches still in progress, and 1 search suspended. Two of these hires have been a results

of the Provost's Diversity Hiring Initiative. We may end up with 16-17 new colleagues in the fall.

- vi. The Dean also commented on the budget, indicating that the outlook is not very good. Dean Conley is currently working with Dean team on trying to determine how we can cut 1-2% of our budget. The best idea is to spend less which might be realized as authorizing fewer searches next year. If a search is requested and not authorized, this would constitute a delay in searches not a denial. The College underestimated financial aid cost this year by \$3.7mill. that must be accounted for over four years as these students complete their undergraduate degrees.
- vii. The Dean sent an email on the Friday before spring break indicating that Theresa Longo is the new dean of Interdisciplinary Studies and Director of the Charles Center. The Dean plans to post a search to appoint a Faculty Director for Undergraduate Research, which would be a new position. This would be breaking Joel Schwartz's role into two roles.
- viii. The Dean updated faculty of the work of the FAC. Currently the FAC is working on appointing a subcommittee to study the TE/NTE balance. At the last FAC meeting, Christy Porter came and spoke. Christy is a member of the NTE Status Working Group that was charged in February of 2017 to gather information on the status of NTE faculty in A&S.

III. Nominations and Elections (Brett Wilson, English)

Below are the list items for this election:

Faculty Assembly, Area I, 3-year term, choose one:

Suzanne Hagedorn, English
Molly Swetnam-Burland, Classical Studies

Faculty Assembly, Area II, 3-year term, choose one:

Jennifer Mellor, Economics
Meghan Sinton Miller, Psychological Sciences

Faculty Assembly, Area III, one 3-year term, one 1-year term, choose two:

Chris Abelt, Chemistry
Vladimir Bolotnikov, Mathematics
Pieter Peers, Computer Science

Retention, Promotion, & Tenure Committee, Area II, 3-year term, choose one:

John Gilmour, Government
Gul Ozyegin, Sociology

Procedural Review Committee / Personnel Policy Committee, Area II, 3-year term, choose one:

Lee Kirkpatrick, Psychological Sciences
John Parman, Economics

Procedural Review Committee / Personnel Policy Committee, Area I, 3-year term, choose one:

Gayle Murchison, Music
Chris Tucker, Philosophy

Committee on Faculty Awards, Prizes, and Professorships, Area I, 3-year terms, choose two:

Matthew Haug, Philosophy
Charles Palermo, Art & Art History
Talbot (Tolly) Taylor, English

No new names were added from the floor. The ballot will become available as soon as possible after the conclusion of the meeting. It will be available for one week.

IV. Motion from EPC regarding COLL 199 requirement (Laurie Wolf)

The motion was introduced for discussion but is not for a vote for today:

The COLL curriculum will be amended to include a COLL 199 requirement. The College commits itself to developing additional courses to supplement existing courses with a COLL 199 attribute, and to provide sufficient resources. The requirement will only go into effect when a sufficient number of courses have been approved.

COLL 199

The COLL 199 requirement is a requirement that all students take a course of at least 3 credits dealing with justice and equity. The COLL 199 attribute can be applied to other COLL courses, including COLL 100s, 150s, and 200s. Students who take such courses will earn credit toward both requirements. This attribute can be affixed to any course that successfully addresses two pedagogical goals.

These goals are: 1) to deepen students' understanding about marginalization as an ongoing social, cultural and material process; 2) to provide students with a rigorous academic space in which to explore differences in perspective while foregrounding reasoned, respectful discussion as the means for achieving common ground.

To meet these pedagogical goals, COLL199 courses will: 1) examine processes and patterns of marginalization by exploring at least two key social aspects including, but not limited to: race, gender identity, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, language, religion and disability; 2) emphasize respectful dialogue between students as an integral component to the course; 3) enable critical reflection by requiring students to make sustained connections between the course material and contemporary life in the United States.

John ("Rio") Riofrio (Hispanic Studies) provided the following comments about the COLL 199 attribute as background: The COLL 199 attribute comes out of the Race Task Force put together by President Reveley in 2015-2016. This task force was asked to look at campus climate around race and race relations, with one subcommittee investigating curriculum. The task force looked at faculty diversity and the lack of space on campus to have discussions about marginalization. A subcommittee was formed after the task force was disbanded that focused on curriculum. This subcommittee consisted of John Riofrio,

Suzanne Raitt, Iyabo Osiapem, and Laura Heymann from the law school. In discussion of this, there were staff, faculty, and student fora to obtain feedback. Students expressed a significant amount of support for the proposal. The resulting proposal was then discussed with some of the Associate Deans, the CLA, and then the EPC. That then formed the joint subcommittee. Over the past year and a half, the above proposal took shape. Over the last two months, there have been open faculty fora to solicit feedback regarding the proposal as it stands, and a student fora was also held three weeks ago where they expressed a significant amount of support for the proposal.

Marc Sher (Physics) provided the following background information about the inclusion within the current curriculum: When the inclusion of COLL 199 first became a part of the discussion, there were three faculty fora in fall, three in spring and one student forum, where the students expressed the need for additional requirements. Changes were made to the above motion as a result of these.

How many current courses would satisfy this? Marc looked at all COLL 150s, 100s, and 200s from Fall 2017 that would satisfy this requirement with small or no changes –

COLL 150s – 20 courses that satisfy this requirement – 300 seats each semester, 600 seats per year

COLL 100s - 6 courses that satisfy this requirement – 150 seats each semester, 300 seats per year

COLL 200 with 25 or fewer students – 8 courses that satisfy this requirement – 200 seats each semester, 400 seats per year

Non COLL – many that would be viable options

Getting to the 1500 seats needed will not be difficult – more like the creation of COLL 200s which were all modifications.

The following changes were made following the faculty fora:

- Preamble - College does commit to additional courses and resources: CLA – May seminars, Tia Brown McNair workshop, departmental workshops, Deans promised visitors for training in departments.
- The overall desire is to see a limit of 25 students. Large lecture courses may not provide the environment for discussion.
- Small group discussions changed to discussions between students.
- First sentence – used to say social justice and equity, changed to just read justice after feedback from individuals in Sociology regarding the specific meaning of social justice not being appropriate for this context.
- Sustained connections – vague on purpose – there is not expectation that the entire course to deal with topics related to the US. There will not be a defined percentage.

No vote is being held today as the Student Assembly would like to weigh in on this discussion.

Fred Corney (History): Raised a question about the cut off of 25, indicating that he thinks a larger number could engage discussion around this topic.

Another question was also raised about the connection between the first sentence and the context of the statement. The first sentence provides how it should be. Goal 1 that deals with content. It is clear that disagreements are important, but the real problem is the normative issues. Normative issues are important and lead to the most spirited disagreement and that should be explicit.

George Irby (Classical Studies): Indicated concerned about Goal 3. The courses dealing with antiquity would not satisfy this currently, but are in the spirit of this requirement.

John Riofrio (Hispanic Studies): The race task force was convened in midst of the campus protests (Yale, Ithaca, etc). Conversations among students was that curriculum was lacking a place to talk about these issues of marginalization with relation to their lived experiences. The goal was to avoid giving the idea of these being issues that happen elsewhere but that are not being dealt with within the US. Out of the faculty fora, there were productive discussions with those who teach topics that are not related to the US but could be included for students in this curriculum.

Michael Lewis (Computer Science): Indicated that he would like to see the addition of a statement defining marginalization, questioning how will this be decided.

Berhanu Abegaz (Economics): Expressed two concerns. First, when COLL 300 was approved, it turned out to be a mixture of internationalization and multiculturalism. COLL 300 replaced GER 4 and some aspects of COLL 100. Berhanu expressed the hope that now that we are permitted to do COLL 199, we might rethink the division of labor between COLL 300 and COLL 100, perhaps taking out the multiculturalism component of COLL 300. He also indicated that he doesn't like the term marginalization as it plays up victimhood. The special thing about US society is exclusion/inclusion dynamic that is opened up to welcoming those of differing backgrounds while being deeply rooted in institutional practices that are exclusionary. He feels this will focus on the institutional marginalization, only looking at the exclusionary aspects of institutions. The language also focuses on personal prejudices. This tends to play up the social damages, and in his opinion needs to be reworked.

