

3-5-2020

Faculty Meeting Minutes - March 5, 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 - March 5, 2020" (2020). *2019-2020 Meeting Agendas & Minutes*. 10.

<https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/facultyminutes1920/10>

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 - March 5, 2020

Abstract

Minutes of the Gettysburg College Faculty Business Meeting, March 5, 2020.

Comments

Appendix 1 : CERT Statement of Corona Virus

Appendix 2 : Resources for LGBTQ+ Students

Minutes of the Gettysburg College Faculty
March 5, 2020
Mara Auditorium
Business Meeting
(Quorum 95; Attendance 96)

President Robert Iuliano called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

His report began with remarks about an alumni event in New York, in which attendees were gladdened to hear about recent and potential changes to the curriculum. Students at the meeting did impressive presentations on their work in the digital humanities.

He then focused on the college's planning for the threat posed by the corona virus. The Campus Emergency Response Team is meeting regularly, and is treating its spread as an evolving and dynamic challenge. So far, its greatest impact has been on students studying abroad. Various events—Get Acquainted Day and Commencement, for example—could also be affected. He urged everyone to read the announcement from the Response Team that Ms. Yates circulated on March 3. Please see Appendix 1 for the text of that announcement.

The president called attention to essential provisions of the policy: those regarding registration of travel, and its restrictions on the return to campus for two weeks of those who have gone to or through CDC level 3 countries. He advised that the federal Department of Education is aware of a number of racist responses to Asian students. He knows, however, of no evidence of the problem at the college. He thanked Vice President North for her work on a complex problem.

Ms. Johnson, the Associate Director of the Office of Multicultural Engagement and LGBTQ+ Life, discussed concerns about mistakes in identifying students by gender. The best practice, when in doubt about a student's name or appropriate pronoun, is to ask. She noted that agreement of nouns and pronouns is not a constant in the history of the language and briefly alluded to conspicuous examples of the grammatical rule not being in force. She called attention to a document passed out at the beginning of the meeting, and which faculty can use to learn how students wish to be addressed. Please see Appendix 2 for it and for links to two other relevant documents, a survey set up for the envisioned *Rainbow Roadmap*, meant to help incoming students find members and supportive allies of the LGBTQ+ community, and Dean Cole's *Guide for Faculty Advisors*.

Professor Kerney noted that the link to the survey was faulty. Professor Rickert asked that Peoplesoft be refined so that accurate information comes up on all pertinent links to a student, and not just on course rosters or advising lists. Vice President Tosten promised to fix the latter problem.

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

He called for a quorum count, which succeeded.

Minutes for November 21, 2019 and January 30, 2020 were approved as submitted.

The president called for consideration of the amended third motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee (introduced February 6; amended February 20):

...[that] departments and programs develop guidelines to address all three performance categories: teaching and advising, 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. Evaluation of these activities by departmental/program colleagues and the Faculty Personnel Committee should take into account the discipline-specific guidelines for teaching and advising developed by the department/program considering the candidate's case.

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 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 and advising, scholarship and creative activity, and governance to ensure broad consistency across departments/programs and congruence with College criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Professor Day wished to return to a line of inquiry begun at the previous meeting. He appreciates that departments are situated to explain disciplinary standards for scholarship in their fields, but he does not see a clear parallel for teaching, excellence in which should be defined by the college.

Professor Richard Russell noted that in Music, individualized instruction plays a role in a way that it does not in his own field, Psychology. He asked whether the Personnel Committee would find departmental guidance to that effect helpful. Professor Crawford said that it would. The committee has no wish for departments to set their own standards, but to have them identify how the college standards may apply to them, given what is unique to their areas. Professor Dorman, noting how variable pedagogies are in the teaching of individual instruments, observed that guidelines drafted by departments can become so segmented as to prove, if not unintelligible to people outside the field, at least unhelpful. Professor Crawford responded that the Personnel Committee neither expects nor wants overly detailed guidelines; departments can determine for themselves the level of detail they would find useful in setting standards for evaluating their own members. Professor Else suggested that what is singular about instruction in each field might best be addressed in the letters sent to the Personnel Committee as part of each review.

Professor Kerney urged the Personnel Committee to provide clear guidance about qualitative and quantitative expectations for advising. Replying to him, Professor Crawford said that the committee had not discussed developing a proscriptive standard. In response to Professor Else, he pointed out that the value of the statements will be as much for departments, as they articulate their own standards, as for the committee. Professor Hogan added that colleagues' letters will make more sense to the committee with guidelines in the background.

Professor Cain suggested that it would be helpful to have a concrete example and cited introductory courses in departments that have large enrollments, including of students trying to meet curricular goals. Such courses often receive a disproportionate number of harsh evaluations. Departmental statements can be drafted in a way that is supportive of colleagues many of whose evaluations come from reluctant students. Similarly, mentoring student research makes it harder for people to publish their own work. A statement of support that such work is valued departmentally should be written down in advance, rather than improvised when called for. The Personnel Committee should know what matters to departments.

Professor Murphy asked about the role of the chair's committee: will it retain oversight of the college's teaching standards? Professor Crawford answered that it would. Professor Murphy wondered whether the motion creates added complications for the chairs. Professor Crawford noted that anything the chairs say would be likely to strengthen teaching initiatives.

President Iuliano called for a vote on the motion.

It passed, seventy-seven in favor, twenty-nine opposed, with nine recorded abstentions.

The president then asked for discussion of the second motion brought by the Personnel Committee on February 6:

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.

The motion, Professor Crawford noted, is not meant to reduce or raise existing standards of scholarship. It aims at clarity and reflects the will of the faculty. The standards for evidence of continuing scholarship and for its quality are unchanged. He concedes that any proposed change will, however, leave room for different judgments. If one thinks that the current requirement is for performance well in excess of that for tenure, then the motion may seem a lowering of expectations.

Professor Andresen argued that the reason some people may arrive at that judgment is predicated on various deletions from the current language: if we strike phrasing about going beyond what is expected for tenure, then we seem to be lowering our standards. Professor Crawford rejoined that the language the committee wishes to delete implies that the college seeks not a sustained record of publication, but the crossing of a higher bar. Professor Andresen countered that the change is unfair and likely to prove demoralizing to untenured faculty members, who must meet high scholarly standards on a very rapid schedule, while also developing new courses. Perhaps it would be more equitable to retain the original language.

Professor Day indicated his uneasiness about deleting references to the high level of maturity now expected of candidates for promotion. Such language carries with it the expectation of growth. If we expect to see ongoing growth, the statement should reflect that understanding. Professor Crawford replied that the committee concurs; it believes the motion reflects the expectation.

Professor Ogra spoke of the challenges faced by those who do field work: they can find it hard to start new projects given the obligations facing people who are further along in their careers. Professor Mukherjee sees the existing language as effectively doubling for promotion the amount of work people must do for tenure. Some people might respond to the perceived change as a strategic challenge and withhold work they have completed before tenure in order to advance in rank later. Professor Cain asked that the Personnel Committee interest itself in the whole of a person's career. Luck and contingency can create inequities, particularly regarding service. Some people have more time than others for scholarship. She sees the motion as treating people as composites. It offers what we should want. She sees it as emphasizing growth, and is glad for it.

Professor Kaempfer felt a more searching conversation, about our priorities, would be important. We are trying to measure something that we cannot sharply define. We agree that research is vital, and that internationalizing the curriculum is vital; we know that advising is distributed unevenly and that some people avoid it. We should set standards around these various criteria, and be certain that our personnel policies reflect what we claim to value.

President Iuliano called for a vote.

The motion passed, ninety-one in favor, twenty-six opposed with two recorded abstentions.

Professor Evrard announced that a compilation of the findings of the curriculum subcommittee of the Academic Policy and Program Committee is now available through Moodle. People should look for an email from Provost Zappe about the formation of a committee to oversee the curriculum review: nominations, including self-nominations, will go through him. Professor Mullen, speaking for the subcommittee, urged people to weigh in with ideas and models, and to post links to articles that might be of interest.

President Iuliano adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Leonard S. Goldberg". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish at the end.

Leonard S. Goldberg
Faculty Secretary

Appendix 1
CERT Statement of Corona Virus
March 3, 2020

Dear Campus Community,

The College continues to closely monitor updates from the [Centers for Disease Control \(CDC\)](#), [World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#), and the [U.S. Department of State](#) in regard to the status of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) health concern, both internationally and in the United States. The Campus Emergency Response Team (CERT) is meeting regularly to discuss COVID-19 and to take proactive steps to minimize exposure and risk for our campus and for our students and employees traveling abroad.

Please note that there are no confirmed or suspected cases of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) at Gettysburg College.

More information on travel, spring break planning, and infection control is below. Updates will be made to the following website: <https://www.gettysburg.edu/coronavirus>. Be sure to check the website for updates during spring break.

Travel Information:

Please understand that this is a fluid and evolving situation. In addition, given the nature of the virus, we are attentive to the well-being of both individuals who are traveling and that of the community as a whole as people return to campus. With these considerations in mind, the College is putting into place the following travel requirements, which are subject to revision and enhancement as the situation evolves.

- International, work-related travel, with or without students, needs to be registered (as is current policy) and approved.
- International, work-related travel, with or without students, to *or through* a CDC level 3 country is not allowed.
- Personal travel to *or through* a CDC Level 3 country must be registered.
- The College strongly encourages you to register your personal travel to other international areas.
- If you have traveled on personal business to *or through* a CDC level 3 country, you cannot return to campus without a 14-day quarantine and the approval of the College. Students should contact the Health Center (717-337-6970) and employees should contact Human Resources (717-337-6202) for approval to return to campus.
- Continuing with a long-standing requirement, domestic travel with students must be registered.

Travel registration can be submitted through the following CNAV form.

https://cnav.gettysburg.edu/health/travel_notification.cfm

Please note, this is a new form. If you have already submitted through the previous form, you do not need to resubmit. Please register your travel as soon as your plans have been finalized and/or at least two weeks in advance of your trip.

Once submitted, participants who are traveling internationally will be registered with International SOS ([ISOS](#)), Gettysburg College's Medical and Travel Security Assistance Company.

Spring Break Planning:

If you have international travel planned for spring break, be aware that travel advisory levels are fluid and may change while you are out of the U.S. Travelers may experience increased health screenings or other security measures at airports and may not be allowed to re-enter the U.S. for an undetermined amount of time. If you are traveling internationally, please be diligent in monitoring the guidance of local health authorities, the CDC, WHO and US DOS.

If students decide to change their plans for spring break and would like to remain on campus, please indicate that change through CNAV under "My Housing." Additionally, Health Services will remain open over spring break.

Study Abroad:

Our Center for Global Education continues to be in touch with students who are studying abroad and their program providers to ensure the students have the most up to date information. CGE is working with students on a case-by-case basis when local events call for changes to study abroad plans.

Infection Control:

Our community's health and wellness are our top priority. Please be vigilant about your personal health. Please continue to take reasonable and everyday actions to help prevent the spread of illness:

- Voluntary Home Isolation: stay home when you are sick with respiratory disease symptoms. At the present time, these symptoms are more likely due to influenza or other respiratory viruses than to the COVID-19-related virus.
- Wash your hands often with soap and water. If soap and water are not available, use an alcohol-based hand sanitizer and rub your hands vigorously. Please use hand sanitizer stations that have been placed at key locations on campus.
- Avoid touching your eyes, nose, and mouth. Avoid shaking hands. Illnesses spread this way.
- Avoid close contact with sick people.

Please note that the housekeeping staff has increased cleaning around campus.

It is clear that this situation is ongoing and will continue to develop. The College will continue to prioritize the safety and well-being of our community members as we consider how best to respond. We also pledge to keep our community informed as new developments unfold. As we consider how best to approach this situation as a campus community, let us choose to engage and support one another with dignity and respect. The media has reported situations where public anxiety and fear over the Coronavirus have led to unwarranted assumptions toward others and, at times, even prejudice and aggression. Let us continue to be a model of how a community works together and supports one another.

Please reply to this email if you have questions; your inquiry will be forwarded to the appropriate party.

Thank you,
Campus Emergency Response Team (CERT)

Appendix 2
Resources for LGBTQ+ Students

Questionnaire for clarifying names, appropriate pronouns:

Name you want to use in class:

Pronouns: (EX: She/Her/Hers, He/Him/His, They/Them/Theirs. Etc.):

May I use these pronouns in front of the class?

May I use these pronouns in front of others in other settings?

Would you like to follow up with me one on one about your pronouns?

What are three fun facts, hobbies or things you would like me to know about you?

If your preferred name or pronouns change in the future, please feel free to reach to me to inform me of that change.

Academic Advising Guide:

“Offices” Landing Page/LGBTQIA Advocacy & Education/Resources/Campus Resources:
LGBTQIA+Students: A Guide for Faculty Advisors

A Survey for *Rainbow Roadmap* has been set up at the following site:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScsH6u4b77WSUsbJSy-EVckaTFtfsw8JSEkiY4mpo2OcpkkPw/viewform>