

## Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 21, 2011  
4:15 p.m.

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

**Action I.** Approval of the minutes of March 17, 2011.

### **II. Report of the President.**

The Board will be conducting a review of Leadership at the College, and the Board is asking for the faculty to participate in the process.

An update on the Campaign: we are doing well. The alumni support the faculty expansion goals. We now have on hand enough for one (plus) open position to fill next year.

**COMMENT:** It would be good if departments would have a chance to consider applying for this position in a period when their members have not scattered for the summer. (\*More on this from the EPC report which follows.)

The President called upon Jess Lord to report on the current admissions situation; as was already stated in the message sent to us on this subject earlier this week, the "Already Admitted Students" event the previous Sunday was a great success, in both numbers and tone.

**COMMENT:** Would it be possible to hold it in a less noisy venue?

**REPLY:** We are aware that Great Hall is noisy when filled with so many people, and we have tried to conceive of an alternative which is better, but we haven't managed to think of a better place.

### **III. Report of the Provost: Announcements**

Friends and Family Weekend (Oct. 28-30, 2011) will have a new feature: departmental "open houses" in the various departmental office buildings on FRIDAY OCT. 28, 4-6 p.m.

The delegation from Singapore NTU will come here Monday April 25 (and to Swarthmore and Bryn Mawr on Tuesday);

there will be a reception in the CPGC café on April 25 at 5:15-6:15 p.m.

The next D-3 is Jesse Shipley (Anthropology) is Wednesday April 27.

John Muse (Fine Arts, Faculty Gallery Coordinator) has an exhibit opening in San Francisco in April- May.

The annual Faculty end-of-semester party is Friday May 6, 5 p.m., at Linda Bell's house.

**QUESTION TO THE PROVOST:** How *will* the new FAPC and Academic Council "*work together*" to discuss how Academic Council will be constituted in the future? **REPLY:** The relationship is being worked out at the moment. **TO CONTINUE THE QUESTION:** But does the FAPC take the initiative in reaching out to Academic Council? **REPLY:** The two bodies are working together synergistically; but yes, the FAPC was originally charged, upon its creation, with discussing the constituency of Academic Council. **RESPONSE:** It seems to me that we have to address this important question as a faculty in the whole. **RESPONSE (FROM FAPC):** We are aware of disagreements among the faculty about who "owns" this issue. Our working premise is that the constituency of Academic Council is a very urgent issue. So we began with the idea that FAPC and recent Academic Council members would work together.

**Clerk: We have a busy agenda already before us. We are out of time now, and there is obviously need for more discussion.\***

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

- a. Memorial Minute for Richard Luman, Emeritus Prof. of Religion: J. David Dawson.
- b. Richard Freedman, for EPC (attached documents.)

We shall delegate to the individual departments the decision about how their courses respond to the new Bryn Mawr educational scheme.

We are still working on ad hoc search committees for tenure-line replacement positions; but there will apparently be one new position, and the deadline for departmental applications for it is June 3, so that this “sitting” EPC (this year’s constituency) can deal with it. More information will follow.

- 1) Proposal from the Physics Department for a new Track within the Major in Interdisciplinary Physics.

**Action II: APPROVED.**

- 2) Proposal for a required senior project abstract.

**COMMENT:** I don’t think the faculty should require for graduation something conceived for the purposes of an Admissions Office brochure. **LATER QUESTION:** So what is the relationship between this proposal and the Admissions Office brochure? And how “permanent and official” is that Admissions Office brochure?

**COMMENT:** I don’t think that we should have a “narrative” about how the thesis got written (required or not); the thesis should stand for itself. (Especially without faculty “oversight” for such a “narrative.” **SEVERAL OTHER COMMENTS TO THIS EFFECT.**

**CLARIFICATION (EPC):** This is a proposal about the Abstract only, not the “narrative.” It is an addition to the requirement for a Senior Project Title. Such an Abstract would be available as information on the Library’s web site.

**COMMENT:** Such a requirement means that Bryn Mawr students in a bi-college Major would not have this requirement and that Haverford students would. *What are the implications of such requirements for a bi-college major?* **SEVERAL OTHER SUPPORTING COMMENTS FROM BI-COLLEGE DEPARTMENTS AND MAJORS. (Clarification (EPC):** No title or abstract is required in instances in which a student takes a final comprehensive exam rather than completes an independent project. In cases of bi-College majors and departments, the requirement of title and abstract applies only to Haverford students. Individual departments are responsible for setting title/abstract guidelines suitable to their disciplines.

**Clerk:** With the understanding that there is still work to be done on the issues raised about Bryn Mawr students and Bryn Mawr

majors, can we agree on just the final paragraph of the EPC document?

**SUGGESTION:** Can we have wording something like this: **“Every senior project will contain a title and an abstract....?”**

**Action III: APPROVED.** “Each senior project will include both a title and an abstract, to be reviewed and approved by the project adviser. Precise guidelines for the format, organization, and language of the abstract are determined by individual departments and explained to the students as part of the senior project itself.”

3) Items only for discussion now:

A. SHOULD WE MODIFY OUR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS? These are some proposals under discussion:

\*\*\*\*\*Reduce the divisional requirement to 2 courses each, but covering at least 5 different departments

**VARIOUS COMMENTS:** Why 2-2-2? (Why not?) Why not covering at least 4 departments, rather than 5? Departmental identity, much less divisional identity, doesn't always describe intellectual variety. Almost all students take more than 3 courses in SO and HU divisions; but very many students now take only 3 in the NA division, and this would reduce that further to only 2 courses. And the larger question: Why have divisional requirements at all?

\*\*\*\*\*Count only one year of language study to satisfy the Humanities Division requirement

\*\*\*\*\*Eliminate the “pass-out” option for satisfying the language requirement

**VARIOUS COMMENTS:** I support the language “no pass-out.” What about ESL students: are we imposing a third language requirement on them? How does this relate to “Heritage-Language” students who are taking heritage-language courses? Can we please modify our Haverford language to call it “a second language” rather than “a foreign language?”

\*\*\*\*\*Re-think the Quantitative (Q) requirement: for what purpose, and its efficacy?

B. WE **\*MUST\*** FIX THE LOTTERY SYSTEM. (So that students can actually express preferential choices. So that we can know more about our actual course enrollment numbers, perhaps by holding the lottery for LE courses BEFORE Pre-registration.)

c. FAPC: Peter Love and Gus Stadler

The housing policy is indeed being discussed on the campus and on the Board. Any changes in The Mortgage Policy must be made within the context of the whole housing policy.

We have read the 2008 faculty housing survey response and compiled data (attached documents) which show breakdown of occupation of on campus housing by rank. Conclusion: If we add 27 positions to the faculty, we will need 15+ new units. The permanent faculty prefers at least 3-bedroom units.

Current 700 sq ft units are usually occupied by visiting faculty, or for 1 year. The faculty also want flexibility of options. The big question is: what should the composition of the in-campus community be? To what extent should the future resemble the past?

Composition of Academic Council. We will propose at the next faculty meeting that non-tenured ("junior") faculty names be removed from the ballots. Everyone we have spoken with has agreed. (In the distant past, junior faculty have indeed served on Academic Council although very rarely, and in the not so distant past one junior faculty member was indeed elected but did not in fact so serve in the end.)

**COMMENT:** Since there are on-going discussions about the possible re-configuration of Council, should this decision await until we see what shape Council takes?

**CLARIFICATION:** This proposal concerns the current Academic Council as it now exists.

d. Rob Fairman and David Sedley, Faculty Representatives to the Board.

We wish to read to you the following letter from Board Chair Cathy Koshland: (read aloud.)

**QUESTION (Secretary): Will we see this letter in written form? (THE TEXT OF THE LETTER WAS SUBSEQUENTLY DELIVERED TO THE FACULTY BY E-MAIL ON MONDAY.)** The Board reviews the President's performance annually; in this fifth year it will be a more comprehensive review, including selected interviews with many, key, members of the campus constituency; we are hiring an outside HR (Human Relations) firm to help with the review.

**COMMENT:** I have never been asked to participate in any such annual review. Who are these "key" members, and who selects them?

**CLARIFICATION:** Cathy actually said to us that every senior member of the faculty would be interviewed.

**COMMENT:** Well, I think that every member (senior or junior) should be given the opportunity to be interviewed, and that the interviews should be confidential and conducted by a neutral outside interviewer.

**QUESTION/COMMENT:** I understand that this communication from the Board was prompted by a petition to the Board from certain faculty members, rather than by our normal protocol working through our Faculty Representatives to the Board; this process seems opaque to me. I would like to hear the text of that petition, which I did not see. **SEVERAL SUPPORTING COMMENTS:** that they had no been informed about the petition.

**RESPONSE:** The petition from "concerned faculty" was not a "secret document" and had nothing to do with the Faculty Representatives to the Board: we felt that there are enough concerns to merit a direct approach to the Board. The most aggrieved parties did not want to bring their concerns to the open faculty meeting; we felt that we had to preserve confidentiality in order to be able to speak freely. We had no intention to overlook anyone; we tried to reach all the senior (tenured) members of the faculty to read them the petition

and ask if they wanted to sign it. But the process (hurried, given the time constraints of the imminent Board review and the upcoming Board meeting) did not function perfectly. We were asking for a review that would be inclusive, transparent and confidential.

**The Clerk:** Presumably that petition-letter can also be sent to the entire faculty, along with Cathy Koshland's letter of response. (N.B. It was so done.)

**COMMENT:** Last year, when the faculty representatives approached the Board about conflicts in Founders Hall, we were told that this was a bad idea.

**RESPONSE:** The message I took from that experience was that faculty representatives should not presume to speak to the Board "in the faculty's name" about matters about which there was no faculty consensus, and even deep division. What *should* the faculty representatives do when there is a strong faculty feeling but no consensus?

**\*\*COMMENT:** What ever happened to the idea of a Faculty Ombudsman? (The Clerk commented that it should be in the FAPC's agenda.)

**COMMENT:** This petition sought to represent the views of only the signers. But its language was to the effect that *all* the faculty (both senior and junior, both aggrieved parties and non-aggrieved, and both the signers and those who did not want to sign) should have an opportunity to voice their views in the review process.

**QUESTION:** Was it the Board's intention that the faculty should communicate to the Board only through the faculty representatives, or directly to the review committee?

**(REPLY:** Unclear.)

**GENERAL COMMENT:** It seems to me that "tone" is a problem here, and that faculty polarization is a real problem; the problem is not so much "process" as "campus climate."

Adjourned at 6:15 p.m. (the faculty had agreed to extend the discussion.)

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty

