

**Minutes for DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, April 6th, 2009**

***Call to Order:***

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:08 PM.

***Verification of Quorum:***

There were more than 86 ballots distributed to voting faculty as they entered the meeting; therefore, quorum was verified. A total of 113 ballots had been distributed by the end of the meeting.

***Approval of Minutes from the March 2009 Faculty Meeting:***

The minutes of the March 2009 Faculty Meeting were approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

***Remarks from the President:***

The President opened his remarks by stating that he wished to offer the faculty updates on the University's finances and on planning efforts outside of the intellectual life conversations, and then talk about the intellectual life conversations that have been going on. He then plans to turn over the floor to Ray Burgman, who will speak about the new committee on women and family policies.

With regards to the University's finances, the President stated that we are working on the budget for 2009-2010, which will be preliminarily endorsed by the Board of Trustees (we need to wait for admissions information to finalize the budget). The President has had a series of meetings with the Executive Committee of the Board regarding the University's budget, and he noted that the Board remains focused on balancing the budget next year.

The President noted that the 2007-2008 budget closed with an over \$3 million deficit. This year, with the budget already approved, the budget deficit grew to over \$4 million. Among the major reasons for the growth in that deficit were difficulties in the debt market, which increased the cost of the debt that the University has taken on over the past few years. In fact, the President noted that it was a bit of a triumph to get new lines of credit – he thanked Tom Dixon for his hard work in negotiating the University's two new lines of credit. Other issues affecting the deficit were continuing issues with the Walden Inn and pressures in fuel costs and health care costs. The President stated that the University has put together special committees to look at both health care costs and the operations of the Walden Inn, and he was happy to report that we have made significant headway in addressing these issues.

The President continued by stating that we still face pressures trying to balance next year's budget. The Vice Presidents have been directed to take significant funds out of the operating budgets, we have had a *de facto* hiring freeze since October, we will have a salary freeze across all sectors next year, and we have decided that we could not continue non-tenured appointments as they came to term. These measures are painful but necessary. This brings the University closer to a balanced budget, but does not yet balance it, so we must continue to look at all options.

The President stated that we will have to look at the budget for the next several years. The budget is based on the average of the twelve trailing quarters of endowment performance, and 5.5% of that value is included in the budget. By next year, six of the twelve quarters will have depressed values, which will make our budget concerns even worse. The President has asked Tom Dixon to model the budget by assuming that we will see modest but consistent increases in our endowment over two years, beginning late next year. The endowment will keep pressure on the budget for a number of years; the question is

at what pace will we see the recovery of the loss in value of the endowment. He noted that he will have a lot to report after the Board of Trustees meeting in April.

The President noted that we are waiting for word on how the admissions cycle will look this year, as well as for what will happen to the Annual Fund and the endowment. Given the unusual admissions cycle, the slowly recovering endowment, and depressed alumni giving, we have to keep looking at budget-balancing options, in line with the Board's call for a balanced budget. Among the options that remain on the table are decreasing VEBA contributions, looking at a reduction in benefits, a reduction in salaries, or terminating employees. The President referred to this as the "parade of horrors," and stated that he hoped that we will not have to do all or most of these things, but we have to keep them available as options as the Board of Trustees is calling for a balanced budget.

The President continued by stating that he has remained extremely committed to two things: first, not terminating staff, and second (based on the recommendations of the faculty committees last year), we have clung to keeping all tenure and tenure-track faculty searches going this year. This makes DePauw one of the few GLCA schools to do this. Staying committed to these things has restricted some of the other financial options that we could have taken, but the President stated that he felt these were important and that he stands by them. He noted that Tom Dixon and the VPAA have been working with COA about these decisions, and we will report to the whole community about the budget situation.

The President said that before he discussed intellectual life, he wanted to mention two other planning conversations that will soon gather greater speed and importance with help and input from the faculty. First, he noted that we want to know who is attracted to DePauw and who is not. A Board of Trustees committee and a faculty committee are working in this area, and we are surveying students who are interested in attending liberal arts colleges, and seeing who applies to DePauw and who does not. We will also be looking at our marketing partner, who produces admissions marketing material; we have used the same firm for a while, and are considering all our options.

Second, the President noted that our campus planning efforts are progressing; he views this effort as being directly related to the intellectual life conversations and to our admissions efforts. We must make our environs as stimulating and connecting as our academic program. He noted that hiring a campus planning firm is an effort focused primarily on how to improve the intellectual and social liveliness of the campus. We have interviewed several firms and one thing the firms noted was that it was hard to find the campus, and that there are no good obvious entrances to campus – we need to make our entrances bold and noble. The campus planning committee has met with five firms, and the President hopes to announce a choice of a firm soon (within a week or two). The President concluded this section by noting that with this effort and the admissions effort, we will move forward as funds allow – especially external funds. He hopes that these planning initiatives will put no pressure on the operating budget.

The President then began his discussion of intellectual life by stating that this is the most important thing for us to do now. Intellectual life is the core of our endeavors; our curriculum is our soul, it is what we tell the world we believe in, and how we believe students at institutions such as DePauw should be educated. This will define what we are in the future, and will place us in a stronger position with the best students in the country. Only if we have a compelling vision of our education can we attract strong, compelling, and interesting students.

The President has attended a few national meetings of various groups, and there is an intense national conversation about the state of the liberal arts today. We need to be clear about what we think liberal arts means and how it is relevant in the world today. DePauw must show that it has a foundation that is strong, and we must present a clear way that we connect this foundation to life's work. All of our peer institutions are trying to figure this out.

The President noted that DePauw has most of the pieces in place already; we have a strong faculty and a strong tradition in the liberal arts. We have also created a number of programs that connect the liberal arts to life's work. We have created winter term programs and internship structures, among other programs. We just need to ensure that, together, our curriculum and our co-curriculum are clear and compelling.

The President has, in conversations with the Mellon Foundation about what is happening with intellectual life at DePauw, shared with them the process this faculty has engaged in this year. He was happy to report that they are rather interested and impressed, and have been very supportive of what is happening and will be providing funds to cover the costs of these continuing conversations.

The President fully endorsed the faculty governance steering committee's proposed timetable, though he remains concerned about momentum and energy. He thinks we must take the sufficient and necessary time to consider all the issues before us well, but he hopes that we do not lose momentum, and that extra time does not falsely lull us into thinking we do not need to act boldly. He also stressed that now is the time to think institutionally, not programmatically. The temptation is to think only about a single program and what it brings to the students it serves. The weight of the status quo can actually feel like comfort.

Finally, the President asked that the faculty think boldly about DePauw. He does not want to be in a faculty meeting here in a year, or in three years, telling us that we hope that we make our class. He'd rather be here speaking about how we have created a compelling picture of the liberal arts for our times, with clear and coherent ways that we uniquely prepare our students for the world. He wants to report that we have become the envy of our peers, and the desired school of the best students in the nation. The moment is now; this is a national issue now. We would like to be first out of the gate.

The President then asked Ray Burgman to come up and speak about the Task Force on Women and Families.

Ray stated that the President has charged the Task Force on Women and Families with assessing the current status of women faculty, staff, and students and the nature and extent of our family-friendly policies and what type of environment we have at DePauw. The Task Force plans to review current practice and policies, review the policies of other institutions, and conduct surveys and focus groups during the fall. The final report is due in December to the President. In the meantime, the Task Force is setting up various ways for faculty members to communicate with them prior to the fall semester. The Task Force will send an e-mail message to faculty and staff to let them know how they can communicate with us; this e-mail will be coming within a few days. Outside of these immediate communication formats, you can also contact a task force member. The members of the Task Force are Raymonda Burgman, Mandy Henk, Jeannette Johnson-Licon, Kathleen Knaul, Marie Pickerill, Michael Roberts, Francesca Seaman, Dorian Shager, Carol Steele, and Alicia Suarez and Lesley Lytle.

The President returned to the floor to answer questions.

A meeting attendee stated that she has heard that two kitchen workers in the Hub have been laid off, and others have had their hours cut. She also noted that physical plant workers have had their hours reduced as well. She asked if this information was correct? She was concerned that we are hurting the people at the bottom; shouldn't we talk about cutting salaries at the top? The President responded that he was not aware of these issues, and invited Tom Dixon to talk about it. Tom noted that many Sodexo employees are part-time and there is worker turnover, particularly in the summer, because of the variability of the food service operation, and DePauw is not responsible for employee decisions. As for the hour reduction, the only thing DePauw has done is eliminate overtime hours in the physical plant.

The person asking the original question responded that she is aware of these facts, but she wants to avoid the lowest salary employees having to bear the greatest burden. She noted that even though Hub workers are paid by Sodexo, they serve us and clean up after us, and we have a responsibility to them. She was also concerned that the reduction in hours by Sodexo might be a result of sustainability initiatives, and that students behind the sustainability movement would be distressed to learn that it had hurt the most vulnerable employees on campus. She then stated that many physical plant workers expect and count on a certain amount of overtime. Tom responded that overtime was approximately \$225,000, so there was not that much eliminated. The faculty member asked if it wouldn't be better if the people at the top took the salary cuts? The President responded that if it got to the point where eliminating positions seemed likely, he would recommend larger salary cuts at the top. He then mentioned that DePauw spends a lot of money on athletic teams to travel; there have been lots of discussions with schools in the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference about travel budgets, and there are committees discussing this issue.

A faculty member asked how we ended up with such a large deficit in last year's budget? The President responded that we are living on the structure built by the previous budget determination; the Walden Inn was thought of as an off-budget enterprise, then it was added to the budget, and we didn't anticipate the impact. We also mismodeled the benefits structure – we assumed certain things that ended up not being true, particularly in health care. Finally, we took on a lot of debt, and maybe didn't fully model it out. When he came in to DePauw, he put everything “on budget,” which changed things.

Later (after the next question), Tom Dixon discussed the Walden Inn further. He noted that the Walden lost \$1.1 million last year, this year it is projected to lose \$600,000, and in the budget for 2010 it is projected to lose \$450,000. The problem with making more headway in reducing the losses is that revenue at the Walden is flat, so expenses need to be cut. The President added that these sorts of inns usually don't make money, so we need to decide what is an acceptable level of subsidy to have an inn like this. He also noted that there is a new Vice President of Finance – in his previous position, he has worked very closely with faculty, and he understands that his job is to support the academic enterprise. Carla McGuire, who was a financial advisor at DePauw, has moved to Hammond associates. Hammond handles some of DePauw's endowment money, so this move will help us have a better arrangement with them.

Another faculty member asked if the President could be more specific about the kinds of conversations that are going on at other campuses. The President responded that Kalamazoo has gotten rid of almost all graduation requirements, as has Wooster. Lots of schools are moving to a looser structure; many are discussing internships and winter terms – some are studying us and looking at our model. These conversations are taking place because people are questioning the value of a liberal arts education. What is our role? How do we explain that we prepare students to think critically when students and parents are more interested in job preparation? The Mellon Foundation is curious about DePauw's situation, since we are critically considering our internships and winter term program, and other schools are adding them to their programs.

A faculty member asked the President to elaborate on the increasingly difficult environment for student recruitment. The President responded that admissions consultants have told us that the recruiting environment is very brutal – unless you are clear on what you do, it is hard to recruit students. Our situation is a little blurry; students that are tempted by liberal arts, but want to have ways to connect them to the real world, are unsure about DePauw. We need to be clear about what we are. Under a complicated academic structure, we are hiding our strengths.

The President continued by noting that his asking questions is not meant to criticize everything. He stated that we are hiding our strengths behind a far too complicated structure that we haven't articulated well yet. He stated that he “doesn't have many horses in the race” – he just wants the

faculty to vote on what we stand for and clearly articulate it. Unless we are clear, it will be really hard to bring strong and intelligent people here. We've got one shot to sell ourselves to smart, strong students, so we need to be able to articulate clearly why these students should come here. It is the faculty's job to think about this, and now is the time – if we wait too long, it will be too late. We have many interesting programs and pieces, but is the whole strong? The faculty's job is to come up with something compelling and exciting, and he will raise the money for it.

There were no further questions for the President.

### ***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

The Chair of MAO made a motion that the faculty approve the following new course:

*PHIL 370: Intermediate Independent Study, variable credit*

Directed studies in a field or fields of philosophy. It may be repeated for credit with different topics.

The Chair of MAO noted that this is part of a large renumbering of the courses in the Philosophy department. Since the motion comes from a standing committee, no second was needed. There was no discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The Chair of MAO then moved that the faculty approve the following revision to the major in Philosophy, effective for incoming students beginning in the fall of 2009, and available as an option for current students. Additions are in **bold**, and deletions are in ~~strike through~~:

#### *Requirements for a major in Philosophy*

Total courses required: Nine

Core courses: PHIL 251, PHIL 212, PHIL 216, PHIL 490

Other required courses: One course from the following: ~~PHIL 233, PHIL 234, PHIL 230, PHIL 240, PHIL 220,~~ **Value Courses, from PHIL 230 to 242, PHIL 340**, or a topics course (PHIL 209 or 309) in moral philosophy or in the philosophy of art and aesthetics.

# 300 and 400 level courses: Four, including either PHIL 419 or 469

Senior requirement: The senior requirement consists of the completion of PHIL 490.

[Note that the course renumbering detailed below has already been applied; the requirements for the major in Philosophy bridged to another discipline are also affected by the renumbering, but without any other changes.]

The Chair of MAO noted that part of this process was to group courses that are similar in content by numbering, and adding and subtracting a couple courses from the list. Since the motion comes from a standing committee, no second was needed.

A faculty member asked for clarification: should it be "Value courses" or "Values courses". Also, does every course between PHIL 230 and 242 count, or just those two courses? The Chair of MAO responded that "Value courses" is what the department submitted, and it is intended to include every course number between 230 and 242.

There was no further discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The following courses have had a change in course number, title, description, and/or prerequisites (details will be provided on request):
  - PHIL 102 God, Evil and the Meaning of Life (was PHIL 106)
  - PHIL 209 Introductory Topics (was PHIL 206 Topics; description changed)
  - PHIL 210 History of Philosophy: Chinese Philosophy (was PHIL 218)
  - PHIL 212 History of Philosophy: Ancient (was PHIL 215 History of Western Philosophy: Ancient)
  - PHIL 213 History of Philosophy: Medieval (was PHIL 351 Medieval Philosophy; description changed)
  - PHIL 216 History of Philosophy: Early Modern (was History of Western Philosophy: Early Modern)
  - PHIL 220 Existentialism (was PHIL 219)
  - PHIL 230 Ethical Theory (was PHIL 213; description changed)
  - PHIL 231 Leadership and Responsibility (was PHIL 221)
  - PHIL 232 Environmental Ethics (was PHIL 209)
  - PHIL 233 Ethics and Business (was PHIL 207)
  - PHIL 234 Biomedical Ethics (was PHIL 208)
  - PHIL 240 Philosophy of Art & Aesthetics (was PHIL 214 Philosophy of Art; description changed)
  - PHIL 242 Philosophy of Sex and Gender (was PHIL 211)
  - PHIL 251 Logic (was PHIL 202)
  - PHIL 260 Cosmology (was PHIL 203)
  - PHIL 309 Topics (was PHIL 307; description changed)
  - PHIL 342 Philosophy of Law (was PHIL 315; prerequisites changed)
  - PHIL 351 Advanced Logic (was PHIL 309)
  - PHIL 352 Epistemology (was PHIL 311)
  - PHIL 353 Metaphysics (was PHIL 312)
  - PHIL 360 Philosophy of Science (was PHIL 305)
  - PHIL 361 Philosophy of Language (was PHIL 317; description changed)
  - PHIL 363 Philosophy of Religion (was PHIL 310)
  - PHIL 364 Death: Philosophical Approaches (was PHIL 313)
  - PHIL 419 Major Philosophers (was PHIL 430)
  - PHIL 469 Philosophical Problems (was PHIL 433 Philosophical Problem; description changed)
  - PHIL 470 Advanced Independent Study (was PHIL 490 Independent Study in Philosophy)
  - PHIL 490 Senior Seminar (was PHIL 439; description changed)
  - PHIL 491 Senior Thesis (was PHIL 440)

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

CAPP's report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions for the Chair of CAPP.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The Chair of COF gave advance notice of COF's intent to bring up for a vote at the May faculty meeting the following changes to the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty and Personnel Policies sections of the Academic Handbook. The changes suggested to the Personnel Policies sections are in those sections approved by both the Faculty and the Administration.

Deletions are ~~struck through~~, additions are in **bold**.

- a. The following change limits the service on personnel committees to individuals with an on-going obligation to the University.

*By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)*

For a faculty member with an appointment in a single department or school, the Personnel Committee shall consist of all tenure-track faculty **members** and **all** term faculty members **in appointments renewable without the limitation of a maximum of six years (such as faculty librarians and term faculty members with substantial administrative duties that preclude appointment with tenure)** of the department or school except the person being reviewed and those in the first year or last year of service. Non-tenured members and those on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. For a faculty member with an appointment in two or more departments or programs, the Personnel Committee will be constituted as stipulated in the letter of appointment in keeping with the general spirit of the preceding provision.

- b. The following changes simply clarify existing standards with regard to term and interim reviews. First, the changes clarify that the term review standard is the same as the interim review standard. Second, the changes move language about terminal degrees forward from Appendix 3.

*Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)*

In the case of a term review, make an assessment about the evidenced strengths and concerns of **with regard to the candidate's job performance, clearly stating areas of desirable or necessary improvements** and a recommendation regarding an extension of the term, subject to the needs of the department or school.

*Personnel Policies V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status (from 2004-05)*

- **Term review. Required: Strong teaching during the period under review, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**

- **Interim review.** Required: Strong teaching during the probationary period, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. **Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**

- c. As part of COF's work creating new guidelines to reduce file size, COF also recommends a change with regard to COF's file review process. The DRAFT of the revised file guidelines will be available on the faculty governance website by the completion of the Monday April 6, 2009 faculty meeting. While the file guidelines themselves do NOT require faculty approval, COF invites comments from the faculty. To be most useful these comments should be received by Wednesday April 15, 2009 at 4:00 pm.

*Personnel Policies IV.D. Committee on Faculty Procedure*

2. All members of the Committee on Faculty will read the report from the Personnel Committee and any response from the candidate. All members of the Committee on Faculty will read **at least** the **entire core** decision file before making recommendations. **File guidelines established by COF clarify the core decision file includes everything except the scholarly and artistic work appendix.**

**5. If the PC report is unanimous and positive, and if the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for the Committee on Faculty to reach a positive recommendation, COF may proceed to examine the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalize the recommendation. However, if even a minority of the Committee on Faculty reaches a negative conclusion based on the core file or if the PC report is not unanimously positive, all members of the Committee on Faculty must return to the decision file and read the appendices before COF examines the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalizes the COF recommendation.**

56. Before reaching a final recommendation, the Committee on Faculty will examine the contents of the buffer file. Materials deemed relevant to the case will be transferred to the decision file.

*(and renumber the rest of the subsections in IV.D.)*

The Chair of COF asked that the faculty please keep in mind that these suggested changes are a result of the cumulative wisdom of several years worth of reviews and not linked to any specific case addressed by COF. She then noted that she would be providing a brief rationale for the changes, but she believes that, other than clarifying questions, debate or dialogue should be held until the next meeting. If you have any questions or concerns, she encouraged faculty members to contact her before the next meeting. She can be contacted directly via e-mail ([bgourley@depauw.edu](mailto:bgourley@depauw.edu)), phone (x4607), dropping by her office (Julian 354), or through the COF coordinator.

- a. The first recommended change is to *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)*, which is the section that describes personnel committees. The purpose of the change is to limit membership to those with an on-going obligation to the University.
- b. The second recommended set of changes is to clarify the existing standards with regard to interim and term review. This is not an attempt to change these standards – just want to make the language clearer. The change to *Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)* and first part of the change to *Personnel Policies V.* clarify that the standard for term review is the same as the standard for interim review. The second part of the change to *Personnel Policies V.* moves forward the language about completion of the terminal degree from Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies. It reminds candidates and personnel committees that there is a requirement of clear progress toward the terminal degree required at the time of interim or term review. These sections of the Personnel Policies are sections that are mutually agreed upon by the Faculty and the Administration and these have been discussed with the Administration since the VPAA meets with COF.
- c. The third recommended change that COF gives advance notice about also falls in the Personnel Policies of the Handbook in the sections mutually agreed upon by the Administration and the Faculty. This change is a result of COF's work to reduce file size.

The goal of the changes is that in cases where there is unanimous agreement of positive review by the personnel committee and the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for COF to reach

unanimous agreement of a positive review, COF does not have to read all of the scholarly and artistic materials but rather just a subset of them thus reducing workload for those on COF when there are no concerns. However, if there is any disagreement on the departmental personnel committee or even a minority of COF has any concerns, all members of COF will read the complete scholarly and artistic materials.

The Chair of COF then stated that COF's guidelines for the construction of personnel files do not require faculty action. COF has spent the last two years discussing the file size reduction memo forwarded to us by COA, and has come up with DRAFT guidelines that we will be finalizing in advance of the April 22 COF meeting with candidates being reviewed in 2009-2010. Those DRAFT guidelines should be available on the COF website starting later today. COF has taken into account feedback received from faculty members last year and during the fall semester as result of our call for feedback. Additionally, COF members have drawn on their experience reviewing files. In the last two years alone, COF has reviewed approximately 60 files. COF invites the faculty to provide input one last time before the guidelines are finalized. This input would be most helpful if received before Wednesday, April 15.

The Chair of COF then noted that, in short, the guidelines recommend limiting materials **submitted directly by the candidate** to a 2-3" binder for teaching materials, a 1-1.5" binder for scholarly and artistic materials, and at most a 1" binder for service materials.

A faculty member requested that the Chair of COF clarify the size of the binders, and discuss the importance of the different sizes of the scholarly and artistic and service binders. The Chair of COF repeated the sizes, and stated that the guidelines are not making a statement about the relative merit of scholarly and artistic work versus service work, but about the difference in size of the documentation required for those areas.

Another faculty member questioned her understanding that the DPC would read the scholarly material, but COF members would not? The faculty member also asked if this contradicted the current dialogues about intellectual life by implying that scholarly work was less important. The Chair of COF clarified that COF members would read the core binder for scholarly work, but maybe not the entire volume of work. She gave an example of a file that contains an entire book, where perhaps a chapter is included in the 1.5" binder but the remainder of the book would be in an appendix; under the new guidelines, COF would not always be required to read the entire appendix. She reiterated that COF was in no way trying to diminish the importance of scholarly work but rather recognizing that personnel committees are in the best position to read the complete body of scholarly work and put it in context; if that was done effectively COF would likely be able to confirm the decision by reading a subset of the scholarly materials and thus reduce COF's workload.

The Chair of COF finished her report by reminding tenured faculty of the vacancies next year on COF. She stated that she realizes service on this committee has a measurable workload, but it is also important work, both to our untenured colleagues and those tenured colleagues coming up for a promotion review, and to our students. Also, in the event that COF doesn't get a full complement of colleagues serving on this committee, any personnel decision COF might make is put in jeopardy by making those decisions automatically appealable. She encouraged tenured faculty members to consider running for this important committee. She then offered to answer questions about the details of the ebb and flow of workload on the committee.

There were no further questions for the Chair of COF.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- COF continues its work reviewing files.

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC invited Dean Marnie McInnes to report on academic integrity.

Marnie stated that her main goal in making this report is a practical one: to encourage faculty members to follow through with reports of academic dishonesty and to remind us about the process of reporting and settling a case, as laid out in the academic integrity policy. An outline of the settlement process and a copy of the settlement form are on the two-sided yellow handout; statistics from the past several years are included in the agenda. [They are also included here].

<b>Academic Dishonesty Charges 2003-2009</b>					
<b>Semester</b>	<b>First-Year</b>	<b>Sophomore</b>	<b>Junior</b>	<b>Senior</b>	<b>Total</b>
Fall 2003	4	7	5	5	21
Spring 2004	9	6	1	1	17
Fall 2004	10	0	5	4	19
Spring 2005	13	8	4	7	32
*Fall 2005	3	2	5	0	10
Spring 2006	2	1	1	4	8
Fall 2006	0	4	4	7	15
Spring 2007	6	3	4	4	17
Fall 2007	5	2	3	0	10
Spring 2007	12	2	1	4	19
Fall 2008	6	6	2	2	16
Spring 2009					None so far
* First year in which Charles Lipson's <i>Doing Honest Work in College</i> was distributed to all new students (first-years and transfers).					

Marnie indicated that the chart shows a fair amount of fluctuation in the number of cases from semester to semester: the average is 16-17, if the rather odd phenomenon of zero reports this spring is not counted. She believes that the zero is about to change, since waves of reports usually roll in toward the end of the semester. She also believes that the number of reports per semester may have as much to do with faculty members as it does with actual incidents of academic dishonesty. Whether or not faculty members report incidents has to do, for example, with our level of distraction by other work, our willingness to carry through with the often difficult meetings with students, and even with our individual interpretations of the wording and expectations of the integrity policy.

Marnie continued by stating that she has decided that two apparently contradictory things are true: first, that the vast majority of DePauw students are honest, hardworking, and trustworthy; but that, at the same time, certain types of casual dishonesty, especially mosaic plagiarism and cheating on exams, are rampant and easily rationalized by students who consider themselves honest. A Duke University study from a few years ago reported that “on most campuses, 70% of students admit to some cheating,” and Marnie said that she did not think our campus was an exception. [Duke University study quoted in the *Yale Alumni Magazine*, Jan/Feb 2007, pages 61-63.]

Marnie then asked: what should DePauw be doing about this? She was puzzled over this contradiction – honest students who are plagiarizing or cheating with fair predictability. She stated that a colleague has sent her an excellent article from *The Chronicle* by a faculty member at Notre Dame named Susan Blum (February 20, 2009). She will send faculty members a link to the article, but she wanted to summarize its main point here, because it's a useful one.

Marnie pointed out that Blum argues that “the two main approaches” we (faculty members) use to deal with academic dishonesty have serious drawbacks. We tend to see dishonesty alternately as a moral failing or as a crime, and we react by creating honor codes or rules and regulations. Blum proposes that we focus instead on “academic integrity as a constellation of skills” that students must learn not just once and forever, but in nuanced ways in courses across the curriculum. Different disciplines have very different expectations for the citing of sources; even within a discipline, colleagues may differ sharply on how much citation is adequate and on what form it should take. “Students need to be shown,” Blum argues, “how to do what we, their teachers, are asking of them,” and we need to let them know about the lack of absolute agreement over the rules of acknowledging sources. No brochure of instructions, no simple admonishment in the syllabus, no one-size-fits all prohibitions will do the trick. “Rules are historically determined,” Blum reminds us; moreover, “rules about intellectual property are in flux.” It might be good to have a faculty development session on this issue in the near future.

Marnie concluded by noting that this is not to say that we should tolerate intellectual short cuts. Our faculty policy is a decent one; its rules were created for good reason and we should follow it as consistently as we can, using our best judgment to decide what sorts of problems must be reported and penalized. Academic integrity is key to a strong intellectual life. Faculty members are welcome to call Marnie if you have questions and to contact the chair of SLAAC, Greg Schwipps, if you have suggestions about how our policy could be strengthened or clarified.

A faculty member stated that she seemed to remember that, at the end of last semester, students were talking about creating a structure in which they were interested in contributing to honest work at college. The faculty member was wondering what happened to that idea. Marnie replied that she is not sure – the idea of a student academic council came up in SLAAC, but they have not continued those discussions due to the focus on intellectual life. She hopes that this idea will come up again from student leaders.

The chair of SLAAC had no further report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

### ***Reports from Other Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

COA’s report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions for the Chair of COA.

The following announcement appeared in the agenda, but was not read in the meeting:

- COA has met with Jana Grimes, Felice Herrera-Kish and Tom Dixon to discuss possible health insurance plan changes for next year. Conversations are still at a preliminary stage, but to date, the proposed changes appear to be positive ones that DePauw employees will welcome. Discussion of a standard 5-course workload is on hold while details of next year’s health insurance plan are worked out.

#### *Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (Chair: Dave Berque)*

The Chair of the Faculty, speaking on behalf of the FGSC, stated that he wanted to provide a brief overview of the next part of the timeline for the intellectual life discussions, including information about the process for selecting faculty members to serve on a summer working group to continue the

process. After that overview, the FGSC will invite responses on the topic "Which ideas from the proposals are most exciting in terms of their potential to enhance intellectual life?"

The Chair of the Faculty continued by stating that 32 proposals were received a week before spring break. These proposals were discussed in a series of nine open meetings. The FGSC thanks each of the students, staff members, and faculty members who contributed to the proposals and/or to the open meeting discussions. If you were not able to participate, he asked that you please consider reviewing the meeting notes that are posted on the Intellectual Life Moodle course, which currently has an enrollment exceeding 400 people.

The Chair of the Faculty noted that some teams are now working on refined, revised, and new proposals informed by the input gathered before spring break. The schedule for submitting these second round proposals, as well as for the second round of open meetings which will take place next week, can be found on the time line document provided as a handout today. The second round meetings are open to everyone, even senior administrators, and the FGSC hopes that many faculty members will attend. The time line also reviews the schedule for conducting a series of "in principle" straw polls in late April, leading up to at least one vote during the May faculty meeting.

The Chair of the Faculty stated that, as first announced at the March faculty meeting, the FGSC intends to bring a motion to the faculty for a vote during the May faculty meeting. If passed, the motion, which is found in the agenda [the motion is included after this paragraph], will create a summer working group to build on our collective work this year. The additional written materials on the agenda [this material is also included below] outline plans for selecting this working group with six members to be elected (one from each division and two at large) and up to eight additional members to be appointed by the FGSC to ensure continuity and various types of balance. The FGSC recommends that each member of this group receive a \$1,000 summer stipend, equivalent to a department chair's summer stipend, assuming that external funding could be found to support this. As you heard during President Casey's remarks he has, indeed, found this funding. The FGSC's plan is to announce the full working group membership at the May faculty meeting so this information will be available to the faculty as it considers the May motion.

Text of the motion to be brought to the faculty in May:

*The FGSC gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote on the following motion at the May 2009 faculty meeting. "That the faculty charges a summer working group to study carefully the benefits, drawbacks and implications of the proposals that have emerged from faculty discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year. The group's work should be informed by campus discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year that are expressed, in part, by resultant proposals that have emerged. The summer working group should consider these proposals in light of the "in-principle" straw polls, the open dialogue at the April and May 2009 faculty meetings and any additional votes that may be taken at the May meeting. In addition, the summer group's work should be informed by relevant literature and DePauw historical documents. The summer group must present the faculty with a written report no later than 14 days prior to Faculty Institute 2009. The report, which should include one or more concrete recommendations to the faculty along with associated rationales, will form the basis for discussions during Faculty Institute 2009 with subsequent faculty action to be taken as appropriate."*

Description of summer working group structure and process for determining membership:

*Membership of the summer working group will consist of at most 14 faculty members. Six faculty members will be elected and up to eight will be appointed by the FGSC to ensure balance and representation from the School of Music and from committees (for the purposes of continuity).*

*The election is open to tenured and tenure-track faculty and those who serve with “rank of”. Nominations (with permission of the nominee) and self nominations may be made to Divisional Officers in time for them to present a slate to the Chair of the Faculty by 5pm on Monday April 13th. Each nominated candidate is invited to supply a maximum 150 word statement (submitted as a Word document) explaining why she or he is interested in serving on the summer working group. Statements are due to the Chair of the Faculty by 10 pm on Tuesday April 14th and will be made available to the faculty as part of the election process.*

*A divisional election will be run from April 15th through April 17th with each voting member of the faculty permitted to cast one vote in his or her division. The highest vote getter from each of the four divisions will be named to the summer working group, with results to be published on April 18th. Remaining candidates will be entered in an at large election to be conducted between April 20th and the 22nd. This phase of the election will be used to bring the total number of elected faculty members to six. If each divisional election successfully elects a candidate then two additional at large candidates will be elected. If one or more divisions fail to elect a candidate due to a lack of nominees, these positions will be filled through the at large election. The results of this election will be announced on April 23rd.*

*The FGSC will accept expressions of interest from tenured, tenure-track, and “with rank of” faculty until 4pm on April 28th. Expressions of interest may be accompanied by a maximum 150 word statement (submitted as a Word document) explaining the candidate's interest in serving on the summer working group. The FGSC will appoint up to eight additional faculty members to balance the group. The complete working group membership will be announced at the May faculty meeting.*

*The summer task force will begin its work with a two day on-campus meeting starting at noon on May 20th and then again all day on May 21st. The Chair of the Faculty will convene the first day of this two-day meeting and other members of the FGSC will attend this initial meeting as well. The summer working group will elect a chair from its membership at the end of the first day. The elected Chair will convene the meeting on the second day and is charged to report regularly to the Chair of the Faculty throughout the summer.*

*The summer working group will determine its own schedule and mechanisms for carrying out its work during the summer. Roughly one day per week of work during the summer (not necessarily all during meetings) is anticipated. The summer working group will present a written report to the Faculty no later than two weeks prior to Faculty Institute 2009 and will be involved with planning and facilitating the discussions during the Institute. The group is expected to have largely completed its work by the time fall semester classes begin. The FGSC recommends that a \$1,000 stipend (equivalent to Chair's summer stipend) be provided for each member of the summer working group assuming that external funding is available.*

The Chair of the Faculty then stated that if there are any questions about this process, they are welcomed. If not, he would like to ask for responses to the question “Which ideas from the proposals are most exciting in terms of their potential to enhance intellectual life?” The FGSC knows your responses will be useful to groups who are working on second round proposals currently.

A faculty member asked if people from the working groups could tell us how things are working – do you feel comfortable with the feedback you have gotten and the schedule? She also wondered why there were eight appointed positions to the summer working group. The Chair of the Faculty responded that, given the fact that election results are variable, the FGSC wanted to make sure that the group had

continuity – including members who have been working on the topic this year, and who will be working on it next year. Additionally, the FGSC wants to make sure the group is balanced with regards to gender, tenure status, etc. He then called on the other members of the FGSC to comment.

The Chair of CAPP stated that the members of CAPP have been discussing this issue a lot, and have commented to the Chair of the Faculty about what is working and what is not. She then asked the faculty at large to share what they think is working and what is not. The original faculty member stated that she read the proposals, but did not attend the open meetings. She was interested in hearing what CAPP had been talking about; what have the people that have been involved in the process talked about and have concerns about. The Chair of CAPP responded that everyone on CAPP is involved in the discussions via a cross-committee team; they have talked about some of the themes that emerged from the proposals. Her team is charged with crafting the holistic proposals – they have focused on what themes have emerged thus far, and which of them are the most compelling.

The Chair of the Faculty stated that he would summarize the comments that he had received throughout the process. Some people think that the process is moving too quickly, and it is hard to assimilate the information thoroughly. Other people think that we have been talking about this for almost a year and nothing has actually happened. He said that it was important to note that we are not going to have a road map in May for exactly what we will be doing next year. He hopes that the meeting in May will inform the discussions and plans over the next year – we are one iteration into a three iteration process, plus the work to be done over the summer. He asked faculty members to continue to send the FGSC feedback on the process. He then asked for input from the faculty about which proposals are the most exciting in terms of enhancing intellectual life.

A faculty member stated that she was excited about the number of times that the word interdisciplinary came up in the proposals. She said that the holistic proposals had a lot more inter-connections than she expected. One of the things that came up in a lot of proposals was the ENG 130 question, and whether it should be merged with some other way to satisfy a competency. She wondered if ENG 130 should be merged with the first-year seminar program – it would make the first-year seminar more interdisciplinary. She asked if there were things built into the curriculum currently that make interdisciplinary explorations more difficult? A lot of proposals were trying to find a way to make these sorts of things more accessible. Addressing the ENG 130 issue sends a message to the students about why they are here, or what they will be doing while they are here.

A faculty member stated that he was wondering how some of the pieces of the puzzle might be fitting together (or not). He commented that the idea mentioned by the President about pursuing a marketing analysis of high school student preferences – what they are looking for and what they want – seems like a great idea; will we (faculty members) actually have access to that data? Will any of that data come in time to inform what we are doing to transform our curriculum? He then noted that the transformation of our intellectual life seems to relate to a point made earlier in the meeting about the relative values of scholarly and artistic work. Will that value play any role in how it is that we decide to say what we are? Fundamentally, the problem is that we have not been able to say clearly enough what it is that we stand for – to say this is what we are. For as long as he has been here, there have been heated conversations about what the role of scholarly and artistic work and its relation to our teaching obligations – will that fit into the conversation about intellectual climate?

The President responded that he would be more than happy to share the information from the materials that come out about what prospective students think, and that it should be available in about two weeks. He then stated that the role of scholarly production in the university is most acutely associated with the issue of tenure and promotion, and he does not want to wade into those waters. He noted that there was a proposal from the History Department about this issue.

A faculty member from the History Department then commented that one of the proposals makes excellence in teaching a tenure requirement, and links it to excellence in scholarship, and also requires external peer review of scholarship for personnel decisions. The exact language of this issue can be found in the proposal.

A faculty member stated that she found three things exciting about the proposals. First, there seems to be an interest in loosening up graduation requirements; she felt that this gives students more agency in charting their own curriculum, and it seemed to come up a lot in the proposals. Second, the idea of making Winter Term for credit; several proposals touched upon it, and it is compelling for two reasons: it gives academic credit where it is due, and it could give teachers a 3/1/2 teaching load. Third, lengthening the interdisciplinary aspect of the first-year seminar; it helps us think of our students as problem solvers, and gives students more academic agency.

A faculty member stated that he is excited by the idea of the office of undergraduate research; it would be a place where students can go, centralized on campus, and get guidance about internships and research. Winter Term could be folded into this larger office. He finds this idea compelling because it models what we as faculty members do, and because it provides a central place that celebrates student research. Having that sort of entity, centrally located, would go a long way to show students what and who we are.

A faculty member stated that he was concerned about whether or not people are really agreeing with these proposals – how much support is there really for some of these proposals? Or will we get the same old support for the same old things. How can we tell if there are a few very vocal people supporting an idea, or if there is wider support? Is there some way to get quantitative data about how much support there is for these ideas?

The Chair of the Faculty responded that polls are soon to come, but we are waiting for ideas to emerge and get discussion going about them before we do them. The faculty member noted that polling, as it is usually done, is not very scientific, because only people who have strong feelings either way will actually respond. Has there been any thought about this? The Chair of the Faculty responded that the FGSC would think about this.

A faculty member stated that he likes the reduced graduation requirements, and he likes the idea of a year-long first-year seminar experience, but faculty members only have a finite amount of energy and time, and we cannot keep adding things to our schedule. He noted that these discussions give us a possibility to look at things and say, what do we really want to do and do we have time to do these things really well. If we change the graduation requirements, can we remap them in such a way to make the workloads more manageable? It would allow us to work more efficiently? He stated that there is a tendency to ignore the fact that faculty members have a finite amount of time available.

A faculty member stated that he found the idea of two courses at a time a compelling proposal. It would help to address the workload issue in a unique way. It would also give students and faculty more time off that was shared, thus giving more opportunities to meet and collaborate outside of class. He found this proposal really interesting.

A faculty member stated that she also found that proposal [two courses at a time] very interesting. She stated that what is compelling about these proposals is that many of them let us streamline and get rid of the pileup that we have done to ourselves. It would be really helpful to find a way to streamline things, and reevaluate why we are doing what we are doing – and this is already embedded in the proposals.

The Chair of FDC wanted to pass on congratulations to the student summer research award winners. The FDC received the most summer research applications that they have ever received – 21 faculty members proposed 24 projects with 32 students. The FDC received many excellent proposals that they could not fund. They only had funds to give awards to seven non-SRF faculty members, three SRF faculty members, and a total of sixteen students; SRF faculty members' stipends come from SRF funds, so FDC only has to pay for the students' stipends for those awards. There was one administration-funded project. The Prindle Center was not able to fund an award.

The Chair of FDC then stated that since FDC had no more money to give away, they would begin reviewing general policies.

### **2009 Faculty Development Student/Faculty Summer Research Awards**

Project Title: Cloning of High Copy Suppressors of a Mutant H4 Protein in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Lynn Bedard** (Assistant Professor of Biology)  
 Student: Jenna Whitbeck '11

Project Title: Epitope tagging and Localization of the Chromatin Assembly Factor, Cac1p, in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Lynn Bedard** (Assistant Professor of Biology)  
 Student: Joo Young Park '11

Project Title: Geology Beneath the Great Wall of China, Continued: Development of "the Cradle of Chinese Geology"  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Tim Cope** (Assistant Professor of Geosciences)  
 Student: John (Jay) Wellik '10

Project Title: Team-Building and Empowerment Workshops of Putnam County  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Tim Good** (Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre)  
 Student: Minnu Paul '11 and Mackenzie Travers '10

Project Title: Knowledge Creation: Archaeology, Memory and Narrative Through the Conover-Cochran Collection  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Marie Hopwood** (Instructor of Sociology and Anthropology)  
 Student: Lindi Conover '10

Project Title: Analysis of VERITAS Observations of High Energy Gamma Ray Sources: A Comparison of the "Maximum Likelihood Method" and the "Ring Background Model"  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Mary Kertzman** (Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
 Student: Akanksha Chawla '12

Project Title: Romancing the Chat Room and Roaming the Internet  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Sherry Mou** (Associate Professor of Modern Languages and Asian Studies)  
 Student: Lisa Poole '12 and James Workman '12

Project Title: Neurophysiological Processing of Cognitive Maps  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Michael Roberts** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
 Student: Dillen Wischmeier '11

Project Title: Novel and Familiar Stimuli in Categorization/Perceptual Representations with Memory  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Michael Roberts** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
 Student: Amy Sato '10

\*Project Title: Café Con Leche: An Enabling Myth of Venezuelan Racism?  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Kellin Stanfield** (Assistant Professor of Economics and Management)  
 Student: Yang Chen '11

Project Title: Measuring Ultrasonic Backscatter Coefficient  
Faculty Sponsor: **Timothy Stiles** (Assistant Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
Student: David Everson '11

Project Title: Nonlinear Effects in Measuring Ultrasound Backscatter  
Faculty Sponsor: **Timothy Stiles** (Assistant Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
Student: David Good '10

Project Title: Documenting the Oral History of Ghost Ranch  
Faculty Sponsor: **Steve Timm** (Professor of Communication and Theatre)  
Student: Kristen Mitchell '10 and Sara Ketterer '11

Project Title: Research in Psychosocial Oncology  
Faculty Sponsor: **Christina Wagner** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
Student: Kelly Garringer-MacCabe '10

\*Funded with Administrative supplement funds.  
No ethics-related awards given for Summer 2009.

### ***Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA began his remarks by calling the faculty members' attention to announcements circulated earlier by e-mail regarding April and May faculty activities:

- The Academic Awards Convocation: Monday, April 27, at 7:30 p.m., in Meharry Hall, East College. Followed by a reception for students, parents, faculty members, and donors.
- The Faculty Achievement Recognition Program/Reception (sponsored by FDC): Thursday, May 7, from 4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m., at the Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
- The Faculty Recognition Dinner (sponsored by President Casey): Friday, May 8, reception begins at 5:30 p.m.; dinner and short program from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; at the Walden Inn Student Social Center

All faculty members, including emeriti faculty members, and their spouses and partners are invited to the Faculty Recognition Dinner where we will note faculty achievements and awards and honor retiring tenured faculty members Bob Stark and Tom Hall.

- Commencement: Sunday, May 17, at 1:00 p.m.

The VPAA noted that, in light of there being no further comment on the COF-proposed removal of the "time in rank" requirement for eligibility for timely promotion to Associate Professor, that change is now approved by the Administration and effective immediately. The VPAA and his staff will review all cases of delay of previous decisions for reason of the prior rule and propose remediation steps to those whose promotions might have been delayed by this requirement in the past. The adjustments to the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook will be made on the version on the web site shortly.

The VPAA then provided an update on our current searches and the size of the faculty for next year. DePauw has made appointments in 5 of our 8 tenure-track searches. In one case there is still an offer outstanding. Two searches have been closed without making appointments. We will wait until early Fall before deciding whether these searches will be re-started in 2009-2010. We now do not expect to make any tenure-track appointments through the opportunity hiring process this year.

The VPAA continued by noting that faculty numbers for next year continue to be fluid; we currently expect the faculty to have 13 fewer benefit-eligible faculty members next year (and 20 fewer part-time faculty members), which is roughly an 11% reduction; and we will have about 60 fewer courses each semester, which is about a 10% reduction. Class sizes will have to be correspondingly higher

(currently the average class size is 16; the increase will probably be about 2 more per class), particularly with fewer and larger sections of multi-section courses. The student to faculty ratio is currently slightly below 10:1, and next year will be slightly more than 10:1.

The VPAA concluded his remarks by stating that a strong pool of tenured faculty candidates interviewed for the position of part-time Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs for next year. He was pleased to report that Carrie Klaus, Associate Professor of Modern Languages (French), has accepted appointment to that position. He then opened the floor to questions.

A faculty member asked if first-year seminar sizes would be rising to 20 students, as she had heard. The VPAA responded that the average first-year seminar enrolls 14 students, and it will probably be 3-4 students higher than that next year, so we might expect an average size of around 17 students. Noting that to achieve the average increase some classes would have to go up in size more than others, since some classes cannot increase in size, the VPAA concluded that the size of first-year seminars would have to increase more than the average increase in class size.

There were no further questions.

***Old Business***

There was no old business.

***New Business***

There was no new business.

***Announcements***

The Chair of the Faculty announced that election results were available as a separate handout at the meeting.

***Adjournment:***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 PM.