Israel Burshatin presiding

1. Minutes from the Faculty Meeting October 30, 2014

2. Items for Action, and Items for Discussion
   a. FAPC, Jill Stauffer: Bionic feedback (discussion)
   b. Faculty reps to the Board, Laura McGrane & Casey Londergan: Honorary degree candidate selection (discussion)

3. Report of the President

4. Report of the Provost (see attachment)

5. Open question period

Attachments in connection with agenda items:
   a. FAPC, Jill Stauffer: Bionic feedback
   b. FAPC, Casey Londergan: Honorary degree candidate selection
   c. Provost, Kimberly Benston: Provost’s Report
   d. Provost Kim Benston: Chesick Summer Institute
Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

October 30, 2014

Israel Burshatin, Clerk

Moment of silence.

**Action I.** Approval of the minutes of October 2, 2014.

I. **Reports, Items for Action, and items for discussion.**

1. Phil Meneely for EPC. Review new course proposals, spring 2015. (att. doc.)

   We went through the proposals, page by page. Phil pointed out several things:

   We note that there are two courses which deal with Oil: one in Anthropology and one in Political Science. EPC got both professors into contact, they carefully worked out the courses so that they do not overlap, and a student could take both courses.

   We now have some courses which have no Divisional designation (such as ICPR 1- , Tecoisky-Willman, “The Persistent Lack of Diversity in the Sciences”.)

   One course is listed as “crosslisted in General Programs, which of course no longer exists as such; it should be ICPR. This comes from a glitch/“ghost” in our old system: Bionic has now brought to the surface some oddities of the old system which we have not yet fully eliminated; it is not Bionic’s fault; we are working on it.

   **COMMENT:** There seems to be a great variety of how we use Limited Enrollments, and how we set the priorities for the enrollment limits. How do we manage to accommodate these varied desiderata requested by the faculty?

   **REPLY:** EPC is talking about this now. The problem seems to be with the EPC *form* for the proposals, which has a standard LE format; and we have to figure out how to implement the priorities in a systematic way. Jim Keane is working on it.

   The Clerk noted that, as there were no objections raised to the proposals, the faculty has accepted the EPC proposals.

**Action II:** The faculty accepted the spring 2015 course proposals.
2. Richard Freeman and Fran Blase, LACOL update (att. doc.)

The Consortium consists of Amherst, Carleton, Claremont-McKenna, Haverford, Pomona, Swarthmore, Vassar, Williams.

As for “The Liberal Arts Consortium for Online Learning,” the consortium is about collaboration across these campuses on technology. The Online Learning part of the title is perhaps confusing, and we would be happy for a modification of the name. [Dan Weiss: I am sure that the Consortium itself would be receptive to this idea.]

We would like to continue these conversations this year at Haverford; we have outlined the four working groups. What might Haverford do? How do you see it? We are holding an open meeting to discuss this on Friday Nov. 14, 1-2:30 right after the Faculty Lunch in the Faculty Dining Room.

**QUESTION:** I note that Bryn Mawr is not on this list; is that a complication? **REPLY:** No, Bryn Mawr and Haverford have separate initiatives in many areas.

**QUESTION:** How is IITS involved? They have been very helpful to faculty who are trying to use technology for teaching and research. **REPLY:** Hiroyo Saito, Steve Fabiani, and Laurie Allen (Library) attended the LACOL meeting in Pomona, and Hiroyo and Steve will be at the November 14 meeting.

3. Casey Londergan and Laura McGrane for FAPC: report about the Oct. 24-25 Board meeting (att. doc.)

There seemed to be a positive energy about the campaign and also about the solidification of our Administration.

The Strategic Plan was approved,

The Board is looking at its own governance, in order to institute more discussion and less just-listening to reports, and also to create more opportunities for Faculty/Board interaction.

We have indeed raised $175,000,000 of the projected Campaign’s $225,000,000; but there have been short-falls in this years budget and we anticipate the same in next year’s budget too. This is a result of one-of-a-kind needs and also of our ways of accounting (e.g., the way we calculate for the deterioration of buildings.)

Technology: we are behind and we must catch up, recognizing costs and budgetary constraints. Your thoughts on this?
The Board stressed that it is open to a transparent model for “process.” A current issue for the Board, as it is for us, is Diversity.

The Board wishes to make the process of Commencement-planning more open; please respond to requests for suggestions.

There have been four major Capital issues, but also a few smaller ones. We need a more open process in tracking our progress on these Capital projects: more open for the Board and more open to us.

**COMMENT:** About Technology: although it is true that we *are* behind, I want to stress that in some other technology ways we are doing wonderfully: in *human* support from IITS, and in the classroom technology in which we are absolutely up-to-date. **SUPPORTING COMMENT:** I agree.

**COMMENT:** About the budget: The message seems to be: “The Endowment did very well; 2) we do well with it; 3) We are broke.” How do we reconcile these statements?

**REPLY (The President):** It is really a matter of our past performance of enrollment-control (predicting and providing for # admitted; # attending; # on study abroad…) There have been miscalculations in the past.

Annual giving was indeed very large; but we did not budget well about it.

Most of the deficit has to do with “revenue-shortfall,” because we didn’t *know* things. We have to develop a more sophisticated management policy. We are slowly recovering from a 2008 loss of revenue; we are in a new $-environment of lower increases of revenues and lower gifting, and we must adjust to it, because we can no longer rely on that magic “5%.”

**REPLY (Mitchell Wein):** The micro-issues from last year will continue next year, but we have to be more transparent with the community. We *all* have to adjust to a new macro-level environment.

**COMMENT:** Don’t forget that last winter was a winter of Bad Weather (unplanned expenses of over $300,000) and the Scoreboard blew up ($35,000.)

**QUESTION:** What about new lights on Walton Field? Then we could have more night games, rather than 4-6 p.m. games which seem to infringe on 2:30-4 classes. **REPLY (President):** About Walton Field: first we have to make the track runnable, and then we will address the issue of lights. (In reply to a question): and we can correct some of the problems with the Swann Field lights.
COMMENT: Do department Chairs have any impact when they are involved in annual budget discussions? Should Chairs get some training in dealing with budgets? 
REPLY (President): Chair-budgets involve a small number. Most of our budget is fixed: salaries and financial aid to students. But we have to maximize our ability to respond to department-Chair requests, because we have so little extra with which to deal with them.

COMMENT: Sometimes it is the Administrative Assistants who have the continued memory, since Chairs rotate in and out; they can help with the routinizing of operating costs.

REPLY (President, Provost): For the 6 or 7 new department Chairs each year, we could easily make it a practice to have a training session; we could include this as an agenda item at the early group meetings of Department Chairs; we will also meet this year one-on-one with certain departments with many levers to push in their budgets; and we could urge departments as a whole (not only the Chair) to have a routine practice of budget discussions early in the process.

II. The Report of the President.

About Capital project budgets: It is a management issue and we have to know things that we didn’t know in the past. The Sharpless project is urgent; it must go on now (whatever arrangements we decide for funding it.)

The Board has asked about sexual misconduct on campus, (not because of any incidents but because it is an issue of general concern.) Are we following best practices? We are indeed compliant with the law.

We will develop new occasions for Faculty/Board interactions, and not only in connection with coincident Board meetings; perhaps a dinner event in December, even though there is no longer a December Board meeting.

The Diversity Task Force is complete (at #16.) We will engage you all in its deliberations.

There was a student letter in “The Clerk” questioning the Board’s decision NOT to divest on the Biofuels issue. We are meeting with those students tonight. The Board is open to such a discussion.

COMMENT: You have just announced that the Board has abolished its “Committee on Investments and Social Responsibility.” I can appreciate eliminating a committee when it is redundant or unnecessary or dysfunctional, or when it makes more sense to relocate that function elsewhere. But “Social Justice in Investing” is a legitimate matter of public concern and a matter for regular deliberation, reporting, and accountability. My concern
is that this change is a shift from a publicly marked institutional commitment to a more bureaucratic function removed from public view. Community members who wish to raise College investment questions as a public concern rather than as something to be taken up personally with senior staff are left without a venue. The Haverford community must have a place in which to raise questions about investing in markets.

**REPLY (President):** The Board discussed this a lot. The structure of that committee did not work, because it had no impact on the Board Investment Committee. Where is the place for people to come to the Board? (About anything: investments, the endowment, financial aid…) The Board had a very balanced discussion about divestments. When an issue rises, a Task Force can deal with it. The Board feels that the whole Board has a “responsibility” for investments.

**QUESTION:** So: without the CISR, will there be any regular reporting on social responsibility and the College’s investments? **REPLY (President):** The short answer is “No,” there will not be a single body that will report on that.

**COMMENT:** Building on the previous speaker’s comments: I believe the College needs to engage social responsibility in all its dealings. Instead of a specific committee, the Board should include a discussion of social responsibility in all of its reports. **REPLY:** I can take this to the Board; I assure you that the Board does feel a “social responsibility” on this issue.

**COMMENT:** In the Title IX discussion, I noticed a “hetero-normative” rhetoric: it was all about “protecting women.” The language did not invite the Board to reflect on Gender issues. This issue is about men and women, and sexual harassment across gender.

**COMMENT:** (Secretary: This came up later in the meeting, after the Provost’s report, but it belonged here.) About the Budget: Can we be more creative with them? The form in which we get questions about the budget is restraining and too standardized; many of the items have no relationship to my department. Can we re-write the way we do it, in terms of line-categories? **REPLY (Provost):** Yes, we would indeed like to know what your “intuitive budget” would look like. (Mitchell Wein: We can indeed hold an open meeting with the faculty, in coordination with AAC, on explaining the budget.)

**QUESTION:** Could we see how Other Departments do their budgets? **REPLY:** YES, WE COULD DO THAT. THIS MIGHT BE A GOOD AGENDA ITEM FOR AN UPCOMING CHAIRS MEETING. (SOONER RATHER THAN LATER.)

**COMMENT:** Since we are on this topic: Since an advantage of Kuali is that it is Open-Source, can it be adapted for our needs soon? **REPLY:** This is not a free option. But we are discussing how we can better use Kuali.

### III. The Report of the Provost (att, doc.)

Department staffing requests are due tomorrow.
Operating budgets are due November 21. Please think ahead about it.

The application date for Tri-Co “brainstorming grants” is coming up fast.

The Faculty Dining Room lunches will continue.

We are thinking about a modest program of “Provost’s Teas.” The first one will be on Diversity.

IV. **Open Question Period**

1. Judy Owen (also speaking for Anne Preston) (att. doc.)

   The idea for Public Policy fora came out of our discussions of the Strategic Plan. We have many new curricular efforts in Public Policy, but they don’t speak to one another. Could we get the students to talk with one another?

   The inaugural forum will be on March 21, 2015.

2. Maud McInerney: Mellon-Mays Fellowships

   Please nominate students for the Mellon-Mays Fellowship Program. You will receive a reminder soon.

Adjourned at 5:40 p.m.             Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty