

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

March 14, 2018
Griffin 3 – 4:00 p.m.

1. Call to order and remarks *Interim President Majumder*
2. Reminder about online balloting for election to the Curricular Planning Committee *Interim President Majumder*
3. Reminder about online balloting for nomination to the Faculty Steering Committee *Interim President Majumder*
4. Motions to Approve the 2018-19 Curricular Revisions (formerly known as the Course Package) *Professor Shore-Shepard*
(see attached memo from CEA)
5. Motion to Allow Half-Credit Fifth-Course Recording in Theater *Professor Shore-Shepard*
(see attached memo from CEA)
6. Motion to Allow Half-Credit Fifth-Course Recording in Dance *Professor Shore-Shepard*
(see attached memo from CEA)
7. Motion to Revise the CAP Election Procedures *Professor Zaki*
(see attached memo from FSC)
8. Updates on Accessibility Accommodations *Dean Sandstrom*
GL Wallace
9. Questions and Announcements

ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE FEBRUARY 14, 2018 FACULTY MEETING

No actions taken

ACTIONS TAKEN AS A RESULT OF ONLINE VOTING

Nominated to the Curricular Planning Committee (2 year term)

Div. II Full – Bojana Mladenovic and Nicole Mellow

Div. III Assistant/Associate – Mea Cook and Julie Blackwood

Note: Faculty with children at the Williams College Children's Center who wish to make use of the 6:30 p.m. pickup option must sign up at the Center by the Monday prior to the meeting. We also want to remind you that the college now has arrangements with the Williamstown Youth Center and Pine Cobble School for childcare during these meetings. If your child does not attend one of these afterschool programs and you would like childcare during the meeting, please contact Assistant Dean of the Faculty Megan Konieczny (mtk2@williams.edu) by Friday.

Date: March 7, 2018

MEMORANDUM

To: Williams College Faculty

From: Lara Shore-Sheppard for the Committee on Educational Affairs

Re: Curricular Revisions for 2018-19

At the upcoming faculty meeting on March 14, the CEA will present the Curricular Revisions for 2018-19 for faculty approval. The Curricular Revisions (formerly known as the Course Package) are available online: <https://registrar.williams.edu/faculty-staff/cea/-annual-reports> and include a report from each department and program describing any changes to the major or concentration as well as new or significantly modified courses. In addition, since this year marks the replacement of the Exploring Diversity Initiative with the Difference, Power, and Equity requirement, all courses submitted to have the DPE designation are gathered together in a separate document so faculty can see what courses are being offered to meet this requirement. There are currently slightly more than 100 DPE courses in the curriculum next year, although new courses may be added as additional faculty are hired.

This year, there will be a departure from the usual procedure of three motions, one for each division. In addition to the divisional motions, there will be motions for proposals by the Theatre Department and the Dance Department to provide a record of student participation in productions and in studio courses, respectively, in the form of a 0.5 partial credit fifth course that would not count towards the 32 courses needed for graduation, analogous to the credit offered for lessons and some small ensemble participation in Music. Each of the motions and their rationales are outlined below.

DIVISIONAL MOTIONS

Below each motion, we highlight significant changes to majors and programs from each division and the rationale for each. Our intention is to alert faculty in advance to changes that may merit discussion during the faculty meeting. We kindly request that faculty members who expect to challenge any portion of the curricular revisions on the floor of the faculty meeting inform the chair of the CEA in advance (lshore@williams.edu). In this way, we hope to arrange for representatives of relevant departments to be present and prepared to respond to the challenges.

DIVISION I: The CEA moves that the curricular revisions for Division I for 2018-19, including the significant changes to majors and programs described below, be accepted by the faculty.

Romance Languages

Change to the French Majors

1. Proposed Change

All courses in RLFR can count towards the French major, including RLFR 101 and RLFR 102.

2. Rationale

A. Many (if not most) departments count their introductory courses (101, etc.) towards their major.

B. It is unfair for our students who begin their French studies with 101 and 102 to not have these 2 courses count towards the French major. In recent years, we have had several students who have not been able to major, even though they had in fact completed 9 courses in French (the number of courses required for our major in French Language and Literature).

C. Nine courses in RLFR are amply sufficient for an undergraduate degree in French. Even when a student begins their French studies with RLFR 101, 9 courses (which would likely include 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, then 3 upper level courses at the 200 and 300 level, and then the senior seminar at the 400 level) provide ample depth and breadth for a student to gain fluency in French and a sustained intellectual engagement with French and Francophone literature, film, and cultures.

3. Changes to Course Catalogue:

FRENCH MAJOR—FRENCH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

The major consists of 9 courses ~~above the 102 level~~. One of these courses must be the 400-level senior seminar during the student's final year at the College. [etc.]

MAJOR—FRENCH STUDIES

The French Studies major consists of 10 courses satisfying the following requirements: at least three courses in French language and/or literature ~~above the French 102 level~~; [etc.]

Change to the Spanish Majors

1. Proposed Change

The description of the Spanish major will be altered so as to indicate that "Under exceptional circumstances, the Department may grant approval to count 101-102 towards the Spanish major."

2. Rationale

A. As in the case with French, we would like to make the Spanish major accessible to students who begin their study of the language at Williams. We believe that students can achieve an adequate level of linguistic and cultural fluency by taking 101-102 and seven additional courses.

B. Given that we have only in the last four years decided to accept 103 and 104 for the Spanish major, we would prefer to make decisions about 101-102 on a case-by-case basis, at least for now.

3. Change to Course Catalogue

The major consists of nine courses above the 102 level. Under exceptional circumstances, the Department may also grant approval to count 101-102 for the Spanish major. Among the nine courses, one must be the senior seminar taken during the student's final year at Williams. [etc.]

Theatre

During the 2016-17 academic year and continuing this past fall term, the Theatre Department underwent a significant review of its existing curriculum. This review was prompted by our Self Study and External Review, conducted in 2016. Below we list both our current major and our proposed new major and offer explanations of our proposed changes.

The current major in Theatre is described as follows in the 2017-18 Catalog:

The Major in Theatre consists of nine courses. Six required courses are:

1. Theatre 102 In the Room Together: An Introduction to Dance, Theatre, and Performance
2. Theatre 103 Acting: Fundamentals *or* Theatre 204 Acting: Scenework
3. Theatre 201 Worldbuilding: Staging and Design for the Theater
4. Theatre 244 Introduction to Theatre Technology
5. Theatre 248 The Modern Theatre: Plays and Performance *or* Theatre 229 Modern Drama
6. Theatre 406 Senior Seminar

Three elective courses must be taken from the department's other offerings. One of those electives must be at the 300-level or higher. Substitutions of other Williams' courses, or of Study Abroad courses, will be made only with the consent of the department Chair. Students should consult with the department Chair regularly in planning a balance of practice and scholarship in their elective choices.

All majors in Theatre are required to participate in a minimum of four department productions in addition to the laboratory requirement for Theatre 244. Participation in at least two of the four must be in technical production and one of those two must be in stage management.

We wish to make the following changes:

- Move from the current six down to four required "core" courses for the major in Theatre.
- As a result of the above, increase the number of required electives from three to five, with a specified distribution of electives and progression through the major.
- Establish clearer pre-requisites for our four "core" courses, so as to suggest a more transparent progression and pathway through the major.
- Eliminate THEA 103: Acting: Fundamentals *or* THEA 204: Acting: Scene Work from the core requirements for the major.
- Eliminate THEA 244: Introduction to Theatre Technology from the core requirements for the major.
- Substitute the currently required choice of THEA 248: The Modern Theatre: Plays and Performance *or* THEA 229 Modern Drama with a new, 300-level required core course in theatre history and historiographies: THEA 301: Embodied Archives: Global Theatre & Performance Histories.
- Due to our transformation of more technical production positions and opportunities into work-study jobs and backstage crews for students, eliminate the requirement that students participate in technical production for one of their four productions for the major (while maintaining the requirement that they serve as stage manager for one of the four).
- *The new copy will now read:*

The Major in Theatre consists of nine courses, including the following four:

1. THEA 101: The Art of Playing: An Introduction to Theatre
2. THEA 201: Worldbuilding: Staging and Design for Theater
3. THEA 301: Embodied Archives: Global Theatre & Performance Histories
4. THEA 406: Practicing Theory: Senior Seminar

Five additional elective courses must be taken from the department's other offerings (including courses cross-listed with Theatre). Two of the five electives must be taken at the 200-level or higher by the end of the student's junior year, and an additional two of the five must be taken at the 300-level or higher by the time of graduation. Substitutions of other Williams' courses, or of Study Abroad courses, may be made only with the consent of the department Chair. Students should consult with the department Chair regularly in planning a balance of practice and scholarship in their elective choices and in mapping a route through the major.

Production Requirement for the Theatre Major: All majors in Theatre are required to participate in a *minimum of four* department productions. Participation in at least *one* of these four must be in stage management. Assignment to productions in stage management must be made in consultation with the department Chair.

Rationale

The major retains several key elements. THEA 101 (formerly a requirement) remains a core introductory foundation course (albeit substantially revised), as does THEA 201 (our directing/design course) as well as THEA 406, the senior seminar. These three courses, along with a new, one-term course in global theatre and performance historiography, offered at the 300-level, are designed to acquaint all majors with a rudimentary curricular experience grounded in both the embodied practice of theatre making and the critical, historical, and theoretical knowledge of theatre and performance studies across the globe.

We are eliminating the requirement that majors take an Acting course due primarily to a simple observation: almost all students interested in Theatre take an Acting course anyway at some point during their time at Williams. Furthermore, and more importantly, we have moved towards a core requirement sequence that seeks to provide a more holistic balance of practical training rather than focusing on any single area of practice in our field. Lastly, our Acting courses are almost always overenrolled, and we often struggle to place majors into these courses. Alleviating the need to take Acting as a core requirement will allow us both to have a better understanding of who plans to major in Theatre, so that we may strive to prioritize them in our Acting course enrollments, as well as to relieve students of the need to take Acting should they be unable to enroll in such a course.

We are eliminating the requirement that majors take THEA 244: Introduction to Theatre Technology. The reasons for this are multiple: first, we are shifting to a model by which students are given more opportunities for work-study for participation in select technical jobs for our productions; there was decreasing student interest in the technology course; we discovered that many students were resistant to majoring in Theatre because they did not want to be required to take THEA 244: Intro to Technical theatre; we are maintaining the requirement that majors in Theatre gain training as stage managers for productions; and last, we are still providing opportunities for students to gain technical training in theatre by continuing to offer a variation of the THEA 244 technical design course as an elective alongside our traditional work-study shop crews. Furthermore, we believe that certain technical roles within our productions (such as Light Board Operator or Sound Board Operator), which generally are introduced and

needed only at the end stages of a process (in technical rehearsal and performances of the show) and which we usually staffed through our THEA 244 course, will now be staffed through paid, work-study positions, compensating students for their labor. Students do not receive a production credit for participation in a production as a work study job.

On a conceptual level, we are proposing the change to our “core” courses in order to define our major around the tensions and synergies generated by the relationship between embodied practice and critical/theoretical/historical inquiry. Each of our proposed four “core” courses actively embraces both practice and theory inside the classroom, building from an introductory course emphasizing the dynamic exchange between studio and seminar approaches to theatre and ending with a seminar that intentionally requires students to put theory into embodied practice. The middle two courses, offered at the 200 and 300 level, provide our majors with a balance of a studio and seminar experience, with the THEA 201: Worldbuilding course emphasizing the making and building of theatre by practitioners and THEA 301: Embodied Archives course emphasizing the scholarly and critical approach to studying theatre and performance history. Yet, each of these two courses also embraces its opposite approach: thus, Worldbuilding also engages the active scholarship and criticism of theatre and Embodied Archives also engages the studio-based practice of theatre.

The streamlining of our four required courses coupled with the opening up of the field for students to take more electives (five instead of three), is also highly and strategically designed in such a way as to address the need for our major to diversify its curriculum, at both the content and methodological level. We are redesigning and/or modifying our current courses to include a more diverse and globally oriented approach to theatre and performance. We are adding the 300-level Embodied Archives course in order to provide a curricular component that examines theatre and performance worldwide (a variation of which we’ve done in the past) and engages closely with the study of performance in the archive and with historiographical methods. Furthermore, by allowing students to take more elective courses cross-listed in Theatre but offered within and across other disciplines and units at the College—such as Comparative Literature, English, Women’s Gender and Sexuality Studies, Africana Studies, Art History, Latinx Studies, and American Studies—we are encouraging them to diversify their knowledge in theatre and performance beyond the scope of what only our own unit can provide.

DIVISION II: The CEA moves that the curricular revisions for Division II for 2018-19 be accepted by the faculty.

DIVISION III and No Division: The CEA moves that the curricular revisions for Division III and No Division for 2018-19, including the significant changes to majors and programs described below, be accepted by the faculty.

Environmental Studies

Proposal to revise the earlier restructuring of the ENVI major and concentration

In the spring semester of 2016 the Williams faculty approved a restructuring of the majors and concentration offered by Environmental Studies. Some of the changes to our major and concentration implemented as part of our restructuring were successful; others, on the basis of feedback from students and faculty, were less so. Further, some unexpected staffing issues in 2016-7 required us to depart from our planned course offerings, and we discovered, again from student and faculty feedback, that some of our improvisational changes were very advantageous. We would like to revise our earlier restructuring efforts in the light of our experience with the changes we implemented, both those that were planned and those that were unplanned.

Below we list each of the revisions to our major and concentration, along with the rationale for each revision.

1) We would no longer offer majors and concentrators the choice of taking *one* of three different senior seminars (currently ENVI 411 Environmental Planning Workshop: Community-Based Environmental Problem Solving; ENVI 412 Practicum: Environmental Science and Policy; and ENVI 413 Environmental Research Practicum: Culture and Society). Instead we would require that all majors and concentrators take the Environmental Planning Workshop: Community-Based Environmental Problem Solving (formerly ENVI 302, currently ENVI 411), offered each year in the fall semester, *as well as* one 400-level Environmental Studies senior seminar that would be offered in the spring semester. We envision structuring our spring semester course offerings such that we would have the option to add a second senior seminar course should registrations for the one senior seminar class exceed a manageable class size.

Rationale:

There are three reasons for this set of revisions. Our desire to return ENVI Planning to the status of a required course is motivated by continued positive student feedback regarding the Environmental Planning Workshop course, and in particular student feedback regarding the benefits of having to grapple with “real-world” problems for real local clients. The positive feedback alone might not suggest a need to make the course a required one; we are responding as well to senior exit interview comments from several students to the effect that they would not have chosen to take the course had they been given the choice, but that in retrospect it was one of the best courses they had taken at Williams. Having the requirement that students take the Environmental Planning Workshop course in the fall semester followed by a Senior Research Seminar course in the spring semester serves as well to avoid allowing students to choose between the Environmental Planning Workshop, with its focus on *application* of environmental planning, and a senior seminar focused on an in-depth academic research project. While we believe strongly in the value of an *applied* environmental planning course, we believe equally strongly in the intellectual benefit

of a senior capstone course that requires students produce a substantial research paper and to engage with the many disciplinary perspective that inform environmental concerns.

Another benefit of our proposed approach is that we will be better able to avoid situations of enrollment imbalance. We do not at present have enough majors and concentrators to run three competing senior seminars effectively, and we may not for some time. This past year, we were forced to cancel the spring seminar because all but two students enrolled in the fall senior seminar offering. Low enrollment in a senior seminar may not seem like a problem, but in fact, when the enrollment in a senior seminar is too low, it makes it difficult for the course to function effectively in fostering the kind of cross-disciplinary communication and collaboration that we feel is essential in Environmental Studies. As we mentioned above, because we would build some flexibility into our course scheduling, should the need for it arise, we would be able as well to avoid the problem of senior seminar classes that are too *large* to be manageable.

2) Reduce the number of courses in majors' "course cluster requirement," currently *five* courses, to *four* courses.

Rationale:

The "course cluster" is a group of courses selected by each major in consultation with a faculty advisor with a thematic or disciplinary focus tailored to the student's particular interests. If, as proposed, we require all majors to take both Environmental Planning and a senior seminar, adding one course to the number of required courses, then we must reduce the cluster from five to four courses if we are to leave the number of courses required for the major unchanged. We do not view this change as significantly affecting students' ability to tailor their Environmental Studies major to their own interests because in most cases they should be able to pursue their cluster-related interests in the senior seminar and because our major already offers considerable freedom to explore the curriculum in all three divisions.

3) Give majors *and* concentrators who are pursuing a two-semester honors thesis the option of substituting the second semester of their thesis work for the spring semester senior seminar.

Rationale:

All the students who wrote full-year honors theses last year complained about the disadvantages of being required to do a senior research project in their Environmental Studies senior seminar (ENVI 412) that focused on a topic that differed from that of their honors thesis; all remarked that doing so significantly reduced the attention that they could give to their thesis, and all remarked that their desire to focus on their thesis research caused their commitment to the ENVI 412 research project to be weak. We believe that allowing students who pursue a two-semester honors thesis to replace the spring semester senior seminar with the second semester of their thesis work gives students the opportunity to avoid this problem should they wish to. (Note: students have the option to pursue honors projects that occur during fall semester plus WSP; these students will be required to take the spring semester senior seminar.)

4) Because we propose to restore ENVI 411: Environmental Planning Workshop: Community-Based Environmental Problem Solving to the list of courses required for the ENVI *concentration*, we propose to restore the number of courses required for the concentration from the current number, 6, to 7, the number of courses required for the ENVI concentration prior to our 2016 restructuring.

Rationale: We recognize the existence of a trade-off here, but on balance feel that the change is beneficial. In terms of the advantages, we see little difference between our majors and our concentrators in their level of interest and commitment to environmental issues and we see benefits from including them in both of the required upper level courses. (It is worth noting that the structure of the Environmental Planning Workshop is such that we are able to accommodate up to 24 students in the course. If the combined number of our majors and concentrators should exceed 24, we would have to devote additional teaching resources to the course.) The potential disadvantage is the possibility that restoring the number of courses required for the concentration to its pre-restructuring 7 from its current value of 6 would have the effect of discouraging some students who might have pursued the concentration. Though we recognize that we do not know the counterfactual, we note that the fact that we did not observe an *increase* in the number of concentrators when we went from 7 to 6 courses might seem to suggest that we would not see a *decrease* if we were to go back to 7. (Note: consistent with the college requirement that all students pursuing honors must take at least one course in addition to the regular number required for the major or concentration, concentrators who pursue honors in Environmental Studies will have an 8 course concentration.)

The CEA moves that the Theatre Department be permitted to provide a record of student participation in a production in the form of a partial credit fifth class as described in the following proposal.

Theatre's proposal was reviewed and the details extensively vetted by the Committee on Educational Affairs. In addition, the proposal was reviewed by the Curricular Planning Committee, which supported the proposal, noting that the Theatre proposal had no staffing implications and offered benefits to students and to the work of the CPC itself. Finally, the proposal was reviewed by the Calendar and Schedule Committee, which was satisfied that the proposal represents no departure from current practice as it relates to Division of the Day.

Proposal

The Theatre department seeks to provide any student involved in a departmental production with some form of a record for their participation. We ask that we be allowed to provide a .5 partial credit fifth course to a student's College transcript for every department production they participate in, similar to the way the Music department credits participation by students in select instances. Production credits would not count towards the Theatre Major, nor would they count towards the necessary 32 course credits needed at the College for graduation. Rather, they would serve as documentation of a student's participation in a production only. (See below for rationale and explanation of student involvement, new course description, grading, and FTE implications, of which there are none.)

Students participating in a production would be enrolled in THEA 291-299: Theatre Department Production as a partial-credit, fifth course, admitted by permission of the department Chair and evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis only. Students remaining in the course beyond the sixth week of the start of a term will be graded by the instructor. Enrollment is by audition or appointment within the Theatre department. Students who do not wish to enroll for credit will be given the opportunity by the department to be removed from the course. Rehearsals for productions are scheduled TBA, based on the availability of the ensemble, and do not conflict with other academic commitments, such as evening courses or evening exams. The department normally produces three productions per academic year. Students may enroll in multiple productions in the same semester and may repeat a production course by permission of the department Chair. *For each departmental production they participate in, a student will receive a partial credit of .5 on their College transcript. Production credits do not accrue, nor do they count towards a student's 32 required course credits for graduation.*

Rationale

By introducing the partial-credit fifth course for productions, we are proposing to give students a way to mark and track on their transcripts their involvement in a Theatre department production. Because the .5 partial credit neither accrues nor counts towards the student's required 32 credits for graduation, it is purely nominal in function. Yet, it allows students to illustrate to future employers or graduate institutions their involvement in our program beyond their participation in regular courses. Our production program is extremely rigorous and has often been compared as similar to that of the experience of a professional actor or production team member in a regional production. We treat our casts and teams as ensembles, and we stress collaboration and deep involvement at every level of the process. While a production process can run anywhere from five to ten weeks (depending on the specific timeline for that show), students involved as actors in a show, regardless of the role they've been given (i.e. Third Spear-Bearer or Hamlet), can expect to spend between ten to twenty hours in rehearsals every week, that is, *before* the

onset of tech weekend (in which they are called to the theatre for 10-12 hours for two days), dress, and the performance run (normally three dress rehearsals of four hours each, and six to ten evenings of performances running three-four hours each). Please see our proposed new course, THEA 291-299: Theatre Department Production, which provides a full description of this new partial-credit fifth course and meets the following stipulations, as discussed with the Registrar's Office:

- Theater half courses do not count toward the 32 courses required for the Williams degree.
- Theater half courses may not be combined as a substitute for full semester courses.
- Theater half courses are repeatable.
- Theater half courses would be treated as Pass/Fail extra courses. Students remaining on the roster beyond the sixth week will be graded by the instructor.
- Enrollment is by audition with the department.
- Department sends Registrar the list of students in each course at the end of add/drop. The department would also indicate the instructor for each course each term.
- Students who do not wish to enroll for credit would not be included on the roster that the department will submit to the Registrar.
- At least one section of each course will need to be built with all the descriptions fully detailed so that the courses are displayed in the online catalog

For students involved in a production in a non-performing role (i.e. as an assistant director, assistant designer, main designer, stage manager, or dramaturg), the time commitment can be even greater than that required for a performer. While rehearsals may not begin until eight weeks before opening, the process of building and creating a show generally commences in the term or season *before* the production rehearses and opens. Thus, assistant directors and designers can expect to be involved and be spending time on a production as much as six months before that production begins rehearsals, and they are often asked to join creative and production meetings even, in some cases, off campus (such as in New York City). Thus, the time commitment alone is substantial, we believe, to warrant granting students acknowledgment of their involvement in the process of a production via a credit system that appears on their transcript.

In terms of the question of evaluation in a production, partial credit for participation in a production, as a fifth course, would be given at the P/F level only. The department Chair would, in consultation with other faculty members and visiting artists involved in the show, decide, at the end of the process, whether the student should receive credit or not for their role and involvement in the production. Should a student miss enough rehearsals or not participate in the process in a way that has proven their commitment and dedication to the process and the collaboration, they would, at the discretion of the Chair, receive an F for the partial-credit fifth course.

For those students involved in a production at a high or advanced level who wish to achieve a full 1.0 course credit for their participation in such a process, we already offer a 300-level course titled "Advanced Practicum," which allows them, through substantial work and design with a faculty mentor, to gain a full course credit for their role in a production. This course is evaluated either by letter grade or Pass/Fail, depending on the student's interest. Students are highly vetted for this course, and they are only accepted if they have already demonstrated advanced work and classroom experience in their area of study. These Advanced Practicum courses are essentially the equivalent of independent studies, overseen by the Dept. Chair and an individual faculty member, and we do not, as faculty, receive course relief or

credit for serving in this role (i.e. mentoring a student in an Advanced Practicum is performed by faculty members *gratis*).

There is no FTE increase demanded by the commencement of a partial-credit fifth course system for production work. Faculty members who elect to direct or design or are involved artistically in a production already receive compensation for such roles in the form of course relief. We are therefore not asking for more FTE as a result of this change. Basically, we are already providing this service. We are asking the College to recognize the value of our production program by allowing our students to mark and acknowledge their participation within it on their transcripts.

The question of the impact on Division of the Day is also one we've considered. Since our rehearsals generally occur in the evenings, and since students may have other commitments in the evenings, we have, in the past, been vigilant about making it clear to students the expectations for their involvement. This has not been a problem. We already actively work around students' weekly conflicts and try to schedule rehearsals around the problem spots in their specific schedules. It is a delicate dance and often involves elaborate compromising on the part of our faculty and artists, but we make it work. We also, as a rule, do not rehearse on Monday evenings, when some courses are offered, so as to make certain we do not conflict with other units or colleagues offering classes in that evening time slot. Full credit courses and exams for such would, of course, be given preference over our rehearsals for the partial-credit fifth course. Since we would be offering this as a class, we would be able to be very specific in the language of the course description about the expectations for students in terms of the time commitment required, and, if anything, the change might help us to communicate better with students what our needs and expectations are for their involvement in a production. It would help them to be able to make the choice of whether they can or cannot commit to the production process from the start.

As a final, albeit, tangential note, it would help us enormously to institute the .5 credit system in terms of being able to track participation and involvement by students in our production program. Right now, we do not have a way of monitoring or tracking any data in this area, and it would be useful, we believe, to be able to keep a running tab on this central component of our major and Theatre program.

The CEA moves that the Dance Department be permitted to provide a record of student studio coursework in the form of a partial credit fifth class as described in the following proposal.

Dance's proposal was reviewed and the details extensively vetted by the Committee on Educational Affairs. The proposal was also reviewed by the Curricular Planning Committee, which supported the proposal, noting that although the Dance proposal had staffing implications, Dance had a plan in place to manage their course staffing under this proposal without additional FTE. In addition, the CPC noted that as with Theatre's proposal, Dance's proposal offered benefits to students and to the work of the CPC itself. There were no potential implications of this proposal for Division of the Day.

Proposal

The Dance Department would like to propose a new structure for our studio curriculum that will provide students with a record of their studio coursework, allow us to list all of our offerings in the course catalog, and provide credit to faculty for this teaching. We request that our studio courses be offered as half credit, pass/fail fifth courses, registered through the Registrar. Studio course work is a key component of dance studies in the academy, in the same way it is in the other Departments regularly teaching art practice, including Studio Art, Music, and Theatre. The current absence of our studio courses from the catalog creates confusion for current and prospective students, and does not present our Department as valuing embodied practice in conjunction with other modes of instruction. We have ideal facilities and faculty expertise to teach these classes, and continual student interest. The structure we propose is similar to the studio structures in place in Dance Departments at several peer institutions. By offering studio courses as half credit, pass/fail courses, we will allow students to continue their studio practice in conjunction with other academic study, providing documentation of this work on their transcripts. This documentation is particularly meaningful to students with an ongoing engagement with dance, as well as for some future employers. Evidence of ongoing dance practice is also a necessary prerequisite for many graduate programs in the dance field. In addition, the Dance Department currently has, and has graduated, several contract majors in the past five years, and practice-based learning is an essential part of their course of study. Students majoring in other disciplines, such as Theatre, take studio courses because they recognize the need for movement in their major course of study. We want to continue to cultivate opportunities for students of Theatre and Dance to study together.

Dance Department studio courses are full-semester classes, now 3-4 per year, and are currently taught gratis by members of the Dance faculty. All of our studio courses include professional musical accompaniment; accompanists are paid from the Dance budget. The classes meet twice weekly for one hour and fifteen minutes. The study of dance technique requires ongoing engagement, so the courses are repeatable. Students can logically move through a progression while also having the option to repeat a level when needed. Evaluation for half credit, pass/fail students would be based on effort and demonstrated improvement in addition to attendance. The .5 partial credit would not count toward the 32 course credits required by the College for graduation and could not be combined as a substitute for a full semester course.

There are no implications of this proposal for division of the day as we teach these courses during the academic day. We must rehearse ensembles outside of the academic day, and therefore can only teach these classes during the academic day.

We will continue to offer our academic courses with studio components as fully credited, graded courses (ex. DANC 100, DANC 201, DANC 202).

Studio courses historically were budgeted by Physical Education, but since Dance became a Department in 2009, we have continued to offer these semester-long courses, although without compensation from PE, and have awarded students PE credit when earned. The class hour commitment is greater than other PE classes, and we require all students to attend for a full semester rather than a quarter in order to receive credit (they may miss a maximum of two classes in the semester). We would like to continue to offer this service to the College, and the student surveys of these courses support their continuation as well. Students could thus choose either to take the course as half credit pass/fail fifth course (which would appear on their transcript) or for PE credit (which would not). Offering students the option of taking dance technique classes for PE credit does not create a significant administrative burden for us. As long as students have a similar level of experience, they can be enrolled together in a studio course, regardless of the type of credit they seek. In fact, students gain value by observing and working alongside a greater number of peers in a pedagogic method which asks all students to apply information contained in individual instruction and correction. If over-enrollment were an issue, we would prioritize the half-credit students.

To: The Faculty
From: The Faculty Steering Committee
Date: March 7, 2018
Re: Motion to revise the CAP election procedure

MOTION:

To replace the current description of the method of election to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions with the following text:

Election to the CAP

Terms for the elected members of the CAP are for three years on a staggered basis. A full professor elected for the first time must commit to serving for a minimum of two years. Members are eligible for re-election. First 3 coordinators are not eligible to serve on the CAP for a period of six years following their service in this role. When a vacancy occurs, the eligible members of the faculty vote for two persons in the appropriate category. The three receiving the highest number of votes are then nominees for a run-off ballot where each eligible member of the faculty votes for each nominee ranked in order of preference. If any one of the three receives a majority of first-place votes, that candidate is appointed. If no candidate receives a majority of first-place votes, then the candidate with the fewest first-place votes is dropped. The second-place votes on the ballots of the dropped candidate are then added to the first-place vote totals of the remaining two candidates. The candidate receiving the highest number of first-place votes after this redistribution is then appointed. If a vacancy occurs before the three-year term expires, a replacement is elected for a new term, except in cases of a mid-year election, in which case the term is two and one-half years.

RATIONALE:

Members of several committees at the College are elected directly by the faculty rather than appointed by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the Faculty Steering Committee. Some of these elections require balloting for nominees by the faculty followed by an election between the candidates with the highest vote totals (Faculty Steering Committee, Curricular Planning Committee, Faculty Review Panel). Others involve only a single ballot with a slate of candidates selected by the Faculty Steering Committee (Committee on Educational Affairs, Faculty Compensation Committee).

These procedures are described in the official descriptions of the various committees, currently found on the college committees webpage (committees.williams.edu) and soon to be restored to their proper place in the Faculty Handbook, in accordance with the technical correction announced in the memorandum that accompanied the agenda for the September Faculty Meeting.

For the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP), however, the official description mandates a method of election that is distinct from all other committees at the College. The current full description is provided here, with the relevant section in boldface:

Election to the CAP

Balloting for the nominations for the elected professors normally occurs during the November faculty meeting, and the election during the December meeting. Terms for the elected members of the CAP are for three years on a staggered basis. A full professor elected for the first time must commit to serving for a minimum of two years. Members are eligible for re-election. First 3 coordinators are not eligible to serve on the CAP for a period of 6 years following their service in this role. **When a vacancy occurs, the eligible members of the faculty vote for two persons in the appropriate category. The three receiving the highest number of votes are then nominees for a run-off ballot where each eligible member of the faculty votes for each nominee ranked in order of preference. If any one of the three receives a majority of first-place votes, that candidate is normally appointed. If no candidate receives a majority of first-place votes, then the candidate with the fewest first-place votes is dropped. The second-place votes on the ballots of the dropped candidate are then added to the first-place vote totals of the remaining two candidates. The two nominees receiving the highest number of votes then compose a panel from which the President designates one to fill the vacancy.** Balloting for both preliminary nomination and election to the panel is in full faculty meeting, the outcome determined by those present and voting. If a vacancy occurs before the three-year term expires, a replacement is elected for a new term.

According to this procedure, in cases where no candidate receives a majority of first-place votes and the candidate with fewest first-place votes has been dropped, the President is free to choose either of the remaining two candidates, regardless of the outcome of the redistribution of second-place votes described above.

After considering the opinions expressed during the discussion of this provision at the February Faculty Meeting, the Faculty Steering Committee feels that there is sufficient support for a revision that ensures that the candidate with the highest number of votes after the redistribution is automatically appointed to the committee.

During and after the February discussion, several faculty members also expressed concern about the ambiguous language describing cases where a candidate receives a majority of first-place votes. The current description reads: "If any one of the three receives a majority of first-place votes, that candidate is normally appointed." The proposed revision eliminates the ambiguity by deleting the word "normally."

In addition to reflecting these proposed changes, the new text of the voting procedure also deletes the first and penultimate sentences of the old description, which are no longer in accordance with the online balloting system that the faculty approved last year.

Finally, the new text of the voting procedure also restores the complete description of the procedure for filling a vacancy that occurs before the three-year term expires. This description was inadvertently abridged when the committee descriptions were removed from the Faculty Handbook and placed on the committees webpage.

Faculty Meetings

Once each month during the academic year, faculty meetings take place at 4:00 p.m. in Room 3 of Griffin Hall. The President and the Faculty Steering Committee convene the meetings and work together to set the agenda. Faculty meetings include reports from the President, other administrative officers, and from faculty committees with active business. Those in attendance include faculty, representatives of several administrative offices, student representatives of the College Council, *The Williams Record*, and student members of those committees on the agenda for that meeting.

Motion Chart

	Debatable	Non-Debatable Amendable	Non-Amendable	Second Required	Second not Required	Majority Vote	2/3 Vote	May Reconsider	May not Reconsider
Motions									
1. Point of Order		✓			✓				
2. Previous Question Terminate Debate "calling the question"		✓		✓	✓		✓		✓
3. Lay on Table		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	
4. Amendment	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
5. Accept & Adopt	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
6. Consider Article Out of Order	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
7. Adopt a Resolution	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓

Voting Procedures

Please Note:

- i. *On October 6, 2010, faculty approved the motion replacing voice votes and votes by show of hands at faculty meetings with votes by electronic voting devices.*
- ii. *On May 11, 2011, faculty voted to determine the results of votes on motions at faculty meetings by the majority of those voting. An abstention is not a vote and is not counted as a vote.*

Voting Membership

The voting membership of the faculty consists of all Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant professors, and Senior Lecturers, as well as those Lecturers and Instructors who hold full-time appointments. Faculty holding part-time appointments may vote only if they have been notified by the Dean of the Faculty that they have met the requirements to be voting members (see Policies Governing Part-time Faculty). Faculty holding appointments called "Visiting" do not vote. All voting members in the professorial ranks who do not hold major administrative appointments are eligible to be elected to those standing committees with elected faculty membership, according to the rank and divisional categories prescribed for those committees. [*Faculty Handbook*, Section I: B]