

Minutes
Faculty of Arts & Sciences
November 5th 2019, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Tucker Hall, 127A

Dean Conley called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. There were 59 faculty present.

Dean Conley opened the meeting by noting that Provost Agouris was also scheduled to attend the another meeting occurring at the same time and that she would be coming later in the meeting to give her report.

I. Approval of minutes from meeting of faculty on Oct 1, 2019

There was a motion to approve the minutes of October 1, 2019, which was seconded and approved on a voice vote.

<https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/20191001.pdf>

II. Report from the Dean (Kate Conley)

Dean Conley said that she was excited about election day, excited about the upcoming conference of ASWAD (Association for the Study of the Worldwide African Diaspora) with 1000 participants at the Williamsburg Lodge and listed some highlights from the conference, including upcoming art exhibits at the Muscarelle Museum and a dance recital at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts. She noted that anyone with a W&M ID was welcome to attend sessions of the ASWAD conference.

Dean Conley said that she would be acting on the recommendation in the Ad Hoc Committee on COLL 199 to study course evaluations. She added that the Faculty Assembly will undertake a university-wide study to examine course evaluations that would compare our practices with other institutions. Dean Conley said that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and the Council of Chairs and Program (CCPD) had discussions about what we could do right now about course evaluations. She said that she proposed that faculty could write an explanatory comment that could provide some context for their course evaluations, including responses to specific student comments. These faculty comments would be saved as a .pdf file that would travel along with each set of course evaluations in merit reviews, tenure reviews, and promotion reviews. She indicated that FAC and CCPD have had a favorable response to this idea. Since this policy may be implemented during this spring's merit cycle, she encouraged faculty to comment on it to her or to their department or program's contact dean.

Dean Conley noted that the FAC has been working on a charge for the standing committee on equity and inclusion, and that it would be presented at an upcoming A&S meeting. She said that two candidates for new director of equity and inclusion had already visited campus and the final candidate would be coming on November 5. She thanked faculty for coming to these presentations.

Dean Conley also thanked faculty for submitting midterm grades, and said she was pleased that 90% of faculty did so. She emphasized the better success rate for students who receive midterm grades.

Finally, Dean Conley commented on the interlocking motions that the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) would be bringing later in the meeting. She commended the committee for its well-written motions and its collaboration with the Center for Liberal Arts (CLA). She said that

the motions would create a revised COLL 199 requirement, to be known as COLL 350: Exploring Social Difference. She noted that in 2013, the faculty had debated and adopted the COLL curriculum, and this is the latest phase in keeping the COLL curriculum fresh. She said that faculty would be called on to think beyond their own specialties and discuss what general education is and why it matters.

Dean Conley said that Homecoming was successful; W&M is doing well in For the Bold Campaign. She thanked faculty for hosting open houses for their departments and programs and making connections with alumni; she highlighted the Faculty/Student Research Showcases that celebrated academic excellence.

Dean Conley closed by saying that she would be traveling to New York City during the following week with Gerald Bullock for the For the Bold campaign in order to meet with donors; she said that Arts & Sciences had surpassed \$101.8 million in fundraising. There were no questions or comments; Dean Conley then introduced Provost Agouris.

III. Report from the Provost (Peggy Agouris)

Provost Agouris apologized for not coming to the meeting earlier, due to other commitments; she would be going to the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee Meeting immediately after her report.

She began her remarks by saying that she was very impressed by Homecoming, both by the number of people visiting and their passion for W&M.

She noted that she was dealing with three separate Dean searches, all in areas where W&M has academic strengths— Arts & Sciences, Education, and Law. She said she planned to keep these searches encompassing, open, and interactive. She said she was finalizing search committees in the searches for the Education School and Law School Deans. She noted that the committees were in the process of interacting in faculty stakeholder groups in the Education School and the Law School. She stressed the importance of maintaining enthusiasm and involvement during the lengthy search process and expressed her hope that candidates would have engagement from every stakeholder group. No one had questions regarding the searches.

Provost Agouris next raised the topic of Equipment Trust Fund (ETF) allocations, saying that the equipment trust fund was traditionally used by every school for purchase of equipment. When she asked what the criteria were for the distribution of funds, she was told that the allocations were made on historic basis, and that people who were here fifteen years ago could not explain the reason for the current distribution of the funds. She therefore decided to make the process more transparent and decided to allocate funds based on need; A&S has been the biggest beneficiary of the ETF funds.

Provost Agouris noted that A&S has tremendous needs for equipment, especially in start-up for faculty in the sciences. She noted that other schools do not have these needs, but that they nevertheless have received a comparable amount of money in the past. She said that other areas were either were not spending the funds or were spending them to spend them rather than because of a genuine need for equipment. She decided to allocate the funds based on proposals that express needs. She said that the process will need to be tweaked further and that the administration would need to make sure that the funding cycle aligns with new faculty hires. A committee containing representatives from each of the schools would make the allocations. She said the main interest that she had received in the ETF process so far was from A&S. She added that faculty in A&S should expect to see a process that enables more of their needs to be met and expressed her hope that it would be transparent, efficient, and easy to implement.

Suzanne Hagedorn (English) asked how much A&S has received in ETF funds in previous years versus this year. Provost Agouris said that the process was not yet complete for this year, but consulted Dean Conley and said that in past years, A&S had received around \$500,000 in ETF money.

Sibel Zandi-Sayek (Art & Art History) noted that some humanities departments do not use this funding very much. She asked whether the ETF money was still to fund items worth \$5000 and up, a figure that the Provost confirmed. Prof. Zandi-Sayek asked if there would be an opportunity for add-on requests if equipment breaks in the middle of the semester. Provost Agouris replied that she did not know the details but that departments should be able to address failure of equipment through either the ETF or other sources.

Michael Lewis (Computer Science) asked about the procedure for starting negotiations for ETF allocations. Dean Virginia Torczon replied, saying that A&S would proceed with this year's hiring that under the assumption that funds earmarked for A&S's ETF would be available to fund faculty startup for the next three years. Dean Torczon said that she was representing A&S on the allocation committee. She said that A&S would come before the allocation committee in the spring to make requests to fund new hire startups for the following fall.

Provost Agouris said that she felt this change in ETF allocation would benefit A&S. She noted that she had implemented this process elsewhere in the past and hoped that it would work well at W&M.

Suzanne Raitt (English) noted that there was a special fund for diversity during Provost Michael Halleran's term and asked Provost Agouris whether that fund was still available. Provost Agouris replied that the fund still existed and that it provides money for the initial hire, with the plan that money eventually goes back to the schools.

Provost Agouris thanked the faculty and left for a meeting with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly.

IV. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee (David Armstrong)

Dean Conley noted that David Armstrong (Physics) was unable to attend the meeting and would report on the FAC's activities next month.

V. Report from Faculty Assembly (William Hutton)

William Hutton (Classical Studies) reported that the Faculty Assembly held its most recent meeting on October 29th. He noted that the Ad Hoc Committee on Revisions to the Faculty Handbook delivered its preliminary report on changes to language regarding the termination of faculty for medical reasons as well as on faculty suspensions and reassignment of faculty. He said that they would be delivering their final recommendations for revisions to the FA later in the semester and that the committee may consider revising W&M's consensual amorous relationship policies next.

Prof. Hutton reported that a Tiger Team led by Henry Broaddus and Amy Sebring delivered a report on increasing W&M's income through developing continuing education and summer programs. He noted that President Rowe would be hosting a forum on this topic on Thursday, November 7.

Prof. Hutton said that Faculty Affairs subcommittee was happy with the high rate of response to the faculty survey and was processing the survey results in the coming months. The Academic Affairs subcommittee would be spearheading the assessment of teaching and learning mentioned by the Dean earlier in the meeting. He added that the Committee On Planning and

Resources (COPaR) met with the Provost and Amy Sebring to discuss the overall financial state of W&M and that this week, it would meet with Dennis Manos regarding indirect cost revenue from external grants.

There were no questions for the report.

VI. Report of the Committee on Nominations and Elections (Ryan Vinroot and William Fisher)

Ryan Vinroot (Math) and Bill Fisher (Anthropology) announced a special election for an open seat on the Committee on Faculty, Prizes, Awards, and Fellowships; since the seat is open due to a resignation, the term begins immediately. The committee chairs put the following slate of candidates on the floor and asked for further nominations:

Election for Committee on Faculty Prizes, Awards and Professorships (Area I)

Melanie Dawson (English)

Brian Hulse (Music)

Hearing no nominations from the floor, Prof. Vinroot closed the nominations and told faculty to expect an email ballot. He announced that there would be four elections in December. He said the committee usually begged people to run for positions but that it would be better if faculty members volunteered and encouraged interested faculty to email him or Prof. Fisher. He announced the following upcoming elections, all for three-year terms:

Area I International Studies Advisory Committee

Area III International Studies Advisory Committee

Area II Faculty Affairs Committee

Area I Joint Appointment to the Faculty Affairs Committee and Faculty Assembly

Hearing no volunteers or nominations at the meeting, Prof. Vinroot asked faculty members to encourage friends to run for these positions.

VII. Annual Report from Academic Advising (Tom Linneman)

Tom Linneman (Sociology, Faculty Director of Academic) summarized the findings of his full report, available at:

<https://www.wm.edu/as/undergraduate/strategiesplanning/advising/foradvisors/reports/oaa-201819-annual-report.pdf>

Prof. Linneman thanked Shelley Laurenzo, Associate Director and Academic Advising's administrative assistant and three staff advisors. He said that full-time staff advisors had held 714 meetings with students, which were evenly divided among the 4 social classes.

Prof. Linneman reported that the Office of Advising implemented a new summer registration period for students that generally went smoothly. It worked to develop more efficient forms, moving some online, such as the change of the date of examination form. It offered a series of workshops for students and advisors and will have another in December on advising transgender students.

Prof. Linneman reported that the office goals in the coming year will be to implement a new diversity plan, increase engagement with the office across campus, and revisit the matching algorithm. He observed that 70% of advisors are satisfied with their matches and 10% were not and that the office would work to tweak the matching algorithm. Prof. Linneman encouraged faculty to submit midterm grades as early as possible so that his office could reach out to students who needed help.

Prof. Linneman said his office was working to fine-tune what happens when faculty advisors go on leave; he asked advisors to keep the Advising Office informed of their plans and preferences, and quoted one faculty advisor who continued to advise freshman while on leave as saying “In truth, I probably need the human contact.” His remarks were greeted with laughter, but no questions.

VIII. Annual Reports from Committee on Graduate Studies, Graduate Center and Graduate Ombuds (Virginia Torczon)

Virginia Torczon, Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, noted that the committee’s full report was available online:

<https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/graduatestudies/documents/cogsannual-reports/2018-19-cogs-annual-report.pdf>

Dean Torczon said that much of the report documented changes to the catalog, but that the first section discusses the current state of affairs in graduate study and gave program highlights. She noted that COGS approved a new Post-baccalaureate certificate in GIS, vetted the proposal for the master’s program in Computer Science, approved by A&S and waiting for approval from the State Council on Higher Education in Virginia. The committee rewrote the registration section to address situations such as students matriculating at other universities without informing the committee or moving their visas. The committee has standardized the way that students register for dissertation research, with separate sections for each advisor, and gives faculty advisors the option of awarding students a “U” grade for “Unsatisfactory” if a student was not making deadlines or meeting with an advisor. The committee also overhauled Arts & Science forms, which has been helpful to students and administrators.

Dean Torczon reported that Peter Vishton (Psychological Sciences) left as Graduate Ombuds in September to take a three year term as Program Director at the National Science Foundation, and that she was delivering his report, which is posted online at:

<https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/graduatestudies/documents/ombudsreports/2018-19-ombuds-report.pdf>

Prof. Vishton met with nineteen graduate students for consultation during the year about a wide range of issues, mostly dealing with student /advisor conflict over timing of feedback and progress toward degree completion. There were also student collegial conflicts as well as the problem of faculty who leave abruptly, leaving students to finish up their degrees at W&M.

John Swaddle (Biology) asked about the prospect of providing health coverage for graduate students. Dean Torczon noted that she was moving forward with an initial Program Budget Request (PBR) for health insurance premium coverage for doctoral students only and was discussing ways of covering this expense with Provost Agouris.

IX. Motions from Educational Policy Committee (Tuska Benes)

Tuska Benes (History) thanked the members of the Working Group on COLL 199 Implementation, chaired by Hannah Rosen (History) and Mark Sher (Physics), the Center for Liberal Arts and its fellows, and Dean John Donohue. She began by giving an overview of the committee's report and recommended motions, which had previously been circulated to faculty. She noted that EPC will be bringing four separate policy changes in two separate motions. The first motion bundles together proposed changes to COLL 199, COLL 200, and additional domain credits, changes which depend on each other. A second motion addresses changes to the COLL 300.

Prof. Benes noted that in March 2018, the Faculty of Arts & Sciences adopted the new COLL 199 requirement, with a proviso that a working group study the implementation of this requirement. She noted that the requirement was already in place, but that the motions concern the modes of its implementation. In September, the Implementation Working Group presented its report proposing changes to COLL 199; EPC held two faculty forums to respond to these proposed changes and ended up adopting the recommendations of the Working Group. EPC and the CLA gave faculty an opportunity to discuss potential overlap between the COLL 199 and COLL 300; the changes that EPC will be proposing take into account both the Working Group's proposed changes and the response to them in the faculty forums. She then presented the EPC's proposal to change COLL 199 and COLL 300 detailed in the report: <https://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/committees/educationalpolicy/350-motions/epc-proposal-coll-curriculum.pdf>

After Prof. Benes had presented the overview of the EPC motions, she asked the assembled Faculty of Arts and Sciences for commentary on the changes, beginning with the following changes to COLL 199 language:

I. Changes to COLL 199:

EPC proposes accepting the three changes the Working Group recommended for the COLL 199: requiring consideration of race, expecting the connections drawn between course material and the contemporary U.S. be 'substantial' and sustained, and allowing students to compile a total of three credits in COLL 199, rather than take one three-credit course.

In addition, EPC proposes the following changes to COLL 199:

1. Use COLL 350 as the attribute number designating the requirement, rather than COLL 199, and adopt the label "Exploring Social Difference."

The adoption of COLL 350 as the attribute designation reflects the fact that EPC regards the requirement as paired in many ways with COLL 300, rather than as following in a sequence leading out from COLL 100 and COLL 150. Both COLL 300 and COLL 350 (199) have a content component that is not present in the COLL 100/150. Asking students to address social difference with reference to the contemporary U.S. likewise complements the expectation in COLL 300 that students engage the global community. COLL 199 did not yet have a moniker, which risked students or faculty branding the requirement in ways that obscured or distorted its intention. The goals of COLL 350 (199), as the Working Group indicated, go beyond that of "diversity and inclusion," and the terms "power, difference, and

inequality” are too abstract in themselves. “Exploring Social Difference” captures the analytic cast of this requirement without evoking a goal of social activism or politicization.

2. Clarification of the goals of COLL 350 (199) with additional language. The Working Group reported that “some confusion exists among W&M faculty about what COLL 199 has been designed to achieve” and articulated the following interpretation of the requirement: The aim of COLL 199 is, and should be, to deepen students’ understanding and facilitate their critical analysis of the workings of power and privilege, that is, the production and reproduction of inequality in U.S. society and generally, past and present. EPC proposes adopting parts of this clarification to distinguish W&M’s intent with the COLL 350 (199) from two other approaches to “diversity” or “social justice and inclusion” courses that the Working Group identified at other institutions. Such requirements fell into three categories: a) courses aiming to facilitate student comfort and capacity in multi-or cross-cultural settings (which is less ambitious than the COLL 350 (199)), b) courses that facilitate critical analysis of structures of power and inequality (the aim of COLL 350 (199)), and c) courses that not only facilitate critical analysis but also inspire certain action (which goes beyond the COLL 350 (199).)

3. Reordering the goals of COLL 350 (199) to foreground skills and competencies
This brings COLL 350 (199) into sync with the other COLL requirements which are built around skills and competencies, rather than content.

4. Not allowing ‘double-dipping’ on the COLL 350(199)–beyond a four-year implementation phase. Courses can currently carry more than one COLL attribute, but students may only use a given course to fulfill one COLL requirement. Allowing students to double-dip on only the COLL 350 (199) devalues the requirement and reduces it to a second-tier component of the COLL curriculum. At the same time, enough courses must carry the COLL 350 (199) attribute to accommodate the class entering in 2021-22. Many of the already existing courses identified by the COLL 199 Working Group as fulfilling the goals of the COLL 350 (199) are COLL courses, including COLL 100s and COLL 150s. Allowing a four-year period implementation phase during which double-dipping is accepted will maximize the available seats for COLL 350 (199) and give faculty time to develop additional courses.

As proposed, the new wording for the COLL 350 (199) is this:

COLL 350: Exploring Social Difference

The COLL 350 requirement enhances students’ knowledge and facilitates their critical analysis of justice, equity, and the workings of power, privilege, and inequality in U.S. society and globally, past and present. The goals of the COLL 350 are: 1) to provide students with a rigorous academic space in which to explore differences in perspective while foregrounding reasoned and respectful discussion as the means for achieving common ground; 2) to deepen students’ understanding of the value-laden processes of social inclusion and exclusion through institutional, cultural, and normative practices that are both historical and ongoing.

To meet these pedagogical goals, COLL 350 courses will: 1) examine social norms, institutional practices, and patterns of belonging and marginalization by exploring race and at least one other key social category including, but not limited to: gender identity, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, language, religion, and disability; 2) emphasize respectful dialogue among students as an integral component of the course; and 3) enable critical reflection by requiring students to make substantial and sustained connections between the course material and contemporary life in the United States. All students must take one or more courses with the COLL 350 attribute, totaling at least 3 credits. For the first four years after implementation, the COLL 350 attribute may be applied to COLL 100s, 150s, 200s, 300s, and 400s, and students matriculating in the first four years after implementation who take such courses will earn credit toward both requirements. Beginning in Fall 2025, the COLL 350 attribute may be applied to COLL 200s, COLL 300s, and COLL 400s, but a course may only be used to fulfill one COLL requirement.

After Prof. Benes presented these proposed changes, Dean Conley opened the floor to discussion and debate:

Bill Fisher (Anthropology) said that he was sympathetic to the complexity of the issues but uneasy with the labeling of the requirement as “Exploring Social Difference,” since that label separates social class from everything else. He added that racism is not social difference, but oppression and that the present title did not really get at the point of the requirement. He suggested amending the name of the requirement to include “Social Mobility” in the title, but did not propose a formal amendment.

Berhanu Abegaz (Economics) proposed amending the name of the requirement to “Exploring Social Stratification and Mobility.” He suggested that social class would be a better category to explore than socioeconomic status. He also proposed striking “socioeconomic status” from the requirement language and replacing the term with “class.”

Prof. Fisher seconded Prof. Abegaz’s amendment to change the name of the requirement to “Exploring Social Stratification and Mobility.”

There was some *sotto voce* discussion on how best to proceed. Prof. Hagedorn raised a point of order that there was an amendment with a second on the floor that should be discussed and voted on.

Prof. Fisher commented that it seemed premature to vote on what we should call the requirement until the faculty had discussed other things.

John “Rio” Riofrio (Hispanic Studies) said he agreed with all the proposed changes but proposed changing Prof. Abegaz’s language to “Exploring Social Stratification and Belonging.” Belonging has become one of the core values in the strategic plan. He expressed confusion about procedure.

A faculty member seconded Prof. Riofrio’s proposed changes to Prof. Abegaz’s amendment.

Brad Weiss (Anthropology) expressed concerns about difference and that the terms of the requirement were very American. He said he would like to teach about social inequality but was not proposing new language to amend the requirement.

Jennifer Bickham Mendez (Sociology) said that she was also uncomfortable with labels, but also hesitated to introduce new nomenclature for the requirement. She noted that

“stratification” sounds too much like sociology; she said that the word did not seem to capture the spirit of the requirement. While the definition of the requirement includes the word “inequality,” she wondered whether that was broad enough to cover all of Arts and Sciences.

Hannah Rosen (History and American Studies) thanked everyone for good ideas and expressed the difficulty in characterizing the requirement because of the range of courses and content. She emphasized the importance of the term “difference” and expressed concern about removing it. She said that it would be difficult to come up with a term that satisfied everyone, but that she would be satisfied by “Exploring Social Difference and Inequality.”

Silvia Tandeciarez (Modern Languages & Literatures) proposed to separate the debate on the title of the requirement from its substance. She pointed out that comments had dealt with wordsmithing and she suggested “Equity, Difference and Justice” as an alternative. She suggested that the faculty vote on the preferred name for the requirement among a series of options sent out on Tribe Forms. She then moved to table further discussion of the name of the requirement; she further moved that the discussion should shift to the substance of the proposal. The motion to table was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

Prof. Tandeciarez then moved that the body debate the substance of the proposed changes. Prof. Weiss seconded. A faculty member requested clarification of the “substance” that would be discussed. Prof. Benes said that this would be the time to air any discussion of the EPC’s changes. (N.B. There was no formal vote taken on this motion, but the discussion subsequently moved on in the direction that Prof. Tandeciarez proposed, so the motion effectively passed by unanimous consent.)

John Swaddle (Biology) asked about how the thousands of credit hours needed for these COLL courses would be generated after the initial implementation phase. Prof. Benes noted that there would need to be more resources for these courses, but that courses could bear more than one attribute. Prof. Swaddle pointed out that even so, these courses would require thousands of student credit hours.

Prof. Riofrio commented that by taking away an additional COLL 200, we would be essentially trading those credits for these. Prof. Swaddle expressed skepticism about whether a COLL 200 could be converted into a COLL 350 course.

Prof. Raitt suggested the sentence “The COLL 350 requirement enhances students’ knowledge and facilitates their critical analysis of justice, equity, and the workings of power, privilege, and inequality in U.S. society and globally, past and present” should be reworded because not all COLL 350 courses would deal with global concerns. A faculty member pointed out that the first paragraph of the proposed EPC language describes the course, and the second describes points that would be reviewed in the approval process.

Prof. Rosen suggested that if the EPC returned to the language of the original COLL 199, it would require that students deal with issues of justice and equity. She suggested that, rather than saying that the requirement enhances knowledge, it should say that students are required to take a course that deals with justice, equity, and inequality.

Prof. Benes interjected a plea to retain the phrase “aims to facilitate critical analysis.”

At this point, Dean Conley noted that the meeting had to end promptly at 5 p.m. because a class would be meeting in Tucker 136 immediately afterward. She observed that the body had agreed to table the discussion about the name of COLL 350 and had undertaken a discussion of the substance of the changes.

Prof. Sher called the question; he expressed a desire to vote on the bundled motion immediately, pointing out than anyone could move to amend the motion after it had been

adopted. He expressed concern about the timeline to get the implementation of the CLL 350 requirement underway.

Sarah Stafford (Economics) pointed out that it would not be in order to change the wording of a motion that had been adopted at today's meeting at a December meeting, since proposed changes are supposed to be circulated at least two weeks in advance by the EPC.

Prof. Sher reminded the body that he had called the question; another faculty member seconded his motion. The motion appeared to fail on a voice vote. Dean Conley asked for a show of hands; Prof. Sher's motion to close debate and vote on the EPC motion immediately again failed.

Dean Conley concluded the meeting by saying that the body had agreed to table the debate on the title of the COLL 350 requirement, had held a lively debate on the substance of the EPC's first motion and would continue to take up the issue at the next meeting. Prof. Rosen asked whether passing the motion currently on the floor would preclude subsequent amendments; the A&S parliamentarian, Georgia Irby (Classical Studies) said that it would not. Prof. Rosen then inquired whether delaying approval of the implementation language until December would cause problems for the implementation of the COLL 199 (350) requirement. Chris Nemachek (Government and Director, Center for Liberal Arts) and Ben Boone (CLA) indicated that delaying the implementation until December would not pose a problem for the CLA's timeline. Dean Conley asked whether anyone wished to make any further motions upon hearing this information; no one did.

X Motion to adjourn

Dean Conley asked for a motion to adjourn, which was seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Hagedorn, Secretary to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.