

## Haverford College Faculty Meeting Minutes

March 22, 2018

Deborah Roberts, Clerk

Moment of silence.

**Action I.** Approval of the minutes of February 15, 2018.

### II. Reports. Items for Action, and Items for Discussion

1. Maud McInerney, EPC: new course proposals (att. doc.)

**Action II.** The faculty approved the new course proposals.

2. Rob Scarrow, for FAPC: procedure for selecting faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee (att. doc.)

In summarizing the issue, it was noted that the Board is especially interested in getting a diverse group of faculty representatives and it is hoped that the proposed revisions could achieve that; and also that, in comparison with many other Colleges' Presidential Searches (which FAPC surveyed), Haverford has a significant place for student representatives.

**QUESTION:** Why are junior faculty excluded? **REPLY:** FAPC discussed the benefits and downsides of having junior faculty on the Search Committee, and decided to recommend against junior faculty participation. The time commitment is heavy, and a lot takes place in the summer, which is prime time for advancing scholarship; we do not want to derail scholarly progress for our junior faculty members at a critical time in their careers. Also, "not-yet-tenured" status, for a tenure-track person, is awkward, since they would serve on the committee with Board members when the Board would soon be making a decision about their tenure.

**QUESTION:** Given the work-load, how to insure that the faculty representatives are really prepared to do the work? **REPLY:** It is consuming, but also very rewarding work; in any case, there are several opportunities in the process for someone to withdraw from the selection process.

**QUESTION:** Given that the Board is making the final decision, can you talk to us about what role the faculty representatives play? **REPLY (from someone who has served on two searches):** In my first experience, the Search Committee did not make a

ranking, but simply reported “suitable” candidates to the Board; in the second, the Search Committee offered a consensus recommendation to the Board.

The Clerk asked for a straw-poll: (44 votes)

I accept the proposal: 43

I am not willing to accept it: 1

The Clerk asked if the one person would like to speak further to the issue. No response.

Would the one person like to be recorded as standing outside the consensus? No response.

**Action III:** The faculty came to consensus on the FAPC proposal, with one person by implication standing outside it.

3. Ken Koltun-Fromm, for the Research Policy Committee: further discussion about guidelines (att. doc.)

Although it is clear that this policy has a very real impact on the nature of the research that some of us do and little direct effect on the research of others, in fact we are all, as Haverford College faculty members, stake-holders in the issue.

We propose five different versions of a statement, and we hope that this allows us to begin to focus on the critical issues in our discussion, so that we can come to an agreement. Note that versions #1 through #4 assume that 1) the Board has the ultimate decision, 2) the Provost’s office would be first place of appeal and the Provost would consult an ad hoc committee (e.g., Academic Council or FAPC) to make a recommendation to the President.

Version #1 states our current policy.

#2 closes the loop-hole for faculty members doing research through DOD funding from other universities; and states that the Board will hear an appeal from a faculty member about the Department of Defense as a grantor. (**NOTE: it was pointed out from the floor that the version on this current document inadvertently left out “the Department of Defense” clause from #1 which should be in there too.**)

#3 stresses the “design” of the proposed research.

#4 stresses “clear connection” to the development of military weapons.

#5 says it is a matter of the opinion of the individual faculty member.

**QUESTION:** Is #4 intending to “fuzzy” the boundary? **REPLY:** “clear connection” takes out “INTENTION, it is indeed more restrictive in the sense that its coverage is greater than #3 (design), which is a bit more focused and so less constraining.

**COMMENT:** The issue of intention of the funding Agency is missing from #3 and #4.

**REPLY:** Yes, #1 and #2 focus on naming the Agency as grantor; #3 and #4 move away from declaring the Agency. #3 ('designed to develop') can be read to include the presumed intent of an Agency to use the research for militaristic ends.

**COMMENT:** #5 seems like part 1 in #3 and #4, but it removes "the Faculty at large" and "the Board" from the action. **REPLY:** Yes. All *other* proposed versions assume going to the Provost and then to the Board.

**COMMENT:** #5 is the only version which makes possible the inclusion of students in research projects we might want to pursue which have non-publication. Faculty can have independent consulting contracts which do not involve the College's acquiescence.

**RELATED COMMENT:** Private consulting without Haverford student involvement is one thing; private consulting using Haverford students is another. **ANOTHER**

**COMMENT:** Restriction for private research is possible in #3 and #4.

**QUESTION:** If students are involved in our faculty's research, why are students not included in these judgments? **REPLY:** The students at the time of applying for a grant are not going to be the same students involved in doing the research after the grant has been awarded. But I always talk to my students about the nature of the sources of funding for research that is being done. Students are indeed part of Haverford's decision-making in general, which is why I think that #5 won't do. [Comments from the floor: We do not have a policy of notifying students about this, and some professors tend to "protect" students from this question.]

How should we conduct an early straw-poll? In pairs? (#1 and #2, #3 and #4, #5)? Agency focus and Individual focus? Or a simple list of 5?

The Clerk asked for a very simple early straw-poll of the 5 versions: (42 votes)

#1 4  
#2 4  
#3 16  
#4 9  
#5 9

### III. Open Question Period.

1. Several students from a Special Plenary Committee presented their proposals (att doc.) for modifications to the Honor Code, and asked for our participation in fostering engagement between faculty, staff, and student body regarding proposals being proposed at the upcoming Special Plenary. In the failure to ratify the Honor Code, a strong voice was expressed from underrepresented students about the way in which their voices are not being heard in both classroom and social relations among people. In an effort to remedy this, the proposals include 1) re-proposing a Community Day of Engagement

experience (reconceived), 2) the transformation of the language of Confrontation into the language of Engagement in both the Academic and the Social Honor Code. 3) a concern with how the Social and Academic Honor Codes interact in the classroom, recognizing that there are “social” aspects in the classroom itself.

**COMMENT:** We know that concern over this issue reflects, importantly, the experienced of under-represented students. If the Honor Code is not ratified in the Special Plenary, we will have to have to proctor exams in May. How will we do this, and how will this affect students who have already made plans to return home early?, (for instance in order to begin jobs, and this would be particularly difficult for under-represented students.)

Student response: there is no contingency for extending the Honor Code should it not be ratified.

**COMMENT:** About changing the language of “confrontation” to “engagement”: in violations of the Academic Honor Code, I *want* students to confront their academic violation and feel “confronted” about it.

Student response: We do not mean to change the meaning of “confrontation” in the situation of possible academic violation.

**QUESTION:** Are you suggesting that the faculty sign the Social Honor Code?

Student response: We want the faculty to at least recognize the social dimension of the classroom space. However, we are not expecting or asking the faculty to sign the social honor code.

Both the students from the Special Plenary Committee, and a member of the Faculty, urged the rest of the faculty to encourage their students to attend the Special Plenary. The students then left.

2. **QUESTION:** As for relations between students and faculty: STUDENT ADVISING is not working for me, there is a lack of “connectivity.” Is this true for other people? **RESPONSES FROM THE FLOOR:** It is true; we have been talking about this at faculty meetings a lot lately. We even have an ad hoc committee looking into this. Sophomore advising is a particular problem, since they fall between the cracks before they have a Major adviser. We know that Chesick Scholars DO get a lot of advising, both suggested and mandated, and it is very effective. But Major-advising is also a problem. How much is technology responsible for this?, since Bionic’s electronic registration makes it possible for students not to consult faculty advisers, and/or for faculty in frustration to just “click approve” when requested. It is true that one can refuse to “just click” and demand a student-visit, but that disadvantages students who are registering at the last minute.

Perhaps the problem is that we have too many advisees, especially in programs with large numbers of majors. (Provost: we are considering bringing in more advisers from the Professional Staff to supplement the faculty.) But I hear that (first-year) students do not buy into the Faculty Advising system because they rely on student UCAs as advisers, and that attitude then persists. One could study the question: what IS the content of the “value-added” of faculty advising? Perhaps many advising chores could have an electronic substitution, so that the important business of face-to-face faculty advising could get done.

**(President and Provost:** we know from very many studies of this issue that faculty advising is very important in student outcomes. We know from promotion dossiers that students value their faculty advisors. And faculty-student advising relationships is very much a part of what we state is the “special value” of a Haverford education. )

#### **IV. Report of the President:** updates

The Strategic Plan on Sustainability and Inclusion:

- 1) we have a call out for proposals for a Utilities Master Plan that will help guide a recalibration of our plan to move to a carbon-neutral footprint.
- 2) There are three basic ways to address our carbon consumption: revision of our physical plant (we have made great strides with the capital renovation projects and R&R moves, but this is a complex and old physical plant); behavioral reform (everything from travel to food consumption); and the purchase of carbon offsets.

The Strategic Plan for Diversity and Inclusion: We have several new-course grants about diversity, and diverse learning in the classroom. HR is managing a new Staff-orientation program. We have students actively involved in diversity-work: for example, “the student activism archive project” looking at our history as an institution. On the community level, we are working to improve the quality of our diversity data.

In Student Admissions, we have just admitted another very strong class, with more applications and lower admit rate than ever.

#### **V. Report of the Provost**

The talk regarding “Free Speech on Campus” by Leslie Kendrick, scheduled for April 17, will have to be postponed to the fall semester.

David Watt is giving his inaugural talk as Douglas and Dorothy Steere Professor of Quaker Studies on Friday April 27.

We have had seven Faculty Search Committees running this year; we have already completed five, and two more are in the works. But this is too many searches for an institution of our size to manage; we probably cannot sustain this number of searches each academic year.

Adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty