

## **Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes**

October 21, 2010  
4:20 p.m.

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

**Action I.** Approval of the minutes of Sept. 29,2010.

### **I. Report of the President**

- a. The Board has approved a “go-ahead” for the official launching of the Campaign.  
But of course, Institutional Advancement has been working all along at this project, and producing results:
  - 1) we now have funding for seven new faculty positions which we have been gradually filling;
  - 2) the new dormitory plans, including the latest gift from Michael Kim '85, which is partial funding for a second adjacent dormitory construction, which will itself (by moving students now resident in HCA) make possible the renovation of HCA
  - 3) we have raised about \$6,000,000 more for Financial Aid
  
- b. Reminder: The President’s Social Justice speakers for the fall semester are Mark Danner (who is speaking tonight) and Bill O’Neill ‘73, who is speaking on October 28.

### **II. Report of the Provost**

- a. Reminders: Staff and operating budgets will be due Nov. 8.  
Sabbatical leave requests are due November 5.
  
- b. Haverford has been selected to participate in the American Association of Colleges & Universities initiative (funded by the Luce Foundation) entitled “Welcome to Shared Futures: General Education for a Global Century” and concerns both curriculum and faculty development in creating national models.

The faculty members chosen to engage in this project are Jim Krippner (History), Jill Stauffer (Philosophy), Tom Lloyd (Music), and Rob Scarrow (Chemistry.)

- b. The Nanyang Technical University in Singapore has approached Haverford and Bryn Mawr to explore mutual cooperation through arrangements such as student exchanges, visiting professors, summer research, shared classroom experiences. We two Provosts have been discussing this, and have agreed to send a BMC/ HC delegation to Singapore (3 professors from each institution) in February 2010. If you are interested in doing this (it is during class-session time, of course, and would involve about a week's travel), please contact me.

**COMMENT:** I have been involved in previous talks at Bryn Mawr about this, and the issue was raised about the unwisdom of cooperating with institutions in countries whose governments have serious problems with Human-Rights abuses. **RESPONSE:** Yes, we are aware of this, and are keeping it in mind.

### III. Announcements, Reports, Items for Discussion.

- a. Richard Freedman, for EPC: spring 2010 course proposals (attached doc.)

**Action II.** The courses were all **approved** by the faculty.

It was noted that the document just submitted had errors on it, especially in LE figures, which were corrected from the floor.

On the subject of course numbers: It was explained that our new procedures leave *the assignment of actual numbers* to the Registrar, who has to maneuver through the paradigms of individual departments for course cross-listings, and the availability of numbers are determined by previous course history (and the computer system), and other mysteries. EPC discusses only proposed course *level* (100, 200, and 300.)

There was some discussion on the floor, and had been previously in EPC, about the suitability of limited enrollments in courses which are at the 200 level and 300-level (LE 15, LE 25 and so on.) DOES EPC HAVE A POLICY ON THIS?

It was noted that the EPC forms are still in the process of being cleaned-up, and that this is a matter of interaction between EPC, the Registrar, and ITT. For instance, the document just submitted to us still has a category for “Social Justice,” a College requirement which was eliminated by the faculty in 2009. The proposal- submission form sometimes still has items which make it very difficult to use, asking for non-applicable information and presenting blocks to the fulfillment of the chore.

**THE FACULTY REQUESTED THAT THESE FORMS BE CORRECTED.**

b. Martha Denney, Dean of the College

1) Please submit Notes of Concern about student performance pronto. The next CSSP meeting is November 3.

2) The Deans’ office has been discussing our obligations as a College in cases of accusations of Sexual Assault. We *need* to know about them; we are obliged to investigate such charges. If the faculty is approached by a student for help, we ask that you not just say: “I will keep all this confidential and not report it.” We are in the process of fleshing out a better statement of our policy about Sexual Assault.

**COMMENT:** I am concerned about what is apparently a well-used “rehabilitative strategy” for sexual offenders: that they be required to enroll in a course about Gender or Racial problems. This strategy seems to represent a philosophical category-mistake: it misunderstands the educational process, it is intellectually suspicious, and it vitiates the whole classroom experience.

3) We are in the process of preparing a better statement about Academic Dishonesty. Among other issues, there is now a new phenomenon of “Cyber-Cheating”: hiring expert “tutors.” We must all be vigilant to evidence of this phenomenon in action. Our web-site will discuss this.

c. Rob Fairman, David Sedley, Board of Managers reps.

Haverford Corporation: It has been agreed to reduce the number of Quaker reps. to the Board from 13 to 11; and it has been agreed that the Corporation can nominate two non-Quakers of that number. [President Emerson noted that this has not yet become actual

policy; whereas a first decision to this effect has been made, the mandated second re-affirmation has not yet occurred.] The Corporation has created four working groups: 1) Fundraising 2) connections with the Campus, 3) fostering connections with other Quaker institutions, 4) fostering Quaker representation among the faculty.

Educational Affair Committee: There was discussion of the term “student scholar.” To what extent can students in the Humanities do original research in senior theses? Is the situation different in the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences? **[LATER COMMENT: There is already an archive of material about this point (“student-scholar”) from FCAE discussions last year, especially the late spring retreat.]**

It is clear that there are no plans to increase the size of the student body in the near future.

Long Range Planning Committee: discussion of capital projects that have not been specifically approved for the Campaign but are Long Term Critical Needs” (ranging in cost from \$1 to 7,000,000, totaling about \$34,000,000):

- 1) Faculty housing? Is this an educational “asset” or a just financial “asset” to be exploited for income purposes? Is the value of campus Faculty housing worth the cost? Should faculty housing be offered for sale to the faculty? Should we remove 10 Railroad Avenue entirely and replace it with commercially-constructed small townhouses?
- 2) Renovation, upgrade, of HCA
- 3) Renovation of on-campus dorms: turning living rooms back to living rooms (rather than bedrooms as they are now)
- 4) Dining Center renovations
- 5) Stokes first floor renovations
- 6) Renovations to Magill, depending on when/ if the Library will move
- 7) Renovations to Sharpless: Biology research facilities

AAC and FAPC will meet about this tomorrow. If there is interest in discussing this more widely, there will be a brown-bag lunch for all faculty.

**QUESTION:** What is the criterion for discussion of *priorities* in these items?

**COMMENT:** What about renovations of classroom spaces?

**QUESTION:** How is our Endowment doing lately? Our debt-rating?

**REPLY:** (President) Our portfolio has just recently been assessed for borrowing purposes (for finishing the dorms), and the report was good.

**FURTHER COMMENT** (Provost): About the Investment Committee: The Board has re-vamped its investment decision-making, reconfiguring the committee to have individual Managers managing individual segments of our investments in their specific areas of expertise.

d. Peter Love for FPAC

We have determined the following agenda-issues from discussions with the faculty so far, and here below are our committee self-“assignments”:

- 1) the nature of Faculty Meetings (Sedley): Wednesday 11-12 Founders 312
- 2) the nature of Academic Council rules and procedures (Stadler): Wednesday 2-3 Woodside Cottage 102
- 3) the relationship of Athletics to Academics (Lilgendahl) Thursday 9-10 KINSC S405
- 4) issues of faculty benefits: Housing (Love) Thursday 3-4 KINSC Link 105

We need MORE input from you.

e. Wendy Sternberg. Associate Provost: the Faculty Handbook (more items, continued)

**Action III.** There are some agreements, as follows:

p. 6: on distinguished visitors: Change language to: “*ideally* spend substantive time with students” Agreed: **YES**

p. 8: on hiring committees: to the proposed changes, Agreed, **YES.**

**COMMENT:** WE SHOULD CHANGE THE LANGUAGE FROM “HIRING DEPARTMENT” TO “DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE APPOINTMENT IS LOCATED.” AGREED, **YES.**

**QUESTION:** p. 7 faculty book purchase funds (and also research and travel funds): should it include “only permanent faculty?” THE QUESTION IS: CAN visiting faculty get these benefits? What is our policy? There was some uncertainty in the discussion about this, which reflects uncertainty in the faculty. *The answer seems to be: the contracts* which visiting faculty receive state to what extent they are able to utilize which faculty benefits. **The language in the Handbook should make this clear.**

**COMMENT:** On the subject of research and travel funds: **Somewhere** it should be openly stated, by an annual list, which Haverford internal grants were awarded by Haverford each year: TO WHOM, FOR WHAT PROJECT, AND HOW MUCH WAS GIVEN. The Handbook should state here (p. 35, Section IV.C) that this will be done. We need this “transparency.” **RESPONSE:** The web-site can state it, under the Provost’s office.

**The Clerk noted** that the faculty had never in fact considered this issue of transparency in internal Haverford funding; discussion followed.

**COMMENT :** The web-site is too public a place, even if password-protected to the faculty alone; this is not wise. **COMMENT:** Perhaps not the actual names, just the projects and \$ amounts, should be listed. **COMMENT:** Perhaps not \$ amounts, just the projects, with or without names. **COMMENTS:** On the contrary, it *is* wise to list all the data; it stimulates others to apply for such grants also, by making their availability known. The \$ amounts are also useful information to potential apply-ers. **COMMENT:** Information about how much was applied for vs. how much was awarded, and how much total funds was available vs. how much was awarded, is also necessary in the interests of “transparency.”

**COMMENTS:** There should also be “transparency” about who gets research grants from the Centers, for what project, and for how much (see sentence, p. 7: “Internal funding is also available...”); there are also such grants connected to Endowed Chairs, about which there should also be “transparency.” **COMMENT:** How are these figures different from figures about salaries and raises, which are not made public? **RESPONSE COMMENT:** They are different because of the process involved in seeking funding. **FURTHER COMMENT:** Even if there is a continuum from one to another, the faculty can still decide where to draw the line in making the information public.

**The Clerk asked** whether the faculty could come to consensus on transparency concerning grants and amounts, without mentioning names,

but a number of faculty confirmed their discomfort with the publication of amounts. It became clear that there was a diversity views on the matter and that there were more questions here than we could resolve at this meeting, including the issue of the extent of transparency in two different senses: what details would be revealed, and what kinds of funding would be covered.

The Clerk raised the question of whether we could pass the wording of “Section IV.C Funds for research and study” (as a statement of “current practice which reflects changed procedures”), pending future discussion of the transparency issues. There were strong objections from at least one quarter, and in the absence of adequate time and a dwindling attendance, **the Clerk called for a postponement.**

Adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty



