

2-6-2020

Faculty Meeting Minutes - February 6, 2020

Provost's Office
Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/facultyminutes1920>

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Recommended Citation

Provost's Office, "Faculty Meeting Minutes - February 6, 2020" (2020). *2019-2020 Meeting Agendas & Minutes*. 8.

<https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/facultyminutes1920/8>

This open access minutes is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

Faculty Meeting Minutes - February 6, 2020

Abstract

Minutes of the Gettysburg College Faculty Business Meeting, February 6, 2020.

Comments

Appendix 1 : President's Announcement of Personnel Changes

Appendix 2 : Rationales: Personnel Committee Motions

Minutes of the Gettysburg College Faculty
February 6, 2020
Mara Auditorium
Business Meeting
(Quorum 98; Attendance 99)

President Robert Iuliano called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

He noted that two students were in attendance: Benjamin Pontz for the *Gettysburgian*, and Patrick McKenna, for Senate.

Vice President Tosten explained the need for greater digital security and briefly outlined how two-factor authentication, soon to be introduced to the campus, will work, as well as the schedule on which members of the community are to register with Duo Security, the company that is to provide the service.

The president called for a quorum count, which succeeded.

Minutes for December 5, 2019 were approved as submitted.

President Iuliano thanked people who attended the special faculty meeting on January 30. He looks at it as the first in a series of conversations on the changing demography of higher education; future ones will ask for deeper engagement, and will afford opportunities for sustained discussion and deliberation. He referred to the email from Provost Zappe, which went out the evening of the meeting, in which he encouraged people with relevant ideas, particularly about generating revenue and for enhancing the success of our students, to share them with the college leadership.

He reported that the Board of Trustees is on campus and will discuss these same issues. He noted the announcement that went out on February 5, about the formation of the Climate Change and Sustainability Committee, to be co-chaired by Professor Randall Wilson and Peter North. He urged people with recommendations about sustainability to share them with the committee. He also called attention to his letter from January 31, in which he announced various personnel changes. In response to Vice President North's decision to retire at the end of the academic year, he has asked two members of the administration to take on new responsibilities: Associate Provost Stuempfle will serve as his chief of staff and as his strategic advisor, and Dr. Davenport will serve as Assistant Secretary to the Board and become a member of President's Council. Both received hearty applause as he thanked them for stepping into these roles.

Please see Appendix 1 for the full text of the announcement.

Professor Crawford introduced three motions for the Faculty Personnel Committee. The first proposes

...that the following text be added to the Faculty Handbook after the paragraph beginning "THE TASK OF DEPARTMENTAL COLLEAGUES. Tenured

members...” on page 22 of the May 2018 edition in Section D Pre-tenure, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures, sub-section 1. Pre-tenure and Tenure:

“Under unusual circumstances that may interfere with an accurate departmental assessment of a candidate’s performance for pre-tenure or tenure (e.g., there is conflict of interest in the departmental evaluation committee; there is no senior member of the department to assume the supervisory role; the candidate was the object of documented inappropriate behavior by a member or members of the departmental evaluation committee), the candidate or the Provost may initiate a conversation among the candidate, Provost, and chair of the Grievance Committee (in the case of conflict, the Grievance Committee will nominate a replacement from their members) to determine the membership of the departmental evaluation committee. The Provost will make the final determination, seeking consensus among the above parties.”

and similarly in sub-section 2. Promotion:

“Under unusual circumstances that may interfere with an accurate departmental assessment of a candidate’s performance for promotion to full-professor (e.g., there is conflict of interest in the departmental evaluation committee; there is no senior member of the department to assume the supervisory role; the candidate was the object of documented inappropriate behavior by a member or members of the departmental evaluation committee), the candidate or the Provost may initiate a conversation among the candidate, Provost, and chair of the Grievance Committee (in the case of conflict, the Grievance Committee will nominate a replacement from their members) to determine the membership of the departmental evaluation committee. The Provost will make the final determination, seeking consensus among the above parties.”

See the Appendix 2 for the rationale for this and the other two motions.

Through the second the Committee moves

that the language in Section I.C.2 on Promotion be changed as highlighted below.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR. Advancement to the rank of full professor requires ~~a level of performance and promise in terms of all stated criteria greater than that expected of members of other ranks.~~ **continued development in all three categories of performance criteria (Section I.C).** Promotion to professor is based upon convincing evidence of:

1. high quality and effective teaching **and advising**, as well as evidence that this level of teaching will be maintained;
2. ongoing scholarship recognized as being of high quality by colleagues both inside and outside the College. Such scholarship must be beyond that required for promotion to associate professor and should show that the candidate has

reached a high level of maturity as a scholar. Works that have passed the test of critical review--in being chosen for publication, in achieving recognition following publication, or both--must have resulted from this scholarship **since tenure**; an exception to this publication requirement is made for those faculty members in the performing and creative arts, for whom scholarship may be evidenced through performances, compositions, exhibits, or other appropriate ways. Such scholarship **performance or creative work** must demonstrate a level of accomplishment comparable to that expected of colleagues in the other fields. Exception to the publications requirement beyond that made for faculty members in the performing and creative arts would be rare and would be made by the President of the College only after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Provost, and the candidate's department chair;

3. effective participation in the governance of the College at the departmental, committee, and faculty levels demonstrated, for example, by advancing and defending important ideas **by holding leadership roles**, preparing and presenting reports, and devising and implementing new programs and special events. Service to a candidate's profession is also considered.

There are a variety of career trajectories that candidates for promotion to full professor may pursue beyond their tenure review process. While candidates must show evidence of continued development beyond the tenure review process in all three categories, the degree of excellence after tenure in any one category is viewed in light of the accomplishments that a candidate has made in the other two categories.

Please see the Appendix for the rationale.

The third mandates

... that departments and programs develop guidelines to address all three performance categories: teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and governance. These guidelines should describe how the standards for pre-tenure, tenure and promotion manifest within the field. Section I.C and E.2 of the Faculty Handbook will be modified to include these additional guidelines:

Section I.C

TEACHING. The ability to teach in an effective and scholarly manner is the most valued quality in a faculty member. In the recruitment of faculty and in appraisal of performance, therefore, greatest weight is given to promise and performance as a teacher. The effectiveness of a teacher is recognizable by (1) solid command of the subject matter, teaching techniques, and methodology of the discipline; (2) the soundness of the presentation, including clear liberal arts teaching objectives, thoughtful course organization, content reflecting the best available scholarship, and teaching techniques appropriate to eliciting a high level of student understanding and learning; (3) the high standards which are set for student effort and achievement; and (4) the time, effort, and imagination associated with course development. Further, an

integral part of effective teaching is a faculty member's concern for students beyond the classroom in advising, consultation, and discussion.

SCHOLARSHIP. Although scholarship is considered here in a separate category, research and creative activities are intimately and necessarily related to effective teaching; indeed, they are inseparable. Faculty members are expected to engage in an ongoing program of scholarly activities because of the positive effects which these activities should have on general teaching performance. Scholarly activities are to be brought to conclusion from time to time by such means as publications, papers, reports, performances, compositions, and exhibits. Evaluation of these activities by departmental/program colleagues and the Faculty Personnel Committee should take into account the discipline-specific guidelines for scholarship/creative activity developed by the department/program considering the candidate's case. The College expects that the quality of these efforts will enable competent colleagues both from inside and beyond the campus to testify to the significance and originality of the scholarship of its faculty.

PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE OF THE COLLEGE. Each faculty member is expected to participate in departmental and faculty meetings, to accept faculty committee and departmental assignments, and to discharge such duties with fidelity. Other areas of participation include certain aspects of the advising of student organizations and general support of College activities. In evaluating the faculty member in this area, the quality of the contributions which are made is the important consideration.

Evaluation of these activities by departmental/program colleagues and the Faculty Personnel Committee should take into account the discipline-specific guidelines for teaching developed by the department/program considering the candidate's case.

Evaluation of these activities by departmental/program colleagues and the Faculty Personnel Committee should take into account the discipline-specific guidelines for governance developed by the department/program considering the candidate's case.

Section E.2

CHAIRS COUNCIL shall be composed of the Provost; Chairs of all academic departments; and Chairs of all academic programs. It shall be the duty of the Chairs Council: (1) to consider business that comes before the Council; (2) to serve as an initiator and advocate for faculty legislation; (3) to collaborate with the Provost to manage the system of periodic performance evaluation of faculty members. This does not pertain to pre-tenure, tenure and promotion evaluations. Development; (4) to collaborate with the Provost to review departmental/program discipline-specific guidelines for **teaching**, scholarship and creative activity, **and governance** to ensure broad consistency across departments/programs and congruence with College criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Professor Crawford asked that discussion proceed in sequence, one motion at a time. He noted that the first motion addresses the rare circumstances in which departments cannot provide accurate assessments of candidates. The committee believes that the college must have a process that will allow for an appropriate solution. The second and third motions pick up on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion, which recommended external review of scholarship and the drafting of departmental guidelines for advancement. The committee understands that some people sense a gap between what they are being evaluated on and what they believe they should be evaluated on: teaching is not always perceived as carrying the same weight as research. Motion 2 makes explicit the value the institution places on all areas of a candidate's performance, while Motion 3 requires departments to state expectations for success in those areas. So far, seventeen departments, in their statements, only address standards for scholarship, while just eleven discuss scholarship, teaching, and service.

Professor Funk asked about why only one person—the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee—would be involved in all cases in which departments have no one in a senior role. Professor Crawford replied that the reason is for simplicity: there is a need to include a faculty voice in constituting qualified review committees, and to assure that the decisions are not made by the provost acting alone. Provost Zappe observed that as it stands, there is consultation with the department and the candidate; the motion will sustain that practice. Professor Funk felt that it would be appropriate, at least in some cases, to have more people involved in the conversation. Perhaps a phrase such as “at a minimum” would allow for more participants should circumstances warrant it. Professor Milingo recommended using the phrase “Faculty Grievance Committee” as the college has several grievance committees. She also recommended adding a clear antecedent for the phrase “their members” in the second parenthetical clause.

Professor Cushing-Daniels objected to the motion. The chair of the Grievance Committee will have to be recused in case a candidate files a grievance against an evaluation committee that the chair helped constitute. We have a way of handling reviews for candidates in Interdisciplinary Studies, and would be better off adhering to that model. The Grievance Committee should be asked to handle the one responsibility it is charged with to address. Professor Robertson indicated that “senior” in the list of examples was ambiguous. Professor Andresen asked what would happen if the people asked to determine whether there is a significant conflict did not find one. Professor Crawford replied that since the provost makes the ultimate decision, we have to trust that officer. There will also be a paper trail to assure that candidates don't bring frivolous objections. Warning about opening floodgates, Professor Dorman urged more specific criteria: people can identify lots of reasons why they should not be evaluated by their departments. Professor Crawford said that the committee seeks a balance between being overly prescriptive and too general. Professor Dorman asked whether there were examples the committee could cite; Professor Hogan cautioned against any remark that would be in violation of confidentiality. Professor Amster hoped that documented objections would be sufficient to exclude people from evaluation committees. Professor Robertson clarified that she was mainly interested in finding out whether “senior” means “tenured.” Professor Delesalle noted that in the type of cases we are discussing, the provost is assumed to have information and can act on it. What about ones where problems haven't reached that office? Provost Zappe said that if there is a conflict, he should be informed of it.

Professor McCutcheon felt the wording was anomalous: if “senior” refers to full professors in common usage, then the motion should clearly refer to associates as well.

Observing that stories of inappropriate behavior can remain within closed circles until it becomes too pervasive to ignore, Professor Ogra noted that documentation will also happen in different ways and can have varying audiences. Any system we adopt must be flexible enough to respond to the complex ways in which problems occur.

Professor Crawford said the committee would consider changes to the motion and then asked for responses to the second proposal. Professor Birkner asked whether the Personnel Committee had looked at what peer schools, Franklin & Marshall and Dickinson in particular, do. Professor Crawford advised that the Ad Hoc Committee had done so. It reviewed a number of policies, including those of the consortium colleges, and found them to be wide ranging. At one extreme, automatic promotion occurs after twelve years, at the other, scholarship of international renown is mandated. We should be in the middle; the Ad Hoc Committee did not wish promotion to be rare here. Professor Kennedy inquired whether an increase in the number of promotions—perhaps a long term effect of the move to a five course teaching load—could, with bumps in salary, be a source of financial strain. Professor Crawford responded that such concerns lay outside the Personnel Committee’s purview. Provost Zappe added that while promotions do come with raises, and while resources are finite, they do not constrain other initiatives.

Professor Robertson asked whether the motion changes the standard for promotion; Professor Crawford replied that it reflects current standards. Professor McCutcheon wondered whether the motion is in agreement with what the Ad Hoc committee called for. This seems different: the proposal does not treat promotion as a natural step. Professor Goubet-McCall stressed that the Ad Hoc Committee polled the faculty, which indicated its desire for promotion to be more attainable than it was. It identified a worry about an imbalance between teaching and scholarship, and it urged a program of ongoing scholarship, but not, say, a doubling of output needed for tenure, as one of the criteria the college should use. Professor Sijapati pointed out that our standards provide an effective way to have our scholarship read.

Professor Day asked whether we assess teaching meaningfully. Advising loads vary. How do we determine its effectiveness? Professor Crawford answered that the committee defers to departmental guidelines. Professor Andresen was not convinced that the motion really responds to the survey data gathered by the Ad Hoc Committee. Professor Crawford disagreed, and thinks the proposed changes reflect the will of the faculty.

The provost asked that explicit recognition be given work done as mentors and advisors: such work, done well, will improve retention. Some of our students need the kind of attention from us that will make them feel included; what we do to address this need should be lifted up in our evaluative procedures. Professor Dorman asked, if the motion is aimed at eliminating a backlog of promotions, whether the Personnel Committee has the time and resources to handle it. Professor Crawford advised that what matters to it is setting standards that are clear and agreed on.

As discussion of the third motion began, Professor Crawford said that the committee realizes that it may be a challenge for departments, especially those reliant on practices not well reflected by

the language of the Handbook. But the motion should lead to greater transparency. To a question from Professor Robertson about possible discrepancies between what departments call for and what the Handbook states, Professor Crawford said that the goal should be to have a college wide standard that individual departments will manifest in distinct ways. Professor McCutcheon urged adding language that both the Provost and the Ad Hoc Committee recommended, about advising.

The president adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Leonard S. Goldberg". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Leonard S. Goldberg
Faculty Secretary

Appendix 1
President's Announcement of Personnel Changes
January 31, 2020

Dear members of the Gettysburg College community,

I am writing in follow-up to my message about Jane North's decision to retire in May 2020. As the College's Executive Vice President, Jane has been an invaluable member of the President's Council and has held a broad range of essential institutional responsibilities. With her retirement comes the task of ensuring that those responsibilities continue to be effectively handled. Her transition also provides an opportunity to step back and consider the organizational structure that will best position the College to address the many opportunities and challenges ahead.

With these considerations in mind, I have asked Kris Stuempfle, Associate Provost for Academic Assessment and Dean of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Computer Science, to move from her position in the Provost's Office to serve as my Chief of Staff and Strategic Advisor. In this new role, she will serve as a member of the President's Council and will be intimately involved in helping the College establish and make progress on its strategic priorities. Kris will also serve as the College's Ethics and Integrity Officer and assist with the day-to-day management of the President's Office.

I can think of no better person to take on these responsibilities. Over her many years on campus, Kris has proven herself to be a strategic thinker, fiercely committed to the College and to understanding the ever-changing landscape of higher education. She brings experience in crafting and monitoring strategic plans and working on the College's Middle States accreditation. She will offer the perspective of a long-serving member of the faculty to the President's Council, together with a heightened understanding of the College's administration through her years in the Provost's Office.

I have also asked Darrien Davenport to serve as Assistant Secretary to the Board and to join the President's Council. In this role, Darrien will be a key administrative liaison with the Board of Trustees, including serving as principal staff on several board committees. He will also oversee Human Resources—work he undertook earlier in his career—while continuing to lead the Office of Multicultural Engagement (OME) as Assistant Vice President of College Life.

Like Kris, Darrien is a strategic thinker and a keen student of higher education. He is also the consummate bridge-builder. In his new roles, he will help integrate the work of the President's Council and the Board of Trustees, be an invaluable ambassador to the Board and for the College, and provide a student-focused and multifaceted perspective to institutional decisions. I am pleased that Darrien has agreed to continue his work at OME, where he has been such an accomplished and visionary leader. As the College seeks to advance its commitment to belonging and inclusion, having Darrien's voice, and his experience at OME, at the table will make us smarter and more effective.

Kris and Darrien will join Jamie Yates as the newest members of the President's Council. As the Executive Director of Communications and Marketing, Jamie is already serving on the President's

Council and has already made her voice heard. With Barbara Fritze's retirement in June, Jamie will report directly to the president.

Finally, Dan Konstalid, Vice President for Finance and Administration, will add risk management to his portfolio, and Jamie Yates will add community relations to her work.

I am enormously grateful to Darrien, Kris, Jamie, and Dan for taking on these new and important institutional responsibilities. By joining the President's Council, I am confident that Darrien and Kris will add wisdom and new perspectives to our work and will help ensure that the College is thinking broadly and strategically about the future. I look forward to the exciting work ahead and the impact our collective efforts will have on the lives of our students, and on Gettysburg College.

Sincerely,

Bob Iuliano
President

Appendix 2 Rationales: Personnel Committee Motions

Rationale FPC Motion 1

1. In the Standard Operating Procedures of the Faculty Personnel Committee, there is guidance on how to handle rare cases when circumstances prohibit an accurate departmental assessment, but the language is in need of clarification.
2. The Faculty Handbook does not address how these situations should be handled. This motion seeks to clarify our procedures and fill this gap in the Faculty Handbook.
3. While rare, these situations require transparent guidance for the candidate, departmental review committee, and the FPC.
4. If approved, the FPC will replace the previous text in its SOP with the following:

“Once membership of the departmental evaluation committee in pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion cases has been determined, the Provost will contact each candidate informing them of the membership of the departmental evaluation committee. The candidate will be reminded that the Faculty Handbook provides guidance on the formation of the departmental evaluation committee when there are fewer than three tenured department members or when there are unusual circumstances that may interfere with an accurate departmental assessment.”

Original SOP text: “If the FPC determines that special conditions prohibit an accurate departmental assessment of a candidate’s performance for tenure, pre-tenure, or promotion (e.g., there is a conflict of interest in the department; there is no senior member of the department to assume the supervisory role; a disagreement about the candidate’s case cannot be resolved), it will consult with the Provost and the President. With their approval, a review committee consisting of tenured faculty members outside the department or program may be constituted in order to conduct an independent review and report to the FPC.”

Rationale Motion 2

1. The FPC seeks to resolve ambiguities in the Faculty Handbook, and to ensure that the practices and interpretations of the FPC align with the Faculty Handbook and the will of the faculty, as expressed, for instance, in survey results from the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion (AHCOP).
2. The AHCOP survey revealed a “fundamental rift between the value faculty places on teaching and the perception of how teaching actually is valued in the promotion process. While 70% believe that teaching should be the most valued quality for promotion, 57% disagree that it actually is.” In addition, the AHCOP found that “A significant majority of the faculty (75%) thinks that advising should be a valued part of the promotion process.” This motion adds advising to the teaching criteria and removes language that could be interpreted as giving a greater weight to scholarship. External evaluation and clear language in the Faculty Handbook will continue to assure the need for quality scholarship from all promotion candidates. The intention of this motion is to allow for the

consideration of a multiplicity of ways that excellence in all three categories could be instantiated differently in different cases and still satisfy the spirit and letter of the standard in the Faculty Handbook.

3. The AHCOP's report made a number of suggestions, some of which have been implemented: the use of external evaluations of scholarship and departmental guidelines for scholarship. The AHCOP also suggested using a weighting system in promotion evaluations similar to quadrennial reviews. The FPC believes a numeric weighting system would be unwieldy, but that the last paragraph of this motion incorporates flexibility in the standards for promotion to allow different career trajectories and areas of focus to be considered while valuing the variety of contributions faculty make to the college.

Rationale Motion 3

On April 28, 2016 the faculty approved departmental guidelines for scholarship. Of the 28 departments that submitted guidelines, 17 discuss scholarship only, and 11 discuss all three criteria. Additionally, some departments comment on the promotion process in addition to tenure. More uniform guidelines would be helpful. Increased transparency in how each of the three categories of performance apply to pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion to full professor within a discipline is of value to the evaluation process and the candidate.