

Minutes for the DePauw University Faculty Meeting
Monday, October 9, 2006

1. Call to Order – 4:05 PM; Walden Inn Social Center
2. Verification of Quorum

Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceed the quorum of 84 voting members of the faculty.

3. Approval of Minutes from the September 2006 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes from the September 2006 faculty meeting, which were approved by faculty consent.

4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Bruce Serlin)

CAPP has initiated a dialog with the directors of those Interdisciplinary Programs that offer a major and/or a minor. The committee is interested in learning about the resources these programs will need, other than faculty members, to achieve their goals, and the criteria that directors use to assess the vitality of their programs. CAPP also is examining the governance structure for interdisciplinary programs and plans to create a working document to share with program directors.

There have been a number of atypical requests for a course to include a lab that counts toward Group 1 credit with lab and/or to increase the course's teaching load credit. CAPP and MAO believe that there is a need to review the question of what constitutes a lab course. CAPP will be contacting Division Chairs, after fall break, asking them to hold division-wide discussions and to create position papers to forward to CAPP.

CAPP has recommended to the VPAA, after consultation with RAS, that RAS serve as the committee that reviews opportunity hires. The VPAA has accepted this recommendation and will call them into session as needed.

Question – Which RAS is serving in this role? Is it the committee that met last summer or the committee that will meet this summer?

Answer – The committee appointed last summer continues to serves as RAS until a new committee is appointed in the spring. Last summer's RAS, therefore, will serve in this role for the remainder of the academic year.

Committee on Faculty (Jim Mills)

COF is continuing its discussion of student opinion forms and is looking into the possibility of eventually shifting to an on-line form. COF plans to develop several different types of opinion forms and to test them with faculty and student focus groups.

The committee will begin its review of personnel files at the end of the month.

The candidates for promotion were announced; they are:

For full professor: Jim Benedix, Melanie Finney, Jeff Kenney, Mitch Merback, Jim Mills, Craig Paré and Pam Propsom

For associate professor: Aaron Dziubinskyj and Jamie Stockton

For with rank of associate professor: Caroline Gilson

The deadline for submitting a letter to a candidate's decision file is November 13th, not January 29th as reported in *The DePauw*.

There is one spring tenure review, which is for Henning Schneider. The deadline for submitting a letter to his tenure file is January 29th.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Rebecca Bordt)

A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following new courses:

EDUC 223 Deconstructing Difference: Education and Society, 1 credit, Group 2
MUS 395 Topics, 1 credit

Question: Can you provide a description of MUS 395?

Answer: This is a topics course. The School of Music already has a topics course, but it covers both music history and general topics. This new course will allow the School of Music to offer two topics courses, each with a different focus. The description for this course is:

Investigation of specialized topics in areas such as music theory, literature, musical cultures and performance issues. Recent offerings have included Jazz Styles and Analysis, Psychology of Music, Mind, Body & Wellness, and String Quartet Literature.

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

B. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following permanent group designation:

EDUC 280 Contexts of Schooling in the U. S., Group 2

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

C. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the following changes to the Physics major and minor (additions in **bold**, deletions in ~~strike through~~):

Physics major (only those portions of the requirements with changes are shown):

Core courses:

PHYS 120, PHYS 130, **PHYS 220**, PHYS 270, PHYS 280 (1/2 course), PHYS 480 (1/2 course)

Other required courses:

- ~~Three~~ **Two** of the following, one of which must be either PHYS 370 or PHYS 380; PHYS 240, PHYS 250, PHYS 300, PHYS 370, PHYS 380
- Two of the following: PHYS 410, PHYS 420, PHYS 430, PHYS 440

Physics minor:

Total courses required: five
Core courses: PHYS 120, PHYS 130
Other courses: ~~PHYS 370 or PHYS 380~~
300- and 400-level courses: One

The motion to table was approved by a show of hands.

- D. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following change to the Sociology & Anthropology minors (additions in **bold**, deletions in ~~striketrough~~):

Sociology:

Total courses required: ~~Four~~ **Five**
Core courses: SOC 100
300- and 400-level courses: One

Anthropology:

Total courses required: ~~Four~~ **Five**
Core courses: ANTH 151 or 153
300- and 400-level courses: One

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

- E. Announcements

MAO has approved a change in title for MUS 390, Music History Topics (change from Topics).

MAO is continuing its work on timebanks and is researching the timebanks at other liberal arts institutions. MAO will continue to report back to the faculty as it continues with this issue.

- F. Report from the Library Advisory Committee (Carrie Van Brunt)

The Library Advisory Committee is continuing with its work on the redesign of library space. The committee has asked for a list of future needs from the following: the Library, the competency programs (Q, W and S), the Faculty Development Committee, the ARC, Instructional and Learning Services, and the Honors Scholars program. The committee will be taking a tour of the library to look at available space and will generate several

plans for how to use this space. The plans will be sent to the architects who will then present several options to the committee.

Question – Doesn't the library need some of the space that might go to these other programs?

Answer – The library's needs also are being considered.

Question – Is there any discussion of including a retrofitting of the existing building with environmental features for energy efficiency, or of making it LEED compliant?

Answer – The VPAA stated that this isn't likely at this time because the revisions are relatively modest and will not affect the heating and air conditioning system. Steps will be taken, however, to ensure that any work done now will not preclude seeking LEED certification in the future for a more comprehensive project.

G. Report from the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (Harry Brown)

The current membership of ATAC is Bruce Sanders, Harry Brown, Jeff Hansen, Ophelia Goma, Carla Edwards, Sherry Mou, Dan Pfeifer, Carol Smith and Ken Kirkpatrick. The Handbook defines the committee's purpose as: "seek[ing] input from the University community...on all matters related to technology and associated support services that impact, or have the potential to impact, teaching, learning, research academic advising, and academic professional activities." The committee works to ensure that the University community is thoughtful and deliberate in the way it uses technology on campus.

The committee has been investigating possibilities for upgrading or changing the University's current course management system, Blackboard. Recent increases in Blackboard's annual support fees, as well as growing faculty demand for different kinds of functionality in the course management system have prompted the committee to consider following the lead of other institutions and moving to a cheaper and more flexible open-source course management system. This does not mean, however, the end of Blackboard. At this point the committee is simply investigating options and gathering information from other institutions as a supplement to data collected from the faculty survey completed last spring.

At the request of the Registrar and student government, the committee has been working on ways to make the enrollment process more transparent to students and advisors, particularly as it relates to the function of the computer program that interprets student course requests. At present, the committee is revising the handout, "Making Effective Course Requests," to explain more clearly the way this program processes requests.

Finally, the committee has been considering ways to address vulnerabilities in the university's electronic security system, specifically those protecting student academic records. The committee is considering implementing a registration system on new machines, which would allow the university to track users and to determine who is accessing confidential information. This would be a simple process that would offer considerably more protection than we have now.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Janet Vaglia)

The committee announced that the following faculty had accepted invitations from SLAAC to serve on the Community Conduct Council: Lynn Bedard, Rich Cameron, John Caraher, Dan Gurnon, Ann Jennings, Carrie Klaus and Jonathan Nichols-Pethick.

SLAAC is considering minor revisions to the current policy on Religious Holy Days (Article VII in the Academic Policies section of the Handbook), which outlines accommodations for students who wish to fulfill religious obligations. The current language specifies holy days for Judeo-Christian religions, with minor reference to Islamic faiths. Given the current profile of international students and DePauw's commitment to building an international community, the committee believes that it appropriate to adopt a more inclusive policy.

SLAAC is in the process of establishing a subcommittee on Wellness. Since the beginning of the AQIP wellness initiative, very little has happened. While some progress has been made by individual offices, programs or organizations to identify and incorporate some wellness-related activities, there has been no strong integration or coordination amongst these efforts. SLAAC's goal is to have a subcommittee that will identify the types of changes that students, faculty and staff would like to see in the areas of food, fitness and facilities, and to draft a proposal that prioritizes and describes possible projects. The committee is planning for a committee consisting of two administrators, one staff member from the wellness center, two faculty members, two students and one individual from athletics. SLAAC welcomes nominations from the faculty for this subcommittee. The committee expects that this will entail a commitment of approximately 1 – 1.5 years.

Question: Are there any plans to review our relationship with Sodexo as part of this?

Answer: SLAAC has not included this as a specific agenda item.

5. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Jackie Roberts)

The Committee on Administration's function is to advise the President on matters of administration. The current members of COA are Nancy Davis, Marcia McKelligan, Fred Soster, Beth Benedix, Susan Anthony and Jackie Roberts.

The committee has met twice this year. At the first meeting the committee discussed its agenda for the year and at the second meeting the committee met with Dr. Bottoms. During the year COA will be looking at several issues.

The first, and biggest, item on COA's agenda is insurance. This year the University might receive bids from more than one insurance company. The committee is working with Paul Schmitt to establish a timeline that will allow faculty to have sufficient time to review different plans before choosing an insurance carrier. The current hope is that we will have two months during the spring semester (February and March) to review the bids and choose a carrier. Paul Schmitt will be meeting with COA at the end of the month to get ideas for what the faculty and staff would like in terms of an insurance carrier. COA will solicit ideas from faculty via email.

COA also is working with Paul Schmitt on a review of the Emeriti Program. Two meetings have been scheduled for interested faculty members: Tuesday, October 31st at 4:00 p.m. in the Peeler Art Center auditorium and Wednesday, November 1st at 9:30 a.m. in Watson Forum. An additional meeting will be scheduled for retirees.

Other agenda items for the year include: a continued review of the UP/DP awards, the possibility of moving to a 3-2 or a 3-3-3-2 workload, salary and benefits, and faculty attitudes about faculty governance. For the later item, COA is working on a survey.

Question – Will there be a parallel process for staff to review insurance options?

Answer – Yes.

6. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The VPAA apologized for his absence at the September faculty meeting and explained that he was attending a symposium in honor of Percy Julian at the American Chemical Society's national meeting. After reviewing the life and career of Percy Julian, the VPAA reported that the two-hour NOVA special on Percy Julian is complete and that it is scheduled to be broadcast on February 6, 2007. A 20-minute clip was shown at the ACS meeting and DePauw has a 30-minute clip that is available for use on campus.

The VPAA reported that the University is involved in discussions involving energy conservation and sustainability. DePauw hosted a GLCA workshop on Environmental Studies curricula, which included discussions on sustainability. During a recent chairs meeting there was a discussion of conservation and recycling. Finally, the President has appointed an administrative committee to review issues of energy conservation, recycling, and overall sustainability for the University.

The VPAA distributed a handout providing demographic data on tenure-track faculty (see Appendix One). There has been a steady increase in the number of total full-time faculty of color and of tenure-track faculty of color. This growth has outpaced the growth of the faculty. Although there has been an increase in the number of women faculty, the overall growth has slowed due to the low rate of retirement of male full professors. Of the 30 most senior faculty members at the professorial rank, five are women; however, of the 30 least senior faculty members at the professorial rank, 15 are women. Since the 1996-97 academic year a total of 35 tenure-track faculty have left DePauw. Of these, 18 were women and 12 were faculty of color (eight of which were women). The loss of tenure-track women faculty members is roughly proportional to their representation in the ranks of the less senior faculty from which they have left. The loss of tenure-track faculty members of color is disproportionate by about 2.5 times. The loss of tenure-track Hispanic/Latino/Latina faculty members has been particularly severe: we had two and now have three, but lost four over the intervening years. The loss of African/African American tenure-track faculty members also has been severe: we had five and now have 10, but lost six over the intervening 11 years. The VPAA asked Mac Dixon-Fyle, Joe Heithaus, Dana Dudle, Matthew Oware and Angela Castañeda to meet with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees to discuss possible causes and possible interventions for these losses. Two questions that need to be addressed are: How many tenure-track faculty members do we expect to lose? and What is disproportionate loss and how can that be reduced? Discussions of these points will continue.

The following additional demographic information was shared: 26 (33%) of the 80 professors are women and there are seven professors of color; 34 (46%) of the 74 associate professors are women and there are 11 associate professors of color; 33 (47%) of the 70 assistant professors are women and there are 13 assistant professors of color; and seven (54%) of the 13 instructors are women and there are five instructors of color.

7. Remarks from the President

The President announced that bell hooks will spend next September at DePauw.

During the recent Board of Trustees meeting, the trustees focused on three main issues: internationalization, the report from the Greek Fact Finding Commission, and the Reflection Center.

The Board of Trustees heard a report from Becky Konowicz of the Admissions Office about exchange possibilities in India. Cummins of India has agreed to help DePauw recruit students and to host internships for ITAP students. The Symbiosis Institute will send several faculty members to DePauw in the spring and there is a possibility of arranging exchange opportunities for DePauw faculty members.

Bob Hershberger is developing a program with a major emphasis in Segovia, Spain. Bob also is developing an immersion program for newly admitted students. The program will involve intensive immersion in language classes and a service trip during the summer before the students enter DePauw. The University is in contact with a donor with the goal of increasing scholarships that will increase the number of students who can take advantage of study abroad opportunities.

The University also is establishing contacts in China, but this is progressing slowly at present.

The Board also discussed the report from the Greek Fact-Finding Commission. Lisa Hollander currently is making presentations to the various stakeholders, a process that will be completed by October 18th. The President will then meet with the same groups to consider possible responses to the report. The Board appointed a trustee committee to work with the President; the members of the committee are R. Lee Wilson, Jonathan C. Coffin, Alison E. Frost, R. David Hoover, and James G. Stewart. An interim report will be presented to the Board in January with possible actions at the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The President reviewed actions involving the Reflection Center. The Board of Trustees made the decision in August to build the Reflection Center, allowing a cost savings of \$150,000 by completing this work along with construction on the Ethics Center. Following the motion at the September faculty meeting, the President suspended construction until the Board of Trustees had a chance to meet. The President also met once each with the Nature Park Steering Committee and the student Biology club, and twice with faculty and twice with students.

Steve Timm wrote a letter to the VPAA, with a copy to the President that laid out one person's objection to the plans for the Reflection Center. The President shared this letter with Jim Stewart, Chair of the Board of Trustees, and with the chair of the Buildings and Grounds Committee. The Chair of the Board of Trustees met with nine faculty members to discuss concerns about the Reflection Center. The members of the Board of Trustees also read the letters by Wade Hazel and Steve Timm that were published in the student newspaper. The

Building and Grounds Committee supported the vote of the Executive Committee, as did the Board of Trustees. The Board thought that the location was appropriate and that it met the approved design plans.

Question – Why do we need to build a building in which to reflect? Why not just a bench?

Answer – The idea for a Reflection Center came from members of the Student Affairs staff. It provides a place to go that is quiet and allows reflection. The students indicate that they feel the need for a place where they can have alone time away from campus. Having an enclosed place allows for its use without concern for the weather and will make programming possible.

Question – Did the Board discuss the possible flooding of the quarry?

Answer – The University has received a study that is inconclusive. It probably would be very expensive. There is a vigorous debate as to whether the quarry should have more water. Should we favor research or aesthetics? Perhaps there is a compromise in which a berm could be put in. The preliminary report will be shared and discussion will take place with the biology department. It isn't clear that adding water to the quarry is even possible.

Question – Shouldn't we first have discussions about whether this is appropriate and not let budgetary considerations drive the decision?

Answer – The Board of Trustees has not yet said build or don't build.

8. Old Business

Steve Timm - Motion (to be remove from the table) that:

The Faculty recommends to the University administration that construction on the proposed Reflection Center by suspended until such time as concerned faculty and staff can organize, meet, and present their concerns to President Bottoms and Executive Vice-President Abraham.

The motion to remove from the table was seconded and approved by a show of hands. Before introducing a substitute motion, Steve Timm read the following statement:

I hope in the last month you've had the chance to follow developments at the quarry as they've been detailed in *The DePauw*. Or better yet, that you've visited the quarry to see first hand what development looks like. I've spoken with many of you and I appreciate your words of encouragement and support.

Since last month I've had the opportunity to meet with President Bottoms, Architect Dan Moriarity, and interested faculty, staff, students and community members who use the nature park. There's been some confusion about the scope of my original motion and my interest. For clarification, my interest is in preserving the visual integrity of rim as the defining feature of the quarry. I'm opposed to any building or structure on the rim.

Now that I've seen the plans for the Reflection Center, I'm struck in a number of ways.

I don't like that the Reflection Center, which I'm told will blend into the environment, is larger than my house.

I don't like an architect determining the aesthetics of where and how I should view the quarry rim.

I don't like that the view from inside the Reflection Center reduces everything on the other side of the glass to scenery, which I know something about, and that we're better off leaving the scenery in Moore Theatre where it belongs.

I don't like that the lesson we're teaching here is that responsible stewardship of the land means more buildings, more roads, and more staff.

In short, I don't like that continued development at the quarry will ruin the very thing which made the acquisition appealing in the first place: that students, faculty, staff, and members of the community have a place to study, research, learn, to recreate and reflect in a setting where the processes of nature are at work mending our earlier damage to the land.

I recognize that this is my subjective point of view.

I also understand that my proposed motion, as detailed in my letter to *The DePauw*, stops dialogue and draws a line in the sand. I also recognize that broader issues of process are at stake here, and that since decisions on development at the quarry have been made without the full input of students, faculty, staff and community members, I offer the following [substitute] motion.

Motion (to be voted on) that

The Chair of the Faculty convey in writing to the Board of Trustees that the Faculty recommends construction of the reflection center on the quarry rim be halted until a meeting between the Chair of the Board of Trustees and concerned faculty, staff, students and members of the community can be arranged to discuss issues related to the development of the Nature Park, including the placement of the reflection center on the quarry rim, flooding of the quarry bottom, and LEED certification of all buildings.

The motion was seconded.

The President stated that he very much disagreed with the motion. The process for reaching a decision was appropriate. There seems to be confusion on how buildings get built. It is not the case that someone first gives money before an idea exists. Discussions about a Reflection Center have been taking place for 1.5 years. The University approaches donors as it identifies needs. There are lots of negotiations between donors, the Trustees' Buildings and Grounds Committee and various other groups. Building plans can be controversial, as was the case, for example, with the construction of Olin, which required the University to destroy a number of houses.

The President indicated that the Nature Park Steering Committee was not the committee with the final authority for developing the Nature Park; this is evident, he said, from the committee's membership. The President also noted that the Nature Park Steering Committee was advisory and that he does not always accept the recommendations of committees.

The Reflection Center is an unusual building. It is not being built for academic purposes, but as a building for students and to help with student life.

The President noted that he does not share the sentiment that we should not have built anything at the Nature Park. From the beginning, the intent of the Board of Trustees and the administration has been that DePauw will develop this gift of land for numerous purposes. Which of these purposes is primary will always be a point of contention.

In speaking for the motion, Wade Hazel read the following statement:

The tagline to the 1967 movie “Cool Hand Luke,” starring Paul Newman was: “What we’ve got is a failure to communicate.” (I think after the warden said that, he shot Luke.) A failure to communicate is what this motion addresses. I’ve been involved with the Nature Park since before we acquired it. Since the acquisition of the park until last spring, I was chair of the Nature Park Steering Committee. The purpose of the committee was to provide advice from members of the community to the administration and to the Board of Trustees on matters concerning the Nature Park [via] the Nature Park Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was to consist of President Bottoms, Vice-President Abraham, myself and a member of the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee never met. The Steering Committee has done what it was charged to do, but I do not believe its input has been transmitted to the Board of Trustees.

The potential construction of the Reflection Center is an excellent example of a failure to communicate. When the Master Plan for the Nature Park was unveiled, the Steering Committee recommended that plans for a Reflection Center should not proceed beyond the purely hypothetical without further discussion and consultation. When the plans for the Ethics Institute were unveiled, the emphasis was on the fact that the building would be a single story, nestled among the trees and invisible from the rim and quarry, yet the Reflection Center is a huge three-story structure on the quarry rim. As recently as last fall the Steering Committee recommended that the Reflection Center not be built unless it was physically part of the Ethics Institute. As far as I can tell, based on conversations with President Bottoms and members of the Board, the Board was not made aware of our concerns prior to their decision this summer to construct the Reflection Center on the edge of the rim. So, I think it is entirely appropriate that we at least have the opportunity to make our concerns known. These concerns, locating buildings on the rim, flooding the quarry bottom and LEED certified construction are all valid.

Granted, the Board of Trustees has every right to do what they want with the Nature Park. They don’t need our permission for any of their decisions. But the members of the Board are smart people, and I am sure they recognize that it is in their interest to have our input, especially in decisions such as those covered by this motion, decisions where such a large and diverse constituency is affected. And certainly they must recognize that the opinions of the people who on a regular basis walk in the Nature Park, study in the Nature Park, run in the Nature Park, that the opinions of these people should carry some weight – perhaps as much weight as the opinions of folks who visit the Nature Park once or twice a year. I hope you will all support this motion.

Speaking for the motion: This is not a disagreement between the faculty and student services. Building a Reflection Center is okay, but it should be built in a different location and with different building practices. This is not a fight over who owns the quarry.

Speaking for the motion: The problem is not whether there should be a Reflection Center, but that this is the worst possible place to build it. The planned Reflection Center is the opposite of what such structures are intended to do, which is to provide a secluded and imbedded space for reflection. This plan emphasizes dominance over the scene.

Speaking for the motion: The Buildings and Grounds Committee is a small group. The entire Board of Trustees needs to hear this. Although we don't have any power, there are two important issues on which the faculty can speak: aesthetics and environmental ethics. We know the beautiful; this is not. This building is like a billboard; it destroys the rim.

Reply: The President agreed that the Buildings and Grounds Committee is small; however, he indicated that the entire Board heard the report from the Buildings and Grounds Committee. All of the Trustees were informed. How does the faculty expect Jim Stewart to respond to a letter?

Speaking for the motion: If you are Jim Stewart, you should know that the faculty is angry. He knows that the topic of faculty morale has come up in the past. He should know that process matters. Although we've supported administrative moves in the past, we have no control over what happens. When the administration says "We are thinking about..." it means that the issue has already been decided. From the beginning, everyone knew that Internationalization and Ethics were going to be AQIP projects because they were proposed by the administration. Similarly, the reorganization of library space seems to be a done deal. If it hadn't been for the accidental destruction of library materials, the faculty wouldn't have known of the plans for reorganizing the library space. We need to say that we aren't happy.

Speaking for the motion: People will build things and architects can work in concert with nature. Nothing should be built from here on without meeting LEED standards. Although plans for a Reflection Center were well known, this process feels rushed.

Comment: All future building projects should meet LEED standards. At the recent GLCA workshop on Environmental Studies held at DePauw, a colleague from Kalamazoo College asked, in regard to a local building project, if it was to be the last building built using the old standards or the first building to be built using new standards. What should the process be for deciding this? Achieving sustainability in higher education involves everyone: the Board of Trustees, the administration, the faculty and the students.

Question: Have there been any discussions with the Board of Trustees about making the Reflection Center LEED compliant?

Answer: The President stated that the Board of Trustees did not discuss this, but there have been discussions with the architects. Dan Moriarity reported that a building needs 26 points to earn LEED certification and that the current design can achieve 32 points. However, you can't ask for LEED certification if the building is more than 50% glass, which is the case with the Reflection Center. In addition, there are problems with meeting the LEED standards for air quality since the building is designed to have folding doors that allow it to be converted into an open air structure.

Question: Why not work now toward requiring building designs to meet LEED standards?

Answer: The President noted that this is what the University did with the Prindle Ethics Institute.

Question: There seems to be a contradiction in your [the President's] description of the Reflection Center. On the one hand it is to provide students with a quiet space for reflection, but you also stated that it would be available for programming. How do these uses fit together? What kind of programming is being considered?

Answer: The President stated that this is being discussed with students and those in student services. Perhaps some time could be reserved, without programming, as quiet time; but time also could also be reserved for other activities, such as yoga classes or religious celebrations.

Question: Who is on the administrative committee that is examining energy use. How will they investigate this and are there other actions regarding sustainability?

Answer: The President stated that the committee consists of Ted Fares (the new Director of Facilities), Neal Abraham and Dick Speller. They will begin focusing on these questions after fall break.

Question: Is building the Reflection Center on the rim a done deal?

Answer: Yes.

Comment: If it is a done deal, then it is. However, the process has been circumvented.

Question: Who is on the Trustee Buildings and Grounds Committee?

Answer: The President stated that the committee consists of Kathryn Hubbard, Andrew Paine, William Welch, Jim Bartlett and Jim Mullin.

Speaking for the motion: Earlier the President asked what Jim Stewart should do. He has read the letters from Steve Timm and Wade Hazel and he knows of the concern. There is time to put together a reflective statement to the Board and it is not unreasonable to do this.

The question was called and debate ended by a show of hands. A secret ballot was requested. The motion passed by a vote of 64-10 with one abstention.

9. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

10. Announcements

Meryl Altman announced that the Faculty Development Committee has decided to open another round for applications for Faculty Fellowships to begin in 2007/08. Applications are due by October 25th, as are applications for sabbatical leaves.

11. The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Appendix One – Handout from the VPAA

**Tenure-track Faculty Members
Demographics and Attrition**

	<u>Total Fac. of Color</u>	<u>Tenure-Track* Fac. of Color</u>	<u>Tenured Fac. of Color</u>	<u>Total FT Faculty</u>	<u>% Women</u>	<u>TT Left DePauw</u>
1975-76	1	1	1	140		
1989-90	6	6	1	176		
1991-92	9	6	2	181		
1993-94	8	5	2	152		
1994-95	8	7	3	150	27%	
1995-96	11	7	4	152	30%	
1996-97	13	8	5	155	28%	4
1997-98	18	12	6	162	35%	3
1998-99	20	11	6	163	37%	3
1999-00	22	15	7	188	39%	2
2000-01	28	16	8	203	39%	4
2001-02	29	17	8	204	40%	4
2002-03	30	21	9	222	40%	1
2003-04	32	25	12	223	39%	5
2004-05	32	25	14	224	42%	2
2005-06	32	26	19	229	41%	4
2006-07	35	25	17	226	41%	3

Average 3.2
per year

*includes Tenured and Tenure-Track

Attrition 96-97 to 06-07

35 from the tenure-track

18 women

12 of color (8 women)

4 Hispanic (Note totals: 96-97 = 2, 06-07 = 3)

6 African/African American (Note totals: 96-97 = 5, 06-07 = 10)