

Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

January 20, 2011
4:23 p.m.

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

I. New Faculty and Staff Introductions (attached doc.)

Action I. Approval of the minutes of December 16, 2010

II. Report of the President.

1) As the Faculty Representatives to the Board announced at the last meeting, there is a new campus initiative to address the issue of developing coordinated support services for improving student learning, structured around an ad hoc committee chaired by Dean Martha Denney.

2) The budget: we are working diligently to improve the situation and hope to eventually restore the permanent 12% contribution to our pension plan, and we also hope to eventually raise our salary levels.

3) Campaign priorities; a review of what was presented to the Board Oct. 1, 2010, based on the FCAE blueprint, the Campus Master Plan, and our own stated Middle States Assessment of needs, and structured around a minimum \$250,000,000 target.

FCAE Broadening the curriculum, \$90,000,000
Student ability to access to it (financial aid), \$50,000,000
Facilities: two new dorms, library, an academic center (Ryan renovation), music performance and teaching space, \$55,000,000
Unrestricted endowment, \$25,000,000+
Annual fund, \$30,000,000

And if we can raise more: perhaps a \$300,000,000 target
Fine Arts, a Gallery, Theater, \$35,000,000+
Unrestricted endowment, \$30,000,000

III. Report of the Provost

- a. The Consortium for Faculty Diversity (CFD): Department Chairs should look at the forthcoming c.v.s for prospective fellows: February 11, 2011 deadline
- b. ACLS Scholars program: Department Chairs should be alert:
February 1-28, Provost's office will download all the cvs to departments
Offers will go out March 1-11, candidates must accept by March 21
There is a two-year term, with three courses taught a year

- c. The Environmental Biology Search is completed: Jonathan Wilson (Harvard PhD, Caltech post-doc); his research work: "Reconstructing the physiology of extinct plants"
- d. EPC will bring a proposal to the February faculty meeting for *mandatory* senior-thesis abstracts
- e. Iruka Okeke's (Biology) book has just been published by Cornell UP: Divining Without Seeds: The Case for Strengthening Laboratory Medicine in Africa
- f. Deadlines: Faculty Research requests due January 24; New Course Proposals to EPC due February 10. (Announcement of awards for Student Assistance requests will come out next week.)
- g. Upcoming Faculty Research Talks this semester:
 1. Curtis Greene February 24
 2. Paul Smith April 7
- h. The next D-3 (Drinks, Dinner, Discourse) was be given by Jesse Shipley on April 27.

IV. **Announcements, Reports, Items for Discussion.**

- a. Martha Denney, Dean of the College: "The Academic Support Initiative" (with Maud McInerney and Rob Fairman also speaking)

In our Middle States Report we gave ourselves the mandate of reflecting on the issues of widened student admissions and retentions of those admitted students. A greater range of preparation among our students means that we need more support for many of them, especially those who come from "under-prepared" backgrounds and students of "under-represented" groups. Our existing programs are scattered, and there are suggestions that students who use them encounter the experience being stigmatized. Our program will have two parts: we are trying to centralize, professionalize, and mainstream our systems, and we will have new summer bridge programs for talented under-prepared students. We are applying for funds to subsidize such an initiative; and we have "an interested Donor," so we are hopeful.

This year we have an ad hoc Working Group, convened by Dean Phil Bean, consisting of Rob Fairman, Maud McInerney, Richard Freedman (for EPC), Cristina Beltran, Saleha Jilani, Jeff Tecosky-Feldman, and Maris Gillette. This will soon become a formal (President's) Committee. (Last year, Ben Le and Jen Lilgendahl were also in on the preparatory discussions.)

There is an open Brown Bag lunch to discuss this on February 8.

- b. Curtis Greene, for AAC.

The budget schedule has been moved up: we now are planning to present the budget to the February Board Meeting. Consequently, anything you wish to raise with us must be raised now.

We are holding a Brown Bag lunch on Friday Jan. 28.

c. Jen Lilgendahl, for FAPC.

Concerns have been raised about conflicts between the Athletics scheduling and Academic schedules. It is clear that we need a faculty survey, which is forthcoming.

COMMENT: I would hope that the tone of the survey would not elicit *only* negative attitudes about the Athletics program. **REPLY:** Indeed, we realize that there is substantial support for it among the faculty, and there will be opportunities to express that; we are responding now to expressions of concern about a conflict between class time and athletics scheduling.

d. Ken Koltun-Fromm, for the Writing Director Search

Candidates (5) are beginning to come next week. The visit-model will be the following: a research talk on (let us say) Monday, 4:15-6, and then two open meetings just for the faculty the next day, one at 8:30-10 a.m. and then one later in the day. We ask you to participate in these visits, and ask you to try to come to the same kind of event (the talk or an open meeting) for each candidate, so as to make your comparative judgments most useful to the Search Committee.

e. Student Honor Council Co-Chairs (Emily Dix, Anna Brockway): report about last semester. (following on the previously-received e-mail about cases.)

There was some discussion on the floor of the faculty, which revolved around the following points: 1) People noted the complexity of the issue of intellectual property, and expressed gratitude toward Honor Council for pursuing this. 2) "Protecting faculty property rights" is perhaps not the proper way to deal with *cheating* which involves passing on class materials to hired "tutors" who write papers for students; "Cheating" is cheating, and that is how it should be addressed. 3) The issue of plagiarism (whether of doing your own copying or of getting others to write papers for you) is not so much a technical or a legal issue as a moral one: of "community standards," "standards of civility," and "the social contract."

***The Clerk noted that we need more conversation between Honor Council and the Faculty about this.**

f. Wendy Sternberg, editing the Faculty Handbook: can we finish with the continuing saga for the moment? (attached document)

We are presenting two items: 1) for approval (“Communication and Information Sharing from Provost’s Office”) and 2) for discussion (Editing the Faculty Handbook.)

Can we take item 1) “item by item” and get a reading of the sense of minimum agreement among the faculty, without trying for a consensus at first? And then returning to the proposal as a whole at the end? (information to be posted on the Provost’s webpage, for Haverford College faculty only, hence password-protected to the extent that this is a realizable protection.)

- a) frequency distribution of salaries: NO OBJECTION
- b) size of academic budget as proportion of entire budget: NO OBJECTION
- c) Department Chairs will have access to budget information for all departments *within their divisions*, OR to *all divisions* of the College: WITH THE CHANGE TO ALL divisions: NO OBJECTION
- d) Report on total funds spent for travel and research: NO OBJECTION
- e) Annual report on Provost Office funds allocated to individual faculty members for faculty research and student-faculty research collaborations
COMMENT: Some of this information would be more useful if trends over time were indicated. **REPLY:** agreed.

COMMENTS: Discussion focused primarily on the question of whether it is a problem that other information about funding sources isn’t similarly available. Start-up funds may be in a different category, but what about funds allocated by Centers and Departments? Wouldn’t this information be more useful if we had the whole picture? **REPLY:** This may be so, but this particular proposal is about transparency in areas most directly under the purview of the Provost’s office.

With this understanding, those who had raised objections seemed prepared to wave them. Hence, NO OBJECTION

- f) Annual reports of all standing committees will be posted: NO OBJECTION

The Clerk then commented: There seem to be some areas where some people want more transparency; but can we all agree on this much and accept the proposal? **COMMENT:** WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE COULD BE INDICATED LINKS TO THE LOCATION OF MORE INFORMATION. (**REPLY:** Yes.)

Action II. The faculty came to consensus on the proposal.,

N.B. There was no time left for discussion of Editing Procedure for the Faculty Handbook.

Adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty

