

Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 19, 2012
4:15 p.m.

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

Action I. Approval of the minutes of March 15, 2012.

I. Report of the President.

EPC is in the process of reviewing and updating the Blueprint, both for ourselves and for the outside world (Board, Alumni, prospective outside Donors) on which its success so much depends. Its current language is both too-“pre-2008” and too “inward” to serve that purpose now. Our fund-raising goals are indeed to “enrich” our community, and they are fungible; but the economic recession makes it a problem, and our goals must be to underwrite the existing institution as well as to support new endeavors.

Next year, with a new President and a new interim Provost in partnership with the faculty, there will be a new ad hoc committee doing this, working side-by-side with the Campaign.

II. Report of the Provost

1. IITS is looking for additional faculty who would like to try using “Panopto,” a lecture-capture system that would make lectures available online for students and faculty. Fran Blase, Heidi Jacob, and Rob Scarrow have been using it. Corey Chao (IITS) has made a video about it and our experience with it. For information, get in touch with Hiroyo Saito.
2. A student Plenary resolution urges the faculty to get all work back to students, which might pertain to final exams, before final exam period begins.
3. Nikhil Anand (Anthropology) has received a Hunt Postdoctoral Fellowship. from the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

Casey Londergan (Chemistry) received a grant of \$303,000 from N.I.H.

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

1. FAPC, Academic Council (Gus Stadler and Laurie Hart) (att. doc.):
procedures for personnel cases
 - a. Uniformity of dates for 1) the submission of candidate documents and 2) the announcing of the decision to candidate.

n.b.: This is a proposal about the form; the specific dates are still being discussed.

COMMENT: The suggested September date for Presenter's getting the dossier to Council (with outside letters) erodes the Presenter's summer research time. **ANOTHER COMMENT:** Many outside reviewers are on vacation in August. **COMMENT:** In my experience both as a reviewer and having watched many other institutions' procedures, it seems that August is not an "excluded" time in the academy for these kinds of collegial responsibilities. **COMMENT:** but an October deadline is a usual deadline for submission of the Presenter's case to Council. **COMMENT:** It is not good idea to have an early date; reviewers need more time to read the material. **SEVERAL COMMENTS:** There is no institutional infrastructure support to the faculty in the summer; cases can't be prepared in the summer without that support. **REPLY:** But Yes, we have re-thought the date, and thought perhaps it should be October 30 instead. But there will always have to be some trade-offs.

COMMENT: I would suggest that we separate the two dates: 1) Yes, Uniformity of date for when candidates submit their data to the Presenter; but 2) variability (flexibility, staggering of the schedule) for the date when the Presenter presents the completed dossier (with outside letters) to Council. If ALL the completed dossiers are coming in on the same date, which is the date when search committees are also bringing material in, the administrative side will be swamped; Council can only consider the dossiers in a staggered manner, so they can come in to Council in a staggered manner too.

COMMENT: I disagree; I think uniformity of BOTH dates is better, fairer; uniformity represents equity for the candidates.

The Clerk: This conversation suggests to me that we can perhaps agree on certain things now, and postpone other things. Do we have a consensus on this?:

1. Uniformity of the submission date of candidates' documents. And uniformity of date when the candidates HEAR the decision that has been made.
2. The dossiers can be presented by the Presenter to Council in a staggered manner.
3. Gus and Laurie will consider further the specific dates, seek feedback in the interim, and come back to us with a proposal.

Action II. Agreed.

- b. The issue of outside letters: who reads them, and when?)(When the departmental evaluations of scholarship are written.) As for whether there is still a need for a glossator, The Clerk noted: because of these questions and possible variations mentioned by Gus and Laurie, this is NOT yet a question which can be considered for action.)

1. Whether tenured professors should see the outside letters.

COMMENT: I object, as someone else did last month: I think this dis-values the opinions of junior faculty, it needlessly makes everyone a Glossator, and it will undoubtedly affect the letters that tenured faculty write. **COMMENT:** I agree. I think the outside letters should be available only to Council and to the Glossator and Presenter. We should continue to preserve the confidentiality of these outside letters.

COMMENT: I disagree; why should we preserve this system, which is so eccentric in the academy? We are outliers in this; our outside reviewers expect that their letters will be read by all the senior colleagues in a department, because this is “the custom of the country” in our profession. Moreover, if the tenured professors read the letter, then more people will “own” the final decision on the scholarship of the candidate: it will be a more open process, not just a “Star Chamber” procedure.

QUESTION: What *is* the problem for which this change is a proposed solution? **REPLY:** Our view was: that there has been not enough “expertise” being applied to tenured scholarship-decisions; that this would raise the level of departmental discussions of the scholarship; that this would lessen the “guess-work” for Council, who are themselves not experts in the field; [**LATER COMMENT:** When I was on Council, I would have welcomed some more expertise.]; and that this would *educate* the rest of the department about the candidate’s scholarly work.

QUESTION: Why, then, are we limiting the department’s “education” to senior colleagues; why can’t the other junior colleagues have the same education?

COMMENT: I disagree with this proposed change entirely; I can write my own evaluation if I know something about the field; and if I don’t, I don’t need to proffer an opinion, especially not one which is merely a reflection of others’ opinions.

COMMENT: Presumably, senior departmental members have been reading their junior colleagues' work all along, over the many years they have been around?

COMMENT: I am concerned that junior faculty voices were completely invisible from our discussion regarding proposed changes for tenure and promotion: changes that would disproportionately affect them.

COMMENT: I think it would be good for my senior colleagues to learn about my work and what outside reviewers think of it.

The Clerk: We must move on to other issues now.

2. EPC: Anne McGuire (Att. Docs)
 - a. As the President announced, there will be a new ad hoc committee to re-consider the Blueprint.
 - b. The discussion about General Education requirements will continue; we will be issuing a survey on April 30.
 - c. A new course proposal: Biology 200f (a half-course throughout the fall semester), by invitation only attached to Biology 200 (for under-prepared students.) We are tried this out experimentally; we are now asking for permanent approval. In reply to a question: yes, it is a new type of course,

Action III. Approved.

- d. A new Minor in Statistics (n.b.: "The Mathematics Department" has now become "The Department of Mathematics and Statistics.")

Action IV: Approved.

3. FAPC (David Sedley) and Clerk of the Faculty (Deborah Roberts): new faculty meeting procedures
 - a. occasional straw-voting by clickers (which gives us an opportunity to appreciate the distribution of opinion): we propose a 2-year trial period.

[**COMMENT:** assuming that the questions put to a straw-vote are "open" in form, and not so framed as to close further discussion.] The Clerk's response: some questions will be open, but in some cases and at some

points, as with our discussions now, the question will be: “Do you agree with this proposal?”

Action V: Approved.

- b. the question of the agenda, items 2a-d on the proposal: that announcements and reports be circulated in advance; that there be an open period of 10-15 minutes for discussion; that the Clerk and FAPC in consultation determine the order of the agenda; that the President’s and Provost’s reports might take various forms and appear at various points on the agenda.

A concern was raised that “bumping the President to the end of the agenda” might be untactful and even insulting to our new incoming-President, who will be actively engaged in the project of establishing “communication” with the faculty. It was pointed out that the intention of this proposal is to re-assert that faculty discussion is the chief focus of the faculty meeting; but it was also pointed out that the proposal asserts that the Clerk (in consultation with FAPC) sets the agenda, and the Clerk can choose to put the President first on the agenda whenever it seems reasonable.

Action VI: Approved.

- c. Several people objected to the proposal that the faculty meeting end at 6:15 and we did not seek consensus on that subject. The Clerk noted that given the increasing pressure of urgent business (as a result in part of FAPC’s active work) we are very likely going to require either longer faculty meetings or extra faculty meetings at least in the immediate future.
- 4. AAC (Danielle Macbeth.): changes to constituency
 - a. We propose the addition of the Associate Provost, the V.P. for Finance, and an additional Staff representative.

One member of AAC has noted that this change does dilute the faculty voice on this committee; and that since there will be issues which set the Faculty interests against the Staff interests, this might be unfortunate from the faculty point of view.

- b. We have just sent out to you a report to the Board from the AAC faculty subcommittee (Profs. Gould, Macbeth, Norquist.)

Action VIII. Approved, with one faculty member standing outside the consensus.

- 5. FAPC (Peter Love): faculty housing policy (att. docs); for discussion

After many expressions of appreciation to Peter for the way in which he has taken this on, the following comments:

COMMENT: The proposed changeover of selling campus housing to the faculty is *most* problematical.

COMMENT: I am opposed to this whole scheme. We should be emphasizing that we are a residential campus in our housing policy; our comparative advantage in the attraction of students (which gets tougher and tougher as our costs increase) is our smallness in size and the social relationships we have with students. Our goal should be to have a high percentage of faculty, across all ranks, living on or close to campus. **REPLY:** This is a faulty monocausal analysis; we have many other goals too, one of which is representing our new diverse and "global" (at least as far away as Philadelphia) community; [**LATER COMMENT:** and with a faculty which has partners who cannot, or may not wish to, live on campus.] **REPLY TO THAT:** If we don't maintain ourselves as a "residential community," we won't exist within 20 years. **REPLY:** And I disagree with that: if we don't redefine ourselves as a diverse community, and face the reality of this, we are in trouble.

COMMENT: *Does* this policy encourage people to live on campus if they would like to? **REPLY:** FAPC's revisions to the Board's proposals seek to do that, by putting back rental and purchase, and with a more generous nearby off-campus rental subsidy.

QUESTION: Why couldn't we encourage a "residential community" with other techniques than housing policy?: such as, we could have baby-sitting arrangements for evening events, we could facilitate student-traveling to faculty homes off campus...

COMMENT: The loss of the diversity of housing units is a big loss: different sizes, floor plans, locations, arrangements with the outdoors,...

The discussion will continue.

6. The Committee on Plagiarism Education (att doc.) (Emily Dix, Anna Brockway, Prof. Walter Smith) made a short presentation.

To eliminate the "I didn't know" defense, more education of students and faculty is needed. Aside from freshman orientation, we hope that departments will have this discussion with "declared" majors.

7. Casey Londergan invited us all to the dedication of the Kannerstein Field on Saturday May 21st, and the Clerk read Bruce Partridge's invitation to us to attend the Commencement.

Adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty