

Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

January 19, 2012
4:15 p.m.

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

I. Introduction of New Faculty and Staff

Action I. Approval of the minutes of December 15, 2011.

II. Report of the President.

Thank you for your participation in the Interim Provost search. I hope to finish the process by the February Board meeting.

I would like to take a few moments for a midcourse assessment; my goal has been to maintain institutional momentum in this transitional year. Nothing is more important than maintaining the legacy of Haverford as one of the best liberal arts colleges in the country, with an unwavering commitment to academic excellence. Its small size, relationship with Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore, and Quaker-rooted values and traditions make Haverford distinctive, as do its dual goals of intellectual and moral freedom and the humanistic developmental aspirations that are passed on especially within student culture.

But Haverford in the 21st century is not Haverford in the 19th century; there are tensions among goals and there is not complete consensus about the current mission and aspirations for the future. I would like to see us talk about a clarification of mission.

Sometimes there seems to have been an additive rather than an integrative discussion, and one wonders about the feasibility of it all: 27 new faculty lines, new programmatic areas, a reduced teaching load, a new academic center, a new music facility, other buildings, largesse in financial aid--- and all of this on an endowment of under \$400,000,000. It is true that we are now outperforming our financial assets and there is no reason that we cannot continue to do so; but we need a stable economy and a successful fund raising campaign to do it.

The academic program must be front and center of the campaign. The Blueprint reflects hard work and consensus, energy and vision, but we have to be smart and savvy about how we use it as we position the College for success in the future. In truth, I don't find compelling the often-stated short-hand version: "we need 27 new faculty lines in specified areas to reduce faculty teaching load so that we can have more time to do more research." Faculty positions are important; but we have very few donors who can give the \$2.5 million to endow a chair, and those few rich donors are not all interested in faculty chairs, or in the specific positions

outlined in the Blueprint. Indeed, many donors are skeptical about a growth model in a no-growth environment, and in an incremental programmatic expansion when we are a small institution which cannot compete in a variety-competition.

Our donors are interested in maintaining and enhancing Haverford's distinctive superior liberal arts education. We can indeed compete well in the perfectibility of our liberal arts model: a high priority on research and teaching, teaching as mentoring each individual student, teaching that provides to students opportunities to synthesize perspectives, to do real research, and to prepare lives of purposeful engagement.

I think that the faculty's goals should be couched both on this rhetorical high ground and also on the practical low ground of educational outcomes: donors need to be assured that Haverford is analytically assessing educational outcomes, is helping students to integrate and synthesize, and is helping them connect to the complicated, globalized geo-political 21st century realities. There is a lot of good language in the Middle States reaccreditation report and in the Presidential Search materials which is worth harvesting. One example: "At Haverford, every student is an honors student." That encapsulates a lot about Haverford's uniqueness.

Academic enrichment is a large category; money is fungible and can be garnered under different rubrics. What would be extremely useful is to reenergize the Blueprint with a more compelling and cohesive articulation of Haverford's educational mission and goals. I look forward to seeing what EPC can do, and to being part of this discussion.

III. Report of the Provost

1. Upcoming faculty research talk: Suzanne Amador Kane, on Feb. 22, with a follow-up brown bag lunch on Friday Feb. 24 at 12:30.
2. Other upcoming brown bag lunches:
 - a. Jan, 20: (Jeff Tecosky-Feldman), the Chesick Scholar Program
 - b. Jan. 27: (Wendy Sternberg), Assessment (Middle States) updates
 - c. Feb. 2: (FAPC): Faculty Housing
3. The College is moving from Blackboard to Moodle on June 30, 2012.
4. Prof. Anita Isaacs (Political Science) has been named by the American Political Science Association to its Inaugural Distinguished Teaching Award Selection Committee.

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

1. FAPC (Gus Stadler) and Academic Council (Curtis Greene): the revised Appeals Policy statement (since the December 2011 discussion)

About qualifications for service on the Appeals Committee, we have removed “previous Council service” and retained “tenured status.”

Discussion followed:

How does a case move to the Appeal stage? If the Provost’s role in the case is part of the issue, should the Provost be the institution which agrees to initiate the Appeal? **RESPONSE:** No: a review by the Appeals committee is automatic provided it is requested within four weeks; the Provost’s office is simply the place where the request is lodged, hence initiating the process. (We have rewritten the language to reflect this.)

Certain issues are still left hanging because we haven’t discussed them yet.

COMMENTS: It is apparent that we need a clarification of language:

COMMENT: The fourth paragraph needs to be re-worded to reflect the thought that the Appeal is based on a sense that there was a departure from normal procedure, and thus the appropriate redress of procedural errors is intended to achieve the restoration of normal Council procedures.

COMMENT: The third paragraph: what is a trivial violation and what is a significant violation which warrants a new hearing?

RESPONSE: It is left to the Appeals Committee to decide what “warrants” it. “Appropriate redress” can take *any* possible form, and some forms may not require a re-hearing. Alternate Council makes that decision.

COMMENT: The timeline for a new-hearing (it could even be six months) raises the issue of whether *new* data which has appeared should be considered in a re-hearing of a case: is this really just a “re-hearing” to correct procedural violations or is this a new hearing with the new data? I have in mind data such as new publications, or new reviews (positive or negative.) **RESPONSE:** we talked a lot about this, and we could not come to agreement, so the document does not address it. **COMMENT:** We *must* address it. For instance, it is psychologically impossible for us to ignore negative reviews, we simply cannot do it. **COMMENT:** But the point is to return to “normal procedures,” and normal procedures respect the deadline: we do not admit new data after the deadline is set.

COMMENT: But this issue of “deadline” is a fraught issue. *When* is a case closed? Especially in initial re-appointments for young people, time-pressure to “produce” makes this issue of deadline a serious concern.

SEVERAL COMMENTS: Whatever decision we make on this issue, this document should state it clearly. Junior faculty in particular want a clear understanding of procedure, whatever it is.

THE PROVOST: We are talking about the Appeals process here, not about the “normal procedures of Council.” We will come back to “normal procedures” later. **COMMENT:** That suggests that we should omit consideration of this point now, since it will come up when we deal with normal procedures. **COMMENT:** No, these are two different issues and we need something in *this* document.

COMMENT: Why do most Colleges have a deadline? In tenure cases, as a general rule, I think “When in doubt, don’t” is of a piece with “There is a firm deadline, a reasonable one.” We don’t make procedure for anomalies (such as: the candidate wins a Nobel Prize in the interim.)

COMMENT: On which side do you err? There are consequences for both. The Appeals process in some sense is always going to give a candidate a second chance.

COMMENT: The intention of having an Alternate Council hearing means inevitably that Alternate Council will have new data. There is a tension between “ideal” and “real”: one cannot avoid knowing about new things that occur.

We returned briefly to two issues, without time for a full discussion: Should the same person sit on both the Appeals Committee and the Alternate Council that hears the case? (Several people felt there was a problem.) Will voting become politicized as people try to elect in anticipation of particular cases? (As with general elections to Academic Council, it appeared that little could be done about this.)

The Clerk: The proposal needs revision. The first paragraph has been rewritten since the document went out, and there will be clarification in paragraph #4. Substantive changes are needed about “the same person not being on the Appeals Committee and Alternative Council”; there needs to be a ruling on “new material” at the time of appeal. But it seems clear that the faculty is supportive of the basic document.

2. Administrative Advisory Committee (Danielle Macbeth): revisions to the charge.

The cumulative effect of changes can be large; the AAC has been enlarged. The Associate Provost and the Associate V.P. for Finance have now been included, and the Staff Association representation has gone from 1 to 2. There are now more “Staff” than faculty representatives on this committee. What does the faculty think about this?

QUESTION: Is it a problem that the (Faculty) Chair of AAC can (willy-nilly) be only from one division of the faculty? **REPLY (Chair):** I don’t think so; I am not “representing” my division, I am representing the faculty at large.

QUESTION: Is the increased size and increased staff proportion an inhibition? **REPLY:** The faculty still pulls its weight, but it has become more complicated. It makes sense to have the added people; we need the V.P. for Finance and

the Associate Provost for budgetary discussions, and the staff representative needs a colleague. **A DISSENTING REPLY (from a member of AAP):** I don't agree. This is supposed to be a faculty committee and often the faculty is not consulted. Some sub-committees (research and travel funds) cannot not function without instructions from FAPC. AAC is often just a rubber-stamp: the committee is never asked about giving judgments about the opportunity-costs of choices that are made.

COMMENT: Rather than AAC taking on a "global all-College view," the faculty needs an advocacy group; FAPC is functioning as such a group this year, but FAPC may not exist next year. **The Clerk:** We have only very recently seen this document; we need more time. Communicate with AAC.

3. Jeff Tecosky-Feldman: The Chesick Scholars Committee Report, (in preparation for tomorrow's brown bag lunch discussion.)

We have had a "Haverford College Summer Science Institute" for the last six years, for 10 very "special" students; now, with the benefit of a new enhanced Office of Academic Resources and a large new grant, we are enhancing the program to 15 students in all three divisions of the College. The students will be already-admitted students of African-American, Native-American, Latino/a, or "first generation to go to college" background. There will be a pilot five-week program for the summer of 2012, which will help students enhance writing skills and explore disciplines all across our curriculum.

4. Hurford Arts and Humanities Center: Israel Burshatin
The new deadline for proposals for the 2013 Humanities Seminar: Feb. 29.
The Curator Search is now up and running.
Note the opening of the "People's Biennial" exposition on Jan. 27.
5. FAPC (Peter Love): Faculty Housing (in preparation for Feb. 2 brown bag lunch and for the visit of Timur Galen '77 on January 27.)

There is no sense of urgency about re-writing this policy; the Board wants to "get it right." Anything done will be based on "grandfathering" arrangements for existing faculty. Some discussion followed:

"Equity" does not necessarily mean "equality" of arrangements and benefits; we are a varied faculty with varied assets, needs and desires.

The guaranteed-mortgage policy from the College has been a good benefit for us and a not-so-bad investment for the College; will throwing this onto the commercial bank market make it more difficult to get a mortgage?

Will the removal of housing for emeritus faculty make faculty without personal housing resources more reluctant to retire earlier?

These proposed changes make Housing more of a benefit and less of a plan for the sake of the College; this needs consideration.

Adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty

