

DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
September 9th, 2013

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley, Chair of Faculty)

Hi everyone, welcome to our first faculty meeting of the school year. As we begin the meeting I ask you to check that you've silenced your cell phones, something I know it is easy for me to forget to do so I figured a reminder would be helpful. Also if you speak during the meeting today please introduce yourself, it helps those new to our community meet their colleagues and the rest of us review our name recognition. Lastly, the acoustics in this room are such it really works much better if you speak using a microphone. Please give us that moment to pass you a microphone and note it may take a moment for Clay to turn up the volume.

2. Announcement of Fall Semester Quorum by VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

There are 245 voting members of the faculty; 26 are on leave for the entire year, 6 are on leave for the semester, and 214 are present on campus. Forty percent of 214 is equal to 85.2. The quorum for fall semester, rounded to the nearest person, is 85.

3. Verification of Quorum

The voting status of faculty is attached to the end of the agenda for reference.

4. Approval of Minutes from the May 2013 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections to the minutes. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

5. Faculty Remembrance for Forst D. Fuller '38

Forst D. Fuller '38, Professor Emeritus of Zoology served DePauw from 1947 to 1981. Forst passed away on July 6, 2013. Vanessa Fox, Associate Professor of Biology, read the remembrance. A tribute to Forst may also be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

6. Faculty Remembrance for Robert H. Farber '35

Robert H. Farber '35, Vice-president and Professor Emeritus served for 42 years. Dean Farber, as he was affectionately known, passed away on June 19, 2013. David Bohmer '69, Director of the Pulliam Center for Contemporary Media and Media Fellows, read the remembrance. A tribute to Bob may also be found in Appendix B of this agenda.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

7. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockman)

A. Overview of committee charge, anticipated business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has a busy year ahead. Issues the committee will be addressing over the next several months include

continuing to examine and improve the RAS process, tying up loose ends from the reorganization of the FYS committee and the WPC, working with Vice President Stimpert on some of the items on his agenda including Winter Term, and handling the usual curricular business that needs to be done. Also, last spring this faculty asked CAPP to revisit the newly-implemented requirement that students may only earn W's for W courses taken in their sophomore year, so CAPP will be looking at that. There are also a few items that have been kicking around on CAPP's agenda for quite some time, like program reviews for Q and S, and if time permits CAPP would like to get those underway.

Question from a faculty member:

May I ask CAPP to also look at the issue of graduation distribution requirements? The academic policy states that all students must complete the distribution requirements on campus. There seem to be no exceptions to this policy, even for transfer students who have less time to complete this requirement.

Response from Nicole Brockmann:

Yes, we can add this to our agenda.

There were no other questions for CAPP.

8. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

- A. Overview of committee charge, anticipated business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Written Announcements –

MAO will be working with the Registrar on the course registration system, discussing SPAC and waitlist issues raised by the Advising Committee, talking about co-curricular experiences, and continuing our work of evaluating requests for new courses.

Comments from Jennifer Adams

I am speaking for MAO although I am not the chair of the committee this year. That honor goes to Tiffany Hebb of the libraries. I am Jennifer Adams, at-large representative from Communication and Theatre, and I am the spokesperson.

Other members of the committee include Cheira Belguellaoui (Division 2), Kevin Kinney (Division 3), and Jeff Dunn (Division 4). Other members who are non-voting are Ken Kirkpatrick (Registrar) and Mark McCoy (Dean of the School of Music). There will be two student members who will be appointed by Student Congress.

MAO will be working with the Registrar on the course registration system, discussing SPACs and waitlist issues raised by the Advising Committee, talking about co-curricular experiences, and continuing our work of evaluating requests for new courses. MAO will also consider the issue of requiring students to take exams in the evening and other course requirements that conflict with co-curricular activities, such as athletics.

There were no questions for MAO.

9. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

- A. Overview of committee charge, anticipated business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Written Announcements –

COF has no written announcements.

Comments from Matthew Balensuela

This year's members of COF are Susan Hahn, Susan Anthony, Pat Babington, Dan Wachter, and Nachimuthu Manickam. After the recent election, additional members of COF are Marcia McKelligan, Gloria Townsend, Mark Kannowski.

The Committee on Faculty is a Coordinating Committee of DePauw that makes recommendations to the President of the University on policy and procedures for personnel decisions to the faculty (promotion and tenure issues) and department chairs (among other things). The Committee has met twice already this year and now that the elections are concluded we are ready to move forward on interviews of department members where a new chair is to be appointed. COF members have met a number of times with candidates for review (both over the summer and at the start of this semester) to answer questions on constructing a file and the review process.

Also this year, COF will deliberate on items brought forward by the new VPAA regarding issues relevant to the work of the committee. For example, at the Faculty Institute, Larry Stimpert brought up the idea having external reviewers as part of the personnel decision process; COF will discuss these matters before presenting them to the faculty for further consideration.

There were no questions for COF.

10. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. Overview of committee charge, planned business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Written Announcements –

SLAAC is the Student Life & Academic Atmosphere Committee, and is composed of six elected faculty members, the president, two vice presidents, two deans, the director of international student services, and four students. (Not all of these people are voting members.)

SLAAC deals with policies, guidelines, and information on all factors affecting student life and campus-wide academic atmosphere; including specifically but not limited to policies in the Student Handbook, related to international student life, and which encourage faculty-student interactions which foster intellectual life.

Two changes last year may influence this year's discussions and activities: we accepted specific responsibility for international student life, and SLAAC decided to invite representatives of student groups to meet with us. SLAAC will continue work on academic integrity and will respond to other matters as they get referred to the committee.

Comments from Kathryn Millis

SLAAC, the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee, has a name that really says it all. We deal with "policies, guidelines, and information on all factors affecting student life and campus-wide academic atmosphere."

This year's faculty members are Caroline Smith (Division 1), Smita Rahman (Division 4), and Sherry Mou and me (both at large). We have two open positions: a one-year replacement for Division 2 (who must be from Classical Studies, English, or Religious Studies, but not Modern Languages) and a three-year term for Division 3 (the sciences).

We expect to continue work advising Academic Affairs on procedures related to Academic Integrity, such as specifics of how hearings are held when a faculty member suspects plagiarism, cheating, or other academic dishonesty. Other likely academic topics include grade grievance, class attendance policies, and tutoring. We expect to continue to advise Student Life on matters such as alcohol consumption. Last May, our charge and membership were changed to specifically reflect “international students,” and we decided to start holding brief meetings with representatives of student groups.

One specific responsibility we have is developing pools of faculty members willing to serve on panels when a student has been accused of either academic or non-academic misconduct. So far, almost twenty faculty members have replied to my email of last week, seeing volunteers. We appreciate hearing from others, so that there are large diverse pools to draw from.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

11. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

A. Overview of committee charge, anticipated business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Written Announcements –

FGSC has met once. As part of their work for the year FGSC will meet regularly with VPAA Stimpert to help facilitate action on the initiatives for AY2013-14.

Comments from Bridget Gourley:

FGSC stands for the Faculty Governance Steering Committee and is composed of the chairs of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP), the Management of Academic Operations (MAO) committee, Committee on Faculty (COF), Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC), Faculty Development Committee (FDC), Committee on Administration (COA) and Chair of the Faculty. We meet to make sure that we are aware of business that might overlap between our respective committee charges and to serve as a place for some reflective discussion on a variety of issues that might be finding their way through the governance structure. For example, if new committees are being proposed, if committee charges are changing to reflect the dynamic nature of the faculty we try to look at the proposals from a broad perspective. The committee also serves as a sounding board for the Chair of the Faculty more generally, where I can bounce ideas off the committee before or as I work to move them forward. We are a place where things that don't have any other obvious home come, for us to try and think about best ways we might engage the faculty more broadly.

This year VPAA Stimpert has asked to meet with us monthly to help coordinate moving forward on initiatives he is asking all of us to address in the coming year. You'll be hearing more about those initiatives during his report later.

There were no questions for FGSC.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

12. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

- A. Overview of committee charge, anticipated business for the year and announcement of committee members.

Comments from Tim Cope

FDC is in charge of giving away money in the form of stipends and grants, and time in the form of course releases to people who apply for it to improve their teaching and scholarly and artistic work. This year's members of FDC are Marnie McInnes, Maria Luque, Christina Holmes, Ophelia Goma, Valentin Lanzrein, and myself.

There were no questions for FDC.

Written Announcements –

FDC reminds every one of the upcoming proposal deadlines:

Fisher Fellowship – September 11

Pre-tenure leave – September 25

Faculty Fellowships – October 9

13. Committee on Administration – COA (Meryl Altman)

- A. Overview of committee charge and announcement of committee members.

Comments from Meryl Altman

Members of COA are currently: Kent Menzel (Communications), Zhixin Wu (Mathematics), Manu Raghav (Economics), Jeane Pope (Geosciences), Scott Spiegelberg (Music), Francesca Seaman (Modern Languages), and Meryl Altman (English and Women's Studies).

Some general background: COA's charge is by nature advisory (to the President and the VPAA) – we often serve as a "sounding board" – so its agenda varies from year to year as different issues are brought to us by the Administration. We traditionally provide input on salary and on health care and retirement benefits and the like. In recent years the committee devoted a significant portion of its time to discussing a possible move to a 3-2 load; last year we also received some briefings from Brad Kelsheimer, the VP of Finance, from Dan Meyer, the VP of Admission, and from Amy Haug, the Director of Human Resources.

I see from the minutes that during the previous year, there was a discussion of "family-friendly" policies, based on a task force report. A few years back, COA had an advisory role in changes that were made to the preparation of files for COF reviews. Sometimes issues come to us directly from the faculty as well, either as a result of action in a faculty meeting, or from concerned individuals. Please do not hesitate to get in touch if you have concerns that you would like us to address.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

14. Committee on Honorary Degrees – CHD (Naima Shifa)

- A. Update about nomination procedures for honorary degrees and time line for submission.

Written Announcements –

The Committee on Honorary Degrees (Naima Shifa, Mathematics, naimashifa@depauw.edu, Michele Villinski,

Economics & Management, mvillinski@depauw.edu, and Geoff Klinger, Communication and Theatre, klinger@depauw.edu) requests nominees for Honorary Degree recipients at the May 2014 Commencement. Please submit to the committee—by emailing one or all of us—the names of worthy candidates, accompanied by short biographical sketches and explanation. Nominations may include, but need not be limited to, DePauw alumni. CHD needs to receive your suggestions by **noon, Thursday, September 20.**

Additional Business

15. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

First, I wish to say thank you to Wayne Glausser for his remarks during the opening day convocation.

Next, I wish to address a concern raised by some faculty members that Ubben lectures sometimes conflict with class times. Sometimes we engage in three years of conversations to arrange Ubben lectures. Other times the planning happens more quickly and conflicts are inevitable. We have only cancelled classes twice for Ubben lectures (for Bill Clinton and Margaret Thatcher). There is an Ubben lecture tomorrow, and we will not be cancelling classes tomorrow. Thank you for your understanding.

Now I will turn it over to Brad Kelsheimer who will speak about the financial health of the university.

Comments from Brad Kelsheimer, Vice President of Finance and Administration

I am going to show five charts that illustrate the financial health of the university and the economics of higher education.

The first chart illustrates the strength of our balance sheet. The chart details trended net assets or net worth. Net worth is defined as the value of an asset minus liabilities (debt). For example, if you have a car worth \$5000 and a loan of \$3000, your net worth is \$2000. We currently have a net worth of \$682 million. Our net worth grew by over \$100 million from last June 30th, driven primarily by \$84 million in gifts over the last year. Our net worth includes endowment and physical plant (approximately \$300 million in value) less debt. Our endowment grew by \$50 million from June 30th of the prior year.

Debt is the other side of our balance sheet. Our debt level has dropped in each of the last four years. The current construction projects on campus are all funded by gifts, not debt. We will make it through the next fiscal year without taking out any new short-term debt from our line of credit. As our net worth increases, we could take out more debt, but we have no plans to do so.

The next chart transitions from our balance sheet to our operating results. This moves from a point in time (balance sheet) to a period of time. We measure our operating results in two ways. The first is on a cash flow basis. Our cash flow results signal whether we can pay our bills and salaries without dipping into external sources, such as debt or an extra draw on the endowment. We were having problems with this several years ago. We couldn't pay our bills without debt funding. The chart currently shows green, not red; this means we are bringing in more than we are spending. We have a culture right now that lives within the budget. This is extremely important. We have made some progress on auxiliaries such as the bookstore, the Inn at DePauw, and dining services. We are generating about \$1.5 million more than we were several years ago. We have also taken board-approved supplemental draws on the endowment. And we have underinvested in equipment and the physical plant. We have a physical plant that is worth \$300 million. We only spent about \$1.5 million (or 0.5% of the value) on the physical plant last year. This is equivalent to owning a \$100,000 house and spending only \$500 on maintenance during the course of a year, including buying toilet paper, buying gas for the lawn mower, and fixing a broken air conditioner. The number of people going through our "house" is 2,400, not 5.

We are all feeling the lack of investment in our house. There is no doubt that this number has to go up. We anticipate spending 7 to 8 million each year. Last year we spent money on a new cooling tower on the top of Julian.

The next chart reflects a second view of our operating results. This chart includes the impact of depreciation and capital spending and is how our audited financial statements are presented. As the chart illustrates, we have generated chronic operating deficits when including the impact of depreciation. The deficits have become smaller over the last four years as illustrated by the shortened red bars on the chart. But our chronic deficits are a problem. We are able to balance our books on a cash flow basis, but show operating deficits on an externally-reported format because of our underspending on capital. We provide an experience that rivals national liberal arts colleges and universities, but our revenues are regional in nature. The pricing doesn't match the experience we provide. We are spending more than we bring in. Brian will talk more about how we are going to solve this.

Response to questions

Our current endowment draw rate is 5.5 percent of the 12-quarter moving average. Right now, this is equivalent to about 4.8 percent of our beginning of year endowment ("effective endowment draw"). This doesn't include the supplemental draw on the endowment. The supplemental draw on the endowment is a little under 0.5 percent. This brings the endowment draw up to almost 6 percent.

A 403(b) advisory committee has been at work assisting the administration with responses to changes in the 403(b) regulatory environment that began taking place in 2009. The work includes transparency in reporting and vendor selection/management. More will come on this topic in the coming months as the committee continues its work.

Comments from Brian Casey

I will be giving updates on admissions and our progress as we move toward the goals outlined in the 2020 plan.

Last year, we received 5,200 applications for admissions. This ties the number from two years ago (for the class of 2014). During that year, the Lilly endowment waived application fees for students applying to schools in Indiana [which resulted in increased numbers]. This year, applications were similarly strong, but the students applying for admission were higher-quality students than they have been in the past. The class of 2017 is larger, 675 students vs. the class of 2016 which had 614 entering students. The class of 2017 includes 212 multicultural students and 147 domestic students of color. This is a significant improvement over previous years thanks to concerted efforts that bore a lot of fruit. We admitted more applicants and improved our yield, but we are still having problems with yield. I view this as a communications problem. Students are choosing based on many things, including the financial support we provide. We saw a nice overall increase in the quality of incoming students. We admitted fewer students with a high school GPA less than 3.0. And in the year ahead we are likely to move the admission floor to a minimum GPA of 3.1 in the future.

In October 2010, the Board of Trustees approved the DePauw 2020 plan, the central feature of which is to move DePauw towards becoming a strong leading national liberal arts college.

From 2009 to 2012, we have seen an improvement in fiscal health. We balanced our operating budget. The U.S. News & World Report ranking is coming out tomorrow. DePauw's rank is about the same. Our net tuition is the lowest among the top 75 institutions. For three years, the Board let us draw 6 percent from the endowment. This let us keep our academic operations budgets flat rather than cutting them. The U.S. News has reported that the faculty-student ratio at DePauw is now 9 to 1. We have kept this healthy through this

period.

The Board asked us to make a series of first investments and provided funding for admissions and marketing. We looked at student behaviors when they applied to DePauw. We looked at the campus plan. Some aspects of campus have been a deterrent to prospective students. We redid DePauw's web page.

The Board has now approved an additional draw on our endowment and has specified new requirements for spending. We will be spending more on staff in the Admissions Office. A typical admissions officer is managing 900 applicants. We will hire more staff to decrease the caseload of each admissions officer. We will also be spending more money on fund raising. This will help us with building the endowment and improving our operating budget.

We are currently reviewing our academic program and looking at the quality of our academic experience. We are identifying high-impact teaching practices. We have looked at the Winter Term experience for 20 years, and I think we will start moving forward on changes in this part of the academic calendar. We are also looking at student outcomes. This is where the Hubbard Center comes in. In the long term, we will be focusing on four items: the academic program, attracting and supporting students, the student experience and outcomes, and the campus and city of Greencastle.

We will be making some changes during the next three admissions cycles, for the incoming classes of 2018, 2019, and 2020. There are a lot of ongoing construction projects on campus, but we have not incurred a dollar of debt or taken money out of the operating budget. We are moving the Hubbard Center for Student Engagement to a temporary space. The renovated Lilly Center will open. We will be improving all areas in the academic quad. We will begin construction on the Hoover Dining Hall. Prospective students will see progress on these projects when they visit campus. I'm in a full blown wrestling match to raise money for the library. It is really hard to raise money for a library right now. On the academic side, the Hubbard Center will be code for career services. We are connecting alumni to the career services database and we will be looking at student outcomes.

How can we attract and enroll students? By increasing our endowment. No one can actually afford what we provide. In 15 years, there are only going to be 30-40 national liberal arts colleges that do what we do. Only institutions that have sufficient endowments can be in this group. We need \$1 billion in endowment to do this. We will need to raise \$150 million in new endowment in the next two years.

The way we admit students will shift radically for the Class of 2019 admission cycle. We will shift to a precipice admission system for the class of 2019. A precipice admission system means that a student applies and then waits until a specific date for us to make a decision. For those applying regular decision, on April 1st, the student will receive a letter from DePauw and will be either admitted or not admitted. We will admit students with full information about their financial needs. Right now, we are admitting students on a rolling basis. We give students merit awards as they roll in. By the time we know what the students' true financial needs are, we have already offered \$42 million in total merit packages. The students then come back to us and we do as much as we can to meet their financial needs. We can't meet all of the financial need because we already gave the money away as merit aid. The difference between a student's financial need and the package we provide is referred to as "gapping." If a student wants to come to DePauw, he or she has to take out personal loans to make up the gap. We have found that as the number of applicants grows, our strongest students are receiving full financial need packages from Kenyon, Oberlin, and other prestigious liberal arts institutions. We can't keep doing this so we will need endowment. We are going to stop gapping students. We are going to aim toward the neediest students and most talented students.

Some of our peers in the ACM (Associated Colleges of the Midwest) – Carleton, Grinnell, Colorado College,

Notre Dame – have precipice admissions. A lot of other institutions have rolling admissions. This will be a big cultural shift in our Admissions Office. A student may hear from IU by Oct 10th with a package. But the student may not hear from DePauw until April 1st.

Why aren't we adopting this strategy this year? It will take a while for the admissions culture to hear about the changes. We can't roll this out part of the way. We will be revising the comprehensive admissions plan. Dan Meyer will be changing the admissions materials. We will be hosting admissions counselors and guidance counselors from high schools to publicize these changes.

I think it will work. I have full faith in this. We do really interesting things at DePauw with our Winter Term and during the summer. We will be able to say we have sufficient endowment to meet student needs. This will move DePauw into the national conversation.

Question from a faculty member

I am excited but confused. Several years ago, you said we need to get more money from all our students but now you say we need to stop gapping. How do we resolve this?

Response from President Casey

We used to lead the conversation in admissions with money. We used to give a student "x" amount of money. Then we would, essentially, tell the student to please ask us for more money. We changed this—separating the admission decision from the awarding of aid—to make sure the award was not the most important thing. If you are a family with resources, you should be willing to pay for the DePauw experience. If you're a family without resources, we will pay for it. Our current class is so strong because we emphasized academics.

Comments from Christopher Wells, Vice President for Communications and Strategic Initiatives

There is a campus sustainability committee. Members of the committee are Joe Heithaus, Valerie Rudolph, Amanda Halfacre, and Mary Smith. Jeane Pope is the faculty sustainability coordinator. She will be building better connections between faculty and sustainability efforts.

There were no additional questions for President Casey.

16. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

First, I wish to say that I am pleased to be here. It is great to join such a great institution and meet so many of you. I will make a concerted effort to meet many of you. I am joining terrific teams in the office of Academic Affairs and the senior staff. Our fund-raising challenges are formidable. But \$90 million raised in past year is impressive. Thank you for helping my family and me feel welcome here at DePauw.

I know there are lots of other new faculty members in this room. Please raise your hand if you are a new faculty member.

Dave Berque has joined the office of Academic Affairs as the dean of academic life. He joins Terri Bonebright, dean of the faculty, and Raj Bellani, dean of experiential learning and career services. I meet with this group every Friday afternoon.

One of my goals is to encourage a greater sense of community and a more cohesive faculty culture. Tomorrow, Jeff Kenney will host a faculty forum. My personal goal is that the venue for this event will be too small and we will have to move to another venue.

I will be hosting two social events in the near future. The first one will be October 4th. This will be a more

formal gathering with perhaps some chamber music, drinks, and hors d'oeuvres. The second one will be October 17th at the Welcome Center at the Nature Park. This will be more informal. There will be children's games and I may borrow Brian's presidential ambassadors. Everyone is welcome to come to both of these events. Don't worry – I'm not spending money from Academic Affairs to host these events.

Regarding the academic program, I have been meeting with the department chairs and program directors. Dave Berque and Terri Bonebright join me when they can. I have a couple of objectives for these meetings. I am encouraging department chairs and program directors to take a forward look at where they want the department or program to go, and to discuss this with their entire departments. I am also asking each department chair and program director what it will take to have the best department "x" or program "x" in the country. What would it take to move us to the forefront of the best liberal arts colleges? Often the answers aren't more staff or more money but may be changes to the curriculum and pedagogy. Over time, I want to encourage everyone to take stronger ownership of your own department or program and to develop leadership to move forward. I have been very impressed with the current curricula of our departments and programs. And I have been gratified by the fact that department chairs and program directors are aware of the need for improvement.

I have been getting a sense of your needs. I have asked department chairs and program directors to tell me about the critical needs that should be addressed right away. I am asking chairs and directors to do a complete inventory of our equipment needs. What is the annual amount we need to budget to equip our labs, classrooms, and studios, to have a first-rate academic program?

I believe that renovation of the library is a critical need. We need to come up with a vision of the 21st century library. We probably don't need to expand the footprint of the library. But we need to look at the resources within. I think we will find a donor or donors interested in this project.

I'm also well aware that the operating budgets have been stagnant over the last few years.

Regarding various initiatives, we are working at the committee level, discussing faults and problems and thinking everything out, and then we will be bringing the issues to the floor of the faculty. Coming from Colorado College, home of the block plan, I recognize Winter Term as a "block." My first idea was to take the recommendations of the summer working group and make Winter Term a full-fledged course with grades. But there are a lot of problems with this. Instead, we are talking about taking all that is good about Winter Term, compressing it into two weeks and making it strictly voluntary for students and faculty. The academic calendar would change. Spring semester would start earlier. We would roll out a set of summer opportunities. We are working on this set of ideas through our committees.

Regarding the teaching load, I'm well aware that the topic has been studied to death, and would like nothing more than to just do it. But we face a number of "structural" and "behavioral" challenges: Our current average teaching load is 4.9 courses due to the significant amount of release time that we award. But the release time is not spread evenly. In some departments, release time is almost nonexistent. I will be asking chairs and program directors to come up with two models for a future SOC. One model will have the existing six course teaching load. The second model will be a five course teaching load. This will help us see the structural issues. There are also some behavioral issues associated with teaching loads. When a faculty member receives a Faculty Fellowship, the faculty member knows exactly what he or she will be doing with the course release. But if everyone has release time, what will they do? Chairs get a course release. Will anyone be willing to serve as chair if we take this away? What do we want to accomplish in return for a five course teaching load? How can we augment our students' experience? Perhaps the capstone experience could be one of the outcomes of the five course teaching load.

The Hubbard Center is a place where students go to find a whole array of co-curricular activities that enhance their academic experience at DePauw. Students find out about service learning, off-campus study, Bonner Scholars, etc. We plan to enhance this array of co-curricular activities.

Regarding the Honors and Fellows programs, we need to make these stellar. This will help us attract students that we want. The Honors and Fellows programs will be irresistible to prospective students. Dave Bohmer and Bob Steele are retiring at the end of this year. This will create opportunities for future leadership at Prindle and Pulliam.

I am very committed to faculty governance, especially at a liberal arts institution. The faculty is at the heart of the institution. I don't come with a top-down management approach. I can provide a mirror or opportunity for you to reflect about how we govern ourselves.

One conversation we need to have is around student culture. We often assume that our student culture is a given, it is there. But I want to see that cultures can be changed. We can take what we like in our student culture and we can build on this; at the same time, there may be parts that we don't like and we can tackle them head-on. At our newly instituted "Academic Council" meetings, we are taking a look at our student culture and asking what we want to keep and strengthen and what we want to change. And we are also looking at the touch points – the viewbook, student experience, orientation, and commencement – where we socialize students into our culture.

We will look at high-impact educational practices – first-year seminars, capstone experiences, writing across the curriculum, internships, and service learning. We know almost nothing about some of these, or some of us know something about some of these. How do we do these things effectively at DePauw? We discussed these issues during the Faculty Institute. We will continue this dialog.

Regarding the issue of merit, we provide this in the form of release time. Is this the best way to do merit?

Regarding faculty governance, Colorado College had a byzantine approach. We spent an extraordinary amount of time in committees. DePauw has this beat. The perfect system of faculty governance doesn't exist but we can find what works best for DePauw. I see that you are spending a lot of time in committees. We need you to do a lot of other governance items other than committees. You have a tremendous record on scholarship. I think we need to raise it up a notch. If you are presenting at a regional conference, why not present at a national conference? If you're publishing a chapter in a book, why not publish it as an article in a journal? I recognize you need time to do this. So I will ask you to spend less time in committees.

There are other things we need you to do as faculty members at DePauw. Regarding the admissions process, who can better tell this story than you? This is an important investment of your time. Regarding grant writing, I will ask that we hire professional assistance. This is an area that should pay for itself. Regarding academics in the capital campaign, we need faculty participation. You can talk with prospective donors more effectively than a development officer. You may know alumni that the development office doesn't know.

We must do a better job of telling our story. There's a reason why most faculty members at institutions large and small send their kids to small liberal arts colleges and universities like DePauw. They know this is where their kids will get a great education. We need to communicate this value to the rest of the population. The general public has an incorrect view or a negative view of what we do at DePauw. The incorrect view is that DePauw is similar to IU or Purdue but is smaller. The negative view is that we educate a bunch of philosophy majors that can't get a job after commencement. We need to promote a positive message. I will give this high priority in the months and years ahead. One of the reasons why we and other liberal arts colleges and universities have to be concerned about facilities is because most liberal arts colleges and universities haven't

done a good job at conveying the value of a liberal arts education. As a result, we end up competing on facilities.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

17. Remarks from Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Carol Steele)

A. Report on Academic Integrity Issues at DePauw, academic year 2012-2013.

Bridget Gourley decided to delay this report until the October faculty meeting given the time.

17. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

18. New Business

From Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus)

A. The Modern Languages department gives advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty approve the following changes to the departmental constitution. Broader context for the motion can be found in Appendix C. (Note: The Chair of the Faculty interprets this as parallel to a change in the Academic Handbook, thus requiring advanced notice.)

Motion:

The Modern Languages Department recommends that the Department move back into line with University policy, as articulated in the Academic Handbook, with regard to personnel procedures. In other words, we no longer wish to use weighted voting to give a majority vote to one language section, and we no longer wish to maintain the requirement of outside members on DPCs when there are fewer than three faculty from an area of expertise. These two provisions were included in the "Constitution" of the Department of Modern Languages that was approved by the faculty in May 1998, when the Department was created out of a merger of the Department of Romance Languages, the Department of German and Russian, and the programs in Chinese and Japanese.

Comments from Carrie Klaus, chair of Modern Languages

Though Appendix C we have tried to provide the faculty with a brief history of how we came to this juncture and why this motion is before the faculty. We encourage everyone to review it and to talk with members of the department.

Comments from Matthew Balensuela, chair of COF

COF discussed this last spring when the committee was informed of the current conversations in Modern Languages about their procedures. During the COF discussion it quickly became apparent that the Modern Languages constitution was voted on by the full faculty. Therefore, COF came to the conclusion that it would be best for the faculty to vote on the matter itself without a recommendation pro or con from COF. COF will do its best to fairly follow the will of faculty, whatever is decided.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

As Chair of Modern Languages, Carrie Klaus has brought the motion forward on behalf of the department. To be as transparent as possible, we decided to ask someone else from Modern Languages to provide some context of the opposing viewpoint and Howard Pollack-Milgate agreed.

Comments from Howard Pollack-Milgate, member of Modern Languages Department

First, thank you to Bridget and Carrie for allowing me to present some additional information about this motion.

Straight to it. There are two reasons why I am keeping you from your dinner. First, transparency. For example, it was generally clear until four days ago that these issues were not long settled, but needed faculty approval. As with any personnel issue, it is imperative we get this right. Unfortunately, these issues are as complicated as they are important so I beg a few minutes of your attention.

Second reason: departmental autonomy. Now wait, you say. Aren't you speaking at cross purposes to your own department? Well, thereby hangs a tale, similar to that presented in Appendix C, but with a few key additions. And the beginning of the story will show you why the very language of the motion on the table itself might be misleading.

In 1998, a unique structure was created by the very same august body which I am addressing. For those who don't know or have never thought about it, Modern Languages is unique as a department in having seven or so parallel, but entirely separate programs. These programs, with a few exceptions for romance languages, have no classes in common (there is no core class), and share no students, except when a student happens to study two different languages. Modern Languages is not a discipline: There are no Ph.D.s or B.A.s in modern languages. Further, there are a variety of cultural differences between the programs. After all, speakers of these languages have not always coexisted in peace and harmony and these cultural differences manifest themselves in different ideas as to what sorts of courses should count towards majors and minors; how these courses are taught; and even what subject matters should form the core of the major program. This unique situation was recognized through a few political structures which transferred some of the departmental powers to the programs: First, each language program was granted autonomy in determining its own curriculum. Second, in view of the numerical imbalances between programs (as of last week's e-mail, Spanish has roughly 7 tenured/tenurable positions, French has 4; then the smaller programs German 2, Russian 1, Japanese 1, Chinese 1, and Italian 1), in view of this imbalance, a system of weighted voting and external committee membership was implemented for DPCs and search committees, which would give those committee members with knowledge and expertise in the language, literature, and culture of the position a majority voice.

There was much animosity at the time of the creation of the department. (To give a brief illustration: When I first walked into my office in East College, I turned on the computer whose screen saver, this was back in those times when screen savers were made of words, the screen saver was a German proverb: *Lieber ein Ende mit Schrecken als ein Schrecken ohne Ende*; translated as "better a horrible ending than an unending horror." It might have been the merest accident, but this was not quite a "passing the torch" moment.) Though the rancor faded for the most part with the ensuing retirements of several of our former colleagues, the cultural differences remained, and should remain; we are the department of modern languages not modern language (though on a number of levels in describing our department and its work, I prefer the name the department of cultural differences).

After several years of departmental experience, new questions had arisen, and we decided to face again what has become known as the federal question. During a rather excruciating year, we came up with a new departmental constitution, which was voted on during a cold spring afternoon on the Ides of May in 2009 outside of the Welcome Center of the Nature Park, and, despite everything, agreed unanimously. A meeting, for any conspiracy theorists in the audience, for which no minutes exist. This vote was at least in harmony with the spirit of the constitution which in all versions states: "To the extent possible, all decisions affecting the department as a whole shall be arrived at via consensus among all voting members of the department."

The most significant compromise reached during the year – the greatest change to the original constitution in terms of political organization (and I would request that the three versions of the constitution, or at least links to them be posted on the agenda for the next meeting) – was on the topic of weighted voting: some department members wanted to abandon it entirely as a relic of our rather tense origins; others argued that it still made a lot of sense because the basic nature of the department had not changed.

Here was the compromise: given our accumulated experience with DPCs; the fact that they are in-house; they concern a single file; they have more or less two possible outcomes (good teaching / not so good teaching); as well as the possibility of minority reports, we decided to drop the weighted voting scheme.

Searches, on the other hand, are much more open-ended, they involve a number of files, often with significant information in the language of the position – recommendation letters, writing samples – academic credentials from foreign universities – research topics which only make sense against the backdrop of the particular field and so on. It was thought that those with expertise in that language, who know the curriculum best, are best able to judge how a new hire could fit into and service the curriculum, the ones who will have to collaborate most closely with a new colleague, these search committee members could reasonably demand a greater voice in his or her selection. Thus, those with the most expertise and the greatest stakes would continue to have the most votes.

This compromise resulted in what is labeled in the document as the “revised constitution,” which for my polemical purposes might be called the consensus constitution.

Two years later, at the prodding (excuse me, prompting) of COF, the issue of weighted voting was suddenly reopened, and was voted on by an exhausted department over e-mail as noted in Appendix C. As you can see, the language voted on made no mention of the compromise achieved during 2009, did not distinguish between DPCs and search committees, and thus with a few keystrokes, what I have described as a signature achievement of a year of negotiation was annulled by a simple majority vote; a sizable majority, but nonetheless, not a consensus.

The other question under consideration, the question of outside members of personnel committees with competence in the language under consideration to my knowledge never even came up in that year where everything was on the table. If competency in the relevant language and culture is optional, it seems our department would be without one of the chief reasons it exists.

But again, as a result of prompting by COF, the issue was put on the table, this time an issue which would erase not only the consensus constitution but also almost the rest of the original framework of the department. This amendment, which would allow a DPC or a search without a single member competent in the language or culture of the position being evaluated, passed departmental vote by a mere plurality of 8-6, and is essentially what you are asked to be voting on next month, as part of what I will polemically label the “amended” or non-consensus constitution.

While I hope I have not exceeded my brief here to present rather than to debate, I hope that I have at least convinced you that this motion is more than just a footnote in the “new business” section and that it deserves your full attention at the next faculty meeting.

Discussion

The Chair of the Faculty noted that with advance notice we aren't debating the motion at this time but we could take clarifying questions. There were no clarifying questions about the motion. In closing, the Chair of the Faculty encouraged everyone to have conversations with their colleagues in Modern Languages so they felt

prepared to vote on the motion in October.

19. Announcements (Bridget Gourley)

We have a few committee vacancies yet to fill. Look for an e-mail from me later this evening. The committee roster is now updated on the web so you can consider the vacancies in context. I hope you will step forward and volunteer.

20. Adjournment

Appendices

Appendix A. Tribute to Forst D. Fuller '38, Professor Emeritus of Zoology Written by Professor Emeritus of Zoology James Gammon – July 2013

From September 1961 until present Forst Fuller was an important presence in both my personal and professional life. His passing creates a void in my life which will never be filled. From 1961 to 1991 we conducted undergraduate courses, first in the Department of Zoology and later the Department of Biological Science. We also attended annual meetings together of the Indiana Academy of Science and other national conferences and worked with many graduate students in a two-year Master of Science program until its demise in 1983. My initial teaching challenge was a five credit (three lectures and two three hour laboratories) course in Comparative Vertebrate Anatomy, a course which Forst had previously taught. Populated by about 60 students, half Zoology majors and half Pre-medical Science majors, it was a formidable assignment which, with a Seminar, was my entire first semester teaching load. Among the early students was Forst's stepson David Haines M.D. The first (and only) "easy" exam I delivered to this hard-core group was considerably enlightening about the abilities of DePauw undergraduates. For the first three years I hardly saw the light of day except in Harrison Hall and survived mainly because of the advice and support of Forst and Dr. Albert Reynolds our wonderful Department Chair.

Throughout our professional association Forst was enduringly up-beat, encouraging and supportive as well as a model of teaching excellence for undergraduate majors in Zoology, Pre.Med. and Nursing. During the 1960s and 70s the entire Zoology Department cooperated fully in an active two-year M.S. program, broadening and strengthened by additions of Charlie Mays and Mike Johnson. Forst was an important "idea" participant.

Following his retirement Forst continued teaching unconventionally in Indianapolis, taking suitable animals from the Indianapolis Zoo on visits to several children's hospitals. Our friendship continued, frequently sharing morning coffee in his home and the activities of the Retired Faculty and Friends (RFF) association. We planted daffodils from his extensive gardens at the duplex we now spend winters in. He enjoyed Lake Superior smoked salmon, lake trout and white fish which I brought him after returning home from Sherry and my summers in Northern Wisconsin.

I last talked to Forst the day he was hospitalized for his broken leg. I received word that an ambulance was seen at his home. He was not there later that day, and he was also not at PCH. However, he had been admitted to Hendricks County Hospital and we talked that evening. He was optimistic as usual, told me how the accident had happened and was looking forward to having his leg "fixed". I told Forst that we were migrating North to our cabin soon and would return with smoked salmon for him. He told me that his Grandson was expected the next day to build a bridge over the small stream near his house. I returned to his home the following morning and was told by his Grandson that both of Forst's daughters and other family members were enroute. Assured that family members would undoubtedly care for him, we returned North fully expecting to enjoy coffee with him as usual when we returned to Greencastle.

He will be remembered fondly by a multitude of former DePauw University alumni, staff and faculty as a stimulating and challenging educator and a fine gentleman whose life was exemplary. My memories of our times together over the past 53 years will have to suffice.

**Appendix B. Tribute to Robert H. Farber '35, Vice-president and Professor Emeritus
Written by Professor David Bohmer '69**

On June 20, 2013 DePauw University lost one of its best friends and most loyal servants. Robert H. Farber matriculated at DePauw in the fall of 1931 and often joked that he never left. Actually, he did leave. He was drafted to serve in World War II, rising from a private to major during his time on the African and Italian fronts. While sometimes embarrassed that he never saw active duty, his administrative skills certainly contributed to the war effort in a significant fashion. He returned to his alma mater after the war, rising in the administration at the same time he was getting his master's and doctorate degrees. In the 1950's, he became the Dean of the Faculty, later changed to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. He retired from that position in the late 1970's after twice serving an interim acting president of DePauw.

As a student in the late 1960's, I was one of many who considered Dr. Farber to be part of the "clueless administration." It took many years to change that perception. When I returned to DePauw in 1994, Bob was one of the first to welcome me back. He would often stop in to talk when he came to the PCCM to pick up a copy of THE DEPAUW. When health problems prevented him from getting out in 2003, I became a paper boy again, delivering THE DEPAUW to Asbury Towers on Tuesdays and Fridays. I would often visit with his second wife, Vera, and he, and learned a lot about his DePauw career. I especially learned how much he cared for his alma mater and how he tried to improve the faculty during his time here. He had both the courage to change things and the wisdom to avoid areas where he was blocked by other issues. In all cases, he had the best interests of DePauw at heart. In retirement, he continued to attend many campus events and Vera and he were very generous in their support. He was also keenly interested in following matters through THE DEPAUW and would always take time to discuss campus issue with me.

When I pick up THE DEPAUW out of the news bin on Tuesdays and Fridays, I have to think twice about getting an extra copy to take over to Asbury. He always said it was his lifeline. We have lost a real treasure with Bob's departure.

Appendix C. Background on Personnel Procedures in the Department of Modern Languages
(Provided the department)

The Department of Modern Languages came into being in AY 1998-1999, as a merging of the Department of Romance Languages, the Department of German and Russian, and the programs in Chinese and Japanese, following a vote by the faculty in May 1998. At this time, a “Constitution” for the new Department of Modern Languages was drawn up in order to facilitate clear and equitable working relationships among faculty members and language programs. The faculty vote to approve the creation of the Department of Modern Languages presumably also included approval of the departmental Constitution, which included the following specific provisions regarding procedures for personnel committees that differed from those in the Academic Handbook:

The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being recruited or evaluated—including, as needed or appropriate, selected faculty from the Area Studies programs. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from this area of expertise or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee shall select additional tenured members according to a procedure established by COF and the administration. The additional members shall be drawn from the faculty of related departments or programs but may include departmental members serving in full-time administrative positions. When considering a recommendation from a search committee, the DPC shall include two members from other departments, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

For example, in the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Japanese or Chinese, the majority membership of the DPC (in number or weighted votes) would be from tenured, tenure-track or term faculty in the Asian Studies program. In the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Russian, they would be from the Russian Studies program. In the case of German—where no German Studies program exists—such majority members would be from tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty in related departments who have some expertise in this language or its culture.

The two specific provisions that differed from the Academic Handbook were (1) weighted voting giving a language section the majority vote in all personnel decisions (personnel reviews as well as search committees), and (2) the inclusion of outside members when personnel committees include fewer than three members from an “area of expertise” (interpreted either as fluency in the language taught by the faculty member under review or as expertise in the related interdisciplinary studies program). *Note that, according to the Academic Handbook, search committees for full-time tenure-track positions always include two outside members; this procedure is not in question.*

About ten years after the creation of the Department of Modern Languages, faculty members in the Department decided it was appropriate to review and revise the Constitution. Led by a “Constitution Subcommittee,” the Department discussed this document at length and voted to approve a revised version of the Constitution in May 2009. The revised Constitution was then taken to the Committee on Faculty, which raised some concerns with regard to procedures for personnel committees. The Department then discussed these concerns (mainly, the two specific provisions mentioned above).

At a departmental meeting on November 3, 2011, a specific question was raised: *Do we want to continue to have protections and weighted voting procedures that differ from the University’s Academic Handbook? Or, are we now comfortable with allowing the standard University policy to be used in the department?* This vote was conducted electronically, with faculty members voting either for “UP” (University Procedures) or “WV” (Weighted Voting). On Nov. 6, 2011, the chair reported back that 15 people had voted in favor of University

Policy and 4 in favor of Weighted Voting. This decision resulted in a revised version of the Constitution that is labeled “final” and is dated Nov. 14, 2011. The issue of outside membership on committees for personnel reviews was not explicitly raised at this time, however. Here is the relevant text of the Constitution from November 2011:

Department Personnel Committee - The Department Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages is constituted according to the Academic Handbook. All members of the Department Personnel Committee have an equal vote. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from the area of expertise of the position under review or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee selects additional tenured members according to a procedure established by the Committee on Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

In spring 2013, the Department discussed the issue of outside membership on DPCs. After a meeting on May 2, 2013, faculty members again voted (ten members at the meeting and four by electronic vote). This time, faculty members were asked to vote between moving to *University policy, as detailed in the Academic Handbook* (note: the Academic Handbook does not currently require outside members on committees for personnel reviews) and *maintaining an ML exception*. There were 8 votes in favor of moving to University policy and 6 votes in favor of maintaining an ML exception. The chair reported these results back to the Department on May 8, 2013.

Presumably, since the ML-specific procedures for personnel reviews were approved by the faculty, a decision to allow the Department of Modern Languages to return to standard University policy would also need to be approved by the faculty.

The Department of Modern Languages therefore requests that the Committee on Faculty bring this recommendation before the faculty in September 2013 so that we can come back in line with standard University policy in AY 2013-2014.

Note: *The Committee on Faculty has recommended that faculty members hired under the current policy should be able to choose to be reviewed by the terms of the policy under which they were hired. This recommendation seems appropriate.*

Name	Status	Name	Status	Name	Status
Adams, Jennifer	Voting	DeCarlo, Victor	Voting	Hayes, Andrew	Voting
Alexander, Rebecca	Voting	Dewey, Robert	Voting	Hazel, Wade	Voting
Altman, Meryl	Voting	Dickerson, Vanessa	Voting	Hebb, Tiffany	Voting
Alvarez, David	Voting	Dixon, Mary	Voting	Heithaus, Joseph	Voting
Anderson, Jeremy	Voting	Dixon-Fyle, Joyce	Voting	Henk, Amanda	Voting
Anthony, Susan	Voting	Dixon-Fyle, Mac	Voting	Hershberger, Robert	Voting
Aures, Inge	Voting	Doak, Emily	Voting	Hertenstein, Matthew	Voting
Autman, Samuel	Voting	Ducharme, Alain	Voting	Hillis, Rick	Voting
Babington, Patrick	Voting	Dudle, Dana	Voting	Holmes, Christina	Voting
Balasubramanian, Suman	Voting	Dunn, Jeffrey	Voting	Howard, Brian	Voting
Balensuela, Matthew	Voting	Dye, Ronald	Voting	Howley, Kevin	Voting
Ball, Thomas	Voting	Dziubinskyj, Aaron	Voting	Hutter, Verena	Voting
Barber, Amy Lynn	Voting	Edberg, Eric	Voting	Ishikawa, Lynn	Voting
Barreto, Humberto	Voting	Edwards, Carla	Voting	James, Leslie	Voting
Barros, Sandro	Voting	Eppley, Hilary	Voting	Jennings, Kerry	Voting
Bayer, Ellen	Voting	Evans, Arthur	Voting	Jetton, Caroline	Voting
Beauboeuf, Tamara	Voting	Everett, Jennifer	Voting	Kane, Danielle	Voting
Bedard, Lynn	Voting	Fancy, Nahyan	Voting	Kannowski, Mark	Voting
Belguellaoui, Cheira	Voting	Field, William	Voting	Kenney, Jeffrey	Voting
Belyavski-Frank, Masha	Voting	Finney, Melanie	Voting	Kertzman, Mary	Voting
Benedix, Beth	Voting	Flury, Angela	Voting	Kinney, Kevin	Voting
Benedix, James	Voting	Forcadell, Maria Soledad	Voting	Kirkpatrick, Ken	Voting
Berque, David	Voting	Fornari, Chester	Voting	Klaus, Carrie	Voting
Berry, John	Voting	Foss, Pedar	Voting	Klinger, Geoffrey	Voting
Bhan, Mona	Voting	Fox, Vanessa	Voting	Komives, Alexander	Voting
Biehle, Susanne	Voting	Foy, Leonard	Voting	Krulak, Todd	Voting
Bitner, Ted	Voting	Friedman, Seth	Voting	Kuecker, Glen	Voting
Bogaerts, Steven	Voting	Fruhan, Catherine	Voting	Lafontant, Pascal	Voting
Bonebright, Terri	Voting	Fuller, Jason	Voting	LaLone, Darrell	Voting
Bordt, Rebecca	Voting	Gallagher, Maryann	Voting	Lanzrein, Valentin	Voting
Bretscher, Mary	Voting	Geis, Deborah	Voting	Lemon, Gary	Voting
Brickell, Meredith	Voting	Gellman, David	Voting	Liu, Jinyu	Voting
Brockmann, Nicole	Voting	Geroux, Robert	Voting	Luque, Maria	Voting
Brooks, Howard	Voting	Gilman, Daniel	Voting	Lynch, Christopher	Voting
Brown, Harry	Voting	Gilson, Caroline	Voting	Mackenzie, Michael	Voting
Bruggemann, Julia	Voting	Glausser, Wayne	Voting	Manickam, Nachimuthu	Voting
Call, Rex	Voting	Gloria, Eugene	Voting	Marcoux, Christopher	Voting
Cameron, Richard	Voting	Goble, Geoffrey	Voting	Marshall, Lydia	Voting
Caraher, John	Voting	Goldberg, Rachel	Voting	Martoglio, Richard	Voting
Casey, Brian	Voting	Goma, Ophelia	Voting	McCall, Jeffrey	Voting
Castañeda, Angela	Voting	Good, Tim	Voting	McCoy, Mark	Voting
Cavin, Aaron	Voting	Gourley, Bridget	Voting	McInnes, Marion	Voting
Chiang, Yung-chen	