

Faculty Governance Steering Committee Report
Enriching Intellectual Life at DePauw:
The State of our Intellectual Life and Possible Directions for Improvement
December 29th, 2008

Preamble

In 1837 a group of Indiana Methodists planned a college to be "conducted upon free and enlightened principles," which they believed "would be of immense benefit to our citizens generally, by disseminating knowledge and useful literature . . . for the benefit of the youth of every class of citizens, and of every denomination, who shall be freely admitted the equal advantages and privileges of education." That pioneering band would scarcely recognize today's DePauw University, yet their principles of liberal education open to all qualified students, linking learning and life's work, and guided by moral reflection, still influences the curriculum and educational experiences of DePauw students.

For the past several decades DePauw has expanded curricular offerings, developed new teaching strategies, created new internship and international programs, and added additional graduation requirements. Over time programs have evolved in piecemeal fashion; these resulting accretions have fragmented and diffused (but certainly not destroyed) our original liberal arts vision. This fall faculty, staff and students eagerly engaged in conversations about the state of DePauw's intellectual life as a first step in responding to President Casey's charge to create "one of the most vibrant intellectual and creative environments in the nation" that prepares students for the twenty first century but is also shaped by over a century and a half of DePauw tradition.

President Casey focused campus conversations on six questions that emerged from earlier faculty discussions. These questions are addressed in the body of this document. The document itself should be viewed as a progress report on our consideration of these questions. As such, the document summarizes a first step in a multi-step process and provides a "State of the Intellectual Life" of the University interspersed with possible options to consider rather than concluding with a set of definitive recommendations for change.

While there is broad agreement that intellectual life at DePauw has much strength, there is even broader agreement that we are not living up to our potential; there are many weaknesses which can and should be addressed. For example, there is general agreement among many faculty members that:

- Group distribution requirements for graduation are not working and need to be revised.
- Winter Term programs have some strengths but also some serious weaknesses that should be addressed.
- Most faculty members are exhausted which impedes their ability to work with students and contribute to, and benefit from, the intellectual life on campus.
- Programs of Distinction need to be re-examined.

In short, the faculty sees many opportunities for improving the intellectual atmosphere at DePauw and is enthusiastic about dedicating itself to driving these changes. However, many faculty members believe that our responses to individual questions will be most effective if they follow from a clearly articulated vision which transcends individual questions, one based on the current state of the University as reported herein, but also taking into account DePauw's historical strengths and traditions.

I. Process and Time Line

Scope of Charge:

In his October 2008 charge to the faculty President Casey wrote: "Beginning with the 2008 Faculty Institute meeting, DePauw has begun a conversation about its intellectual life, a realm defined by the scholarship and artistic work of our faculty and students and by our curriculum, but also by discussions outside of classes and between departments, by our focus on diversity, and by the spaces we provide for thinking and learning and creativity. Progress on the project of enriching DePauw's intellectual life will depend on faculty review, consideration and (most importantly) leadership. Our task is to see whether, using our considerable resources and aspirations, we can create one of the most vibrant intellectual and creative environments in the nation."

The President asked the faculty to look specifically at six questions related to intellectual life and to provide an initial report by December of 2008. Each of the six questions was assigned to a standing committee for leadership. The Committee on Academic Planning and Policy (CAPP) took the lead with three questions. The remaining three questions were assigned, one each, to the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC), the committee on the Management of Academic Operations (MAO) and the Committee on Administration (COA). The Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC) worked to coordinate the discussions, particularly with respect to developing mechanisms for gathering input related to these questions.

Input Solicited:

The Faculty Governance Steering Committee, and various committees, gathered input in the following ways:

- Conducted an online survey of the faculty with more than 95 online submissions received.
- Conducted open meetings for faculty with more than 120 faculty members signing up to attend one or more meetings.
- Conducted an online survey of Department and Program Chairs with a handful of responses.
- Organized open meetings for staff with more than 70 staff members signing up to attend.
- Organized an open meeting that was attended by more than 30 students and participated in a Student Congress meeting that was attended by more than 100 students.

In addition, several individual committees solicited more targeted input. These additional mechanisms include:

- SLAAC conducted two online surveys, one for students and one for staff, on the issue of spaces to support intellectual life.
- COA gathered input from Department and Program chairs on the impact that changes in teaching load would have on their course offerings.
- COA enlisted the help of the VPAA in obtaining data from colleges in our comparison group on their standard course loads and patterns of reassigned time for faculty members.
- MAO gathered information about graduation requirements from more than 20 other institutions.

A draft report was circulated in early December and discussed at the December 8 faculty meeting. Faculty members, staff members and students were then invited to provide additional written comments on the draft document through December 17th. All of this input was considered as final improvements were made to the report. The FGSC also relied heavily on the input while writing the preamble to this document.

Next Steps:

President Casey is initiating a series of conversations with various groups to discuss this report during December, 2008 and January, 2009. The report, along with these conversations, will be used as the basis for updating the Board of Trustees on the status of the intellectual life discussions during their January retreat. The FGSC has been invited to the retreat to help the Board learn about these issues.

President Casey plans to offer an initial response to the report and the subsequent conversations at the February faculty meeting. Conversations led by the faculty governance system will continue into the spring semester with further input being sought during this time. The focus of the spring discussions will be on endorsing the vision

which will guide the next steps in our work, determining which options from this report (and others which may emerge) should be explored further and/or refined in light of this vision, and developing short, medium, and long-term plans for proceeding with any items that are deemed actionable.

II. Reports on Specific Questions

Question 1: Faculty Time and Faculty Engagement (COA):

Major Themes:

- The faculty believes that classroom teaching is the foundation for all other intellectual engagement with our students.
- A faculty that has more time to be engaged in scholarly pursuits is a faculty more likely to bring new ideas to the classroom, to expose students to the cutting edge in their fields, and to mentor students as scholars in their own right.
- One way to share our intellectual lives with our students is to attend lectures, plays, concerts, and art exhibits, and to participate in roundtable discussions, in order to create a more seamless relationship between the exciting work that goes on in the classroom and living the life of the mind everywhere.
- Our out-of-class interactions with students - academic advising, work with student organizations, attending and sponsoring social events, etc. - will better serve to enhance intellectual life if we are able to engage in these activities with energy and enthusiasm.
- There is general agreement that the detailed obligations of the current workload of the faculty hinders our full participation in and enjoyment of the opportunities for intellectual engagement at DePauw, and there appears to be universal support for restructuring and redefining faculty members' duties somehow to include time and expectation for engagement in and contribution to the broader intellectual life of the University. Many faculty members report high levels of stress and fatigue during the academic year and the sense that, far from doing our best in teaching, scholarship and service, we are often barely keeping our heads above water.
- It is also widely reported that in semesters in which we teach only two courses, we feel we are more effective teachers, more productive scholars, and more helpful and engaged mentors and advisors to our students.

Additional Observations:

- VPAA Abraham reports that the average teaching load for faculty members not on leave (sabbaticals or pre-tenure leaves) in any given year currently stands at 4.9 courses. For reasons of administrative and/or faculty development projects, currently individual faculty members variously teach 2,3,4,5, or 6 courses.
- There is enthusiastic and broad-based, although not unanimous, support for moving to a standard 5-course annual teaching load for all faculty members.
- There is widespread agreement that service obligations are excessive.
- Faculty members express a variety of concerns about a standard 5-course annual teaching load, including: worries about the possibility that standards for tenure and promotion would become more (too?) stringent; worries that some faculty members would not make productive use of their "extra" time; and fears that valuable areas of the curriculum would be sacrificed to make the lower standard load possible. Others welcome more stringent promotion and tenure criteria. Many argue for the need to trust our colleagues to use their time well.
- Responses to the COA's request for information on how a 5-course annual teaching load would affect departments and programs varied. Some reported that adjustments would be relatively easy to make. Several reported that change would be difficult but possible and even welcome. Some reported that change would be nearly impossible. The School of Music would face unique and serious problems since much of the teaching in music is through lessons for individual students.
- While the COA proposes consideration of moving to a standard 5-course annual teaching load for all faculty members (see below), we recognize that there are alternative workload adjustments that also

might enhance intellectual life at DePauw and that it probably will not be clear which model is best until we have made some decisions about other elements of the intellectual life initiative.

Items under Consideration:

The COA proposes that the faculty and administration work together in three major areas to restructure faculty workload in ways that will strengthen intellectual life at DePauw.

(1) Reduce the service load and distribute the necessary work more evenly across the faculty.

Some possibilities: reduce number of committees, or number of slots on existing committees, or both; exempt faculty members from further service when they have already taken on a significant assignment such as serving as department chair, chair of COF, etc; reduce burdens on committees through a careful re-examination and revision of current policies (e.g., see comment on FDC below).

(2) Reduce paperwork.

Some possibilities: re-examine FDC policies that require a great deal of proposal writing, report writing (and reading!); recommend page limits on various documents; reduce amount of required reporting on various activities.

(3) Move to a standard 5-course annual teaching load for all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

Some possible strategies:

- Remove some of the current released time and reassigned time and “spread the wealth”;
- Increase some class sizes and correspondingly reduce the number of sections of multi-section classes taught;
- Teach some single-section courses less frequently;
- Look at curricular changes that would allow us to teach fewer formal courses while accomplishing our educational goals.

Question #2: Liberal Arts vs. Career Prep (CAPP)

Major Themes:

President Casey’s perspective on the question of DePauw’s balance between career preparation and liberal arts education is that we are a “puzzle” – DePauw is a quality liberal arts college enhanced by a School of Music, while at the same time offering specialized tracks so that students begin their academic career with the perception that they are already engaged in specific work. There is a diversity of opinions among the faculty, staff and students regarding this question. Many believe that the Programs of Distinction (PODs) are an effective marketing tool, but opinion differed on whether these programs are elitist and whether the internship aspect of these programs should be maintained in a liberal arts educational environment.

The POD programs are not identical, and should not be lumped together haphazardly: some require internships, while others focus on research or apprenticeships. All PODs encourage students to be part of an intellectual community where they are surrounded by people with similar academic interests. However, in faculty discussions of this issue, the problem of elitism and exclusivity of these programs was recognized by some.

Some argued that internships are antithetical to liberal arts education: students arrive with expectations of internships and a career track since PODs are used as a marketing tool. However, the more prevalent opinion was that internships provide students with the opportunity to practice skills gained at DePauw, enhancing the use of knowledge and validating what students have done in the classroom. There are various modes of learning, and that notion is fundamental to liberal arts education. Many felt that internship programs should be available to a wider range of students, based on their academic performance at DePauw, and that we need to do more to help students “bridge” their on-campus education and their off-campus experiences.

Additional Observations:

- It was argued that internships mesh very well with the liberal arts. The internships provide students with experiences in the world of work that can enrich class discussion in the same way that students returning from abroad can enrich discussion based on their experiences of other cultures (i.e., world of work is a

culture many DePauw students aren't familiar with). This is especially important since DePauw classes do not contain nontraditional older students.

- The MAT and some of the degrees offered by the School of Music are explicitly career preparation, designed specifically for this purpose, and could not remain if they were not primarily career preparation.
- Alumni, as internship sponsors and parents of current students, are enthusiastic about DePauw's blend of liberal arts and career preparation.

Items under Consideration

- Making PODs 100% lateral entry would restrict the marketing function of these programs, and so it may be a good idea to maintain both, but shift toward more lateral entry. (Yield rates on admission are higher for POD students who have visited campus.) Internship and research opportunities need to be made more available to students who have proven themselves.
- Implement an Office of Undergraduate Research/internships that would coordinate research/internship opportunities for students who are not in PODs. Use this as the primary marketing tool, rather than the PODs themselves.
- Change the name "Programs of Distinction" – this contributes to the perception of elitism. Perhaps "Fellows Programs" would be a better label.
- Internships and research opportunities for members of the programs of distinction need to be made equally available to the rest of the DePauw community. Students that have proven themselves at DePauw should get these internships rather than students getting them just because they were admitted to a program of distinction.
- Making honors theses options available across various majors would provide opportunities for avenues of distinction outside the PODs.

Question # 3: Winter Term (CAPP)

Major Themes:

Most faculty members agree that the current Winter Term (WT) structure with on-campus classes, off-campus study and service, and internships no longer works with the intellectual mission of the university. While there are many positive aspects to the WT programs, there is also a high level of dissatisfaction among the faculty. Many faculty members commented that they do not know what the mission of the WT program is, and that many of the problems and frustrations that the faculty has with WT stem from a lack of consensus on what we are doing with this three week period in the middle of our academic year.

Strengths of the Winter Term Experience

For many, WT provides an opportunity for both students and faculty to engage in intellectual pursuits and experiential learning that they would not otherwise have time for or access to in the regular curriculum. Internships can be a transformative experience for some students, many of whom would not be able to take time for such experiential learning during the summer. Faculty members can use on-campus courses as a way to experiment with topics in which they have a great deal of interest but which fall outside their departmental teaching. There is a high level of agreement that our students gain tremendous benefits from the off-campus study and in-service trips. For many students these programs may be their only international experience while at DePauw. For some majors, these trips provide a valuable curricular component. They are also a professional development opportunity for faculty members. It was noted that the high level of interest DePauw students have shown in the Peace Corps, Teach For America, and the Fulbright program may be linked to the in-service trips.

When faculty members are not "on" for WT, they appreciate having the time in the middle of the academic year to work on professional development projects.

Problems with the Winter Term Experience

The faculty noted many problems with every component of the WT program. General problems include: the pass/fail system that makes it impossible to hold students accountable for the work they are assigned – this is particularly problematic for on-campus courses and contributes to an unhealthy atmosphere on campus during January which is marked by a dramatic increase in community standards violations; a lack of consistency in faculty workload between supervising internships, leading off-campus trips, and teaching on campus; lack of consistency in the student workload expectations; the administration of all the winter term programs is a problem – there has been an increase in paper work, accounting, required meetings, etc.; for faculty who are “on” during WT there is a high level of burnout going into second semester (this is particularly true of off-campus programs); and the cost of off-campus trips has excluded many students from participation (the available scholarships are often not enough to cover the costs).

Items under Consideration:

Faculty members have proposed a number of options for revising WT. These range from eliminating the requirement altogether, to moving WT to May, to making WT optional for both students and faculty. Almost everyone who attended the meetings or responded to the survey agrees that if we do keep WT in some form, we have to hold the students accountable and get rid of the P/F grading system. We also need to develop clear guidelines on what the goals of each component of the WT program are.

CAPP proposes the following options for the faculty to consider:

- Keep the structure of WT the same (internships, off-campus study, in-service trips, and on campus classes) but all courses would be graded. Grades appear on the transcript but are not counted towards the GPA.
- Make WT optional. Students can take courses on campus (for credit or not, see below), go off-campus (study projects, in-service, internships), and seniors would have the option of staying on campus to work on senior theses or other research projects.
- Students would receive credit towards graduation for WT courses (from 1/2 to 1, depending on the course and workload).
- Eliminate on-campus courses except those that are the equivalent of a semester long credit-course (e.g., the opera, EMT, intensive languages, science, competencies, etc). Students could still do independent projects, off-campus study, in-service projects, or internships.
- Have first-year students go off-campus (internships, study trips, in-service trips) and allow seniors to stay on campus to work on thesis projects or other research.
- Move WT to May in combination with any of the above options. The spring semester would end in April and the May term would be a 3.5 week term in late April and early May.
- Eliminate WT altogether. The spring term would start the second week in January and we would finish by the end of April (Note: only a few of those who responded to the online survey called for eliminating WT altogether.)

Question 4: Student Requirements (MAO)

Major Themes:

The opinion is near-universal, among faculty, staff, and students, that our current system of graduation requirements is over-complicated and burdensome; rather than encouraging intellectual exploration, it has shifted the advising conversation for many to a focus on “checking off” items from a list. Most people agree that some set of general education requirements is needed to ensure a well-rounded liberal arts experience. However, there is a significant feeling that, if DePauw is to improve its intellectual climate, an important component will be to put more trust in the power of intellectual curiosity and a deeper advising relationship to attain suitable breadth.

Additional Observations:

- The most common requirement seen as needing change is Group 6, with its complicated rules for combining physical education, artistic expression, and a variety of non-credit experiences (newspaper, radio, athletics, etc.).

- There were numerous suggestions to eliminate the W, Q, and S competency requirements (but not the supporting faculty workshops or the Academic Resource Center), on the reasoning that these competencies have been successfully embedded in many of our courses across the curriculum.
- A significant number of respondents, especially but not exclusively students, favor a return to the recent system of allowing two of the groups to go partially unfilled.
- Some respondents, chiefly faculty, called for the elimination of minors, or even second majors, to cut down on an optional extra checklist that many students impose on themselves in a bid for more “credentials.” Conversely, there was a suggestion to take advantage of these extra requirements by replacing the group system with a scheme where each student completes a minor in a field that complements the major, either from a different division or in an interdisciplinary program.
- There was no significant call to move toward a “common core” of specific general education courses, or indeed toward any system with more or stricter requirements than our current set. It was noted when the committee surveyed requirements at other schools that DePauw is currently on the heavier end of the continuum of plans, but not at the extreme end.
- Some of the questions around graduation requirements depend on other parts of this report (for example, whether there are changes to Winter Term), so coordination will be essential in any move forward. Two suggestions to come out of the conversations on requirements that are in this area of overlap are to combine the competencies with an expanded First-Year Seminar, and to apply requirements similar to the Honor Scholar program to all students.

Items under Consideration:

At a minimum, we need to reach a campus-wide consensus on the characteristics we expect of a graduate of DePauw’s College of Liberal Arts. Even if the requirements do not change, it is essential that all participants understand and “buy in” to the rationale behind the requirements. Without this common understanding, any system of requirements will be perceived by some as an arbitrary checklist of mandates, to be endured grudgingly. To help achieve such a consensus, it has been suggested that we adopt a Rawlsian “veil of ignorance,” asking “what system would you choose if you didn’t know which department you belonged to,” so that discussions may focus on the philosophical basis for a curriculum rather than on “protecting one’s turf.”

In terms of potential changes, two broad frameworks have emerged from discussions. These models are presented here not as fully worked out proposals, but as indications of possible directions to pursue. The committee has focused on replacements for the current system of distribution groups, partly because of their prominence and complexity, and partly because some of the other requirements, namely Winter Term, First-Year Seminar, and Internships, are the focus of other questions in this report. Despite a number of calls for the elimination of the competency requirements, the committee feels that there is little evidence to support a claim at this time that the competencies are sufficiently embedded in other courses. However, in the spirit of achieving a broad understanding of the rationale behind all of our requirements, it is clear that further discussions will need to explore this issue in greater detail.

Four Groups

One alternative to the current system would be to reduce the number of groups and the total number of courses required to fulfill the general education requirements. This system features simplicity and flexibility. Although most departments will logically fall within one of the four groups, each individual course will have a group designation; one department may offer courses in more than one group.

The four groups would be:

1. Natural Sciences and Mathematics (current group 1)
2. Social Sciences (current group 2)
3. Humanities (current groups 3 and 4, plus some of group 6 such as art or theatre)
4. Language (current group 5)

Students would be required to take 2 courses in each group to fulfill the general education degree requirements. Alternatively, we might require 3 courses in the Humanities group, considering that we have collapsed three former groups (groups 3, 4, and 6) into this new group. A student with no prior foreign language experience currently takes 11.5 courses to fulfill the general education degree requirements. Under this proposal a student with no language experience would take 8 or 9 courses to fulfill the general education degree requirements.

This model eliminates current requirements for one half course of physical education, and removes the specification of one course in literature and one science course with lab. It retains current requirements for competencies (W, Q, and S), with students having to complete the W requirement by the end of sophomore year, the Q requirement by the end of junior year, and the S requirement by the end of senior year.

Distribution by Advising

The goal of this model is to provide a trusting and open academic structure that invites students to take the lead to their own intellectual development, with close consultation and guidance from their advisors.

The current system of group requirements would be replaced by an open system, similar to the one at Grinnell, which only requires a First-Year Seminar (along with a major and a minimum number of credits). Rather than a specific list of required groups of courses, students and advisors would have a set of guidelines for ways to cover the liberal arts. The guidelines could be organized as a broad range of “dimensions” built on the current competencies: W, Q, and S, plus dimensions such as Internationalization, Diversity, Ethics, Technology, etc.

Students would take responsibility for their intellectual exploration by first proposing a preliminary path of study and choosing an advisor. Thereupon, the student and advisor would engage in regular dialogues to map out a feasible and fruitful plan of exploring both the breadth of the liberal arts and the depth of the student’s academic fields of interest. Students would be given a large amount of autonomy and trust in this system; there is a corresponding increase in the need for advisors to ensure that students understand the benefits of a diverse and comprehensive set of courses.

Question # 5: Building a Common Experience (CAPP)

Major Themes:

Many responses to the idea of a “common experience” queried whether or not the FYS experience was in fact a common enough experience to use as a reasonable template. The original intent of FYS was never that it would be a “common” experience per se, at least in terms of content. The WQS programs were cited as the most “unifying” and common of experiences, but it seems that they operate as extensions of some sort of common experience and are not necessarily the spirit of what this question aims at elucidating. The data show that both curricular and co-curricular themes emerge – there are those who favor common readings as well as common experiences such as international or off-campus experiences.

Additional Observations:

- The importance of interdisciplinarity in a liberal arts university was mentioned often and the suggestion was made that perhaps a common experience should include an emphasis on seniors – should seniors return to this at the end of their DePauw career?
- MAO should be involved here as the majority of responses emphasized the need to look at graduation requirements as a way to understand what is “common” about the requirement experience.
- Potential downsides to the “common experience” included space issues – do we want over 2000 people to be anywhere all together? We value having a diversity of opportunities, events on campus and intellectually lively occasions – we do not want to be in the business of homogenizing the intellectual life.

Items under Consideration:

- Emphasize common curricular or co-curricular experiences. For example, we could require pre-college reading or common seminars at the sophomore level, compulsory off campus study for all.

- Institute “Days of Scholarship” – many felt that we should make time and space in our schedules and in the curriculum for this sort of thing (we could envision shorter semesters or more flexible syllabi to allow for such days).
- Institute “Days of Service” – opportunities for alumni, students, faculty, staff and townspeople to engage in service activities – when these might occur: Old Gold, Monon, Little 5 weekends – taking the emphasis off of the party scene and refocusing it onto intellectual engagement and the lived experience of an intellectual life and commitment. This recommendation is intended to make the common experience, one that extends beyond just those who are “here” on campus at any given time – reinforces some of those connections which students note are important for future success (connections between students, faculty and alums).
- Institute a required Senior thesis for all students.
- Schedule a common Monday convocation period to allow for discussion of and planning for scheduled speakers.
- Open certain spaces 24/7 for common intellectual life experiences. For example, some data suggest the need for the library to be open around the clock (or some portion of the library) to facilitate study space and study communities – although some buildings already operate in these ways, safety and sustainability issues arise.

Question 6: Social Space that Encourages the Life of the Mind Outside of the Classroom (SLAAC)

Major Themes:

The majority of faculty, staff and students feel there is adequate space on campus. We have little need for new facilities, but several of our existing spaces are in serious need of renovation. There is general consensus on this.

Additional Observations/Items under Consideration:

Leading the list of buildings that require renovation/re-invigoration are the Union Building, the Lilly Center, Roy O. West, and the Walden Inn. The Union Building, which is prized for its central location but loathed for its sterile, uninviting environment (especially in the lobby and basement), could be renovated to house a coffee shop and more social/study areas. The Lilly Center needs more fitness equipment, more communal space (with maybe a juice bar), and possibly a fitness area exclusively for faculty and staff. The Walden Inn is currently underutilized due to its poor design and layout. Suggestions for improving the Walden ranged from creating better restaurants to doubling the size of the Duck, making it more of a game room/live music venue. Many agree Café Roy is a success, but some thought the Roy O. West library could better serve the DePauw population with more clearly marked social and study areas, particularly on the first floor and in the basement.

Faculty and staff also see the clear need for a student/staff/faculty lounge for every department, in every academic building. To this end, Asbury Hall and the Olin Biological Sciences Building require renovation. The number of faculty members with offices in Olin has nearly doubled, outgrowing the original floorplan. And Asbury Hall, home to close to fifty faculty members, features small, sometimes windowless offices, with almost no social or seminar spaces for students and majors. The hallways are barren and the building lacks an elevator. For a building with many classrooms (and thus, a lot of student traffic) to lack an elevator is a major problem. Asbury is the last academic building to receive a facelift/renovation, and many feel this is past due.

Faculty and staff also desire more comfortable common spaces that are both fairly public but also private, allowing room for both small group interaction and private conversations. (A large space encircled by booths with dividers, for example.) Spaces on campus that are seen as currently being underutilized (in addition to those already mentioned) include the third floor of Julian, the basement of Roy O. West, and open or underutilized areas in the residence halls and living units. (Could spaces in living units be used for class meetings or reading groups, for example?) Faculty and staff would like places that do not have to be scheduled in advance – spaces where people will naturally gather and serendipitous encounters can occur. Many agree some places – Café Roy, Julian, GCPA – are working and should serve as models.

Students voice similar concerns and desires, with a strong call for a coffee house or similar gathering place that is open 24/7. Many students voiced concern that most places currently close by nine or ten pm, leaving only the fraternities open for socializing. (This is especially true for underage students.) They desire comfortable, informal places where conversations and music could be heard. There was also a strong push for more outdoor seating and gathering places. (More benches along the paths, a gazebo in the Dells.) They also clearly want more study spaces (like those in Julian) that are open late, including on the weekends. Many remarked on the need for better lighting in our social spaces. They all stress the need for comfort.

All groups expressed a need to be more connected to Greencastle, specifically the downtown area. The Blue Door Café is widely regarded as a successful model, but it was suggested multiple times that the “swipe card” system be installed here and at other Greencastle eateries. It was mentioned that some cities (Paducah, Kentucky, for example) have revitalized their downtown areas by offering tax breaks and other incentives to businesses that cater to the arts. Students, faculty and staff all mentioned the desire for a mid-range chain eatery like a Chipotle, and more restaurants in general. There were calls for a larger bookstore/coffee shop downtown. Some expressed a call for DePauw to hold more of its events downtown, and for departments to better advertise their on-campus events in town.