A question was raised of when this would be taken by students – Marc indicated this should be taken early in the college career. Transfer students would be slightly different, but with many COLL 150s satisfying the requirement, they will take these anyway. If anyone has any comments or questions, they can email these to Laurie Wolf.

John Riofrio: Made the comment that this proposal reflects what has been gathered from the student input and reflects their experiences at William & Mary. Used to be called the Inclusion and Common Ground portion of the curriculum.

V. Report from Dean's working group on undergraduate research (Dan Cristol)

- a. A working group, consisting of representatives [Dan Cristol (Biology), Joel Schwartz (Government), Christine Nemacheck (Government), Bill Hutton (Classical Studies), Cathy Forestell (Psychology), and Elizabeth Mead (Art History)] from various parts of the College community has been collecting information for last year and a half.
- b. The first task was to determine what is meant by undergraduate research at this university. Conversations were conducted with about 60 members of the faculty from different departments and programs to determine what qualified as undergraduate research. The group reached a consensus definition from this work. 4 components (traditional or in class):
 - i. Experience was actively mentored by a faculty member – excludes student researching on their own or writing on their own.
 - ii. The activity was designed with the intention of generating new knowledge.
 - iii. Student takes ownership of the project – hypothesis, analysis, etc.
 1. A question was raised about what this means – includes students working on existing faculty projects, but the student is aware of why they are doing a specific piece of this project.
 - iv. Student understands the academic context of the project and can articulate this to an audience.
- c. The working group decided to find out how much undergraduate research is going on that qualifies by the above definition. This included looking at the “70%” that is given as the amount of undergraduate students who conduct research during their time here. A Qualtrix survey was sent to students, able to use 1636 student responses to determine what they did and what they got out of the experience. It was determined that by graduation 60% have done research outside of the class, 70% in class. Overall, 80% had been involved in some form of undergraduate research by the time they have graduated.
- d. The group also looked at who is doing research. There are lower numbers within the population of first generation students, regardless of race. This alerted the group to an area of improvement. They asked why and found that the most common answer (40%) was that these students were not sure how to get involved. The solution to this is that we need to do a better job explaining how to get involved.
- e. The last step was to conduct a survey of all departments and program websites to determine if they have information regarding involvement in undergraduate research. There was variation of information provided for students with not all telling how to get involved. The overall conclusion is that there is room for improvement about providing the specific steps to get involved in activity.
- f. The next step is to decide as a faculty whether we want to do more of this as a faculty. This includes determining if this does benefit us and are we willing to put more in for our students to participate in this.
 - i. Silvia Tandeciarz (Modern Languages) – Asked if the committee looked at how much of faculty mentored research was undertaken by faculty as overloads as opposed to part of their regular teaching responsibilities, as

this relates to invisible labor. Dan indicated that this was not examined in any formal way, but could be determined out of a faculty survey.

- ii. Georgia Irby (Classical Studies) –Asked if any questions in the student survey were used to tease out how they defined student research. Was it thought of that first generation may be doing research and not realize it. Dan indicated that they did not ask what activity qualified as undergraduate research, instead indicating the working group definition and asking what the students got out of the experience. A more involved study to determine specific projects would have to come from another survey.
- iii. Joel Schwartz (Government) that this project generated results that confirmed findings he had found from other research around this topic. If you look at Honors Theses or Charles Center Grants, there is an under-representation of first generation/transfer students. This is not surprising due to not being plugged in as much as traditional students.

Dean Conley stated at the end of the meeting that she is excited about Katherine Rowe coming to campus. She was able to talk with her during her time on campus and indicated Katherine Rowe's first question was about the faculty. The Dean thinks this is a President who will be invested here.

Two events are coming up this weekend:

1. The Lemon Project Symposium – Sadler Center and School of Education. One topic on Saturday is desegregation at William & Mary.
2. Grad student research symposium – host institution of this showcase. This will be held in the Sadler Center.

Tia Brown McNair will be coming in fall to conduct a research workshop for faculty about courses like the COLL 199.

Marc Sher commented that there are a lot of suggestions on COLL 199 and only 3 weeks until the next Faculty of Arts & Sciences meeting. If there are any suggested amendments, please send to Laurie Wolf as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned by Dean Conley at 4:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

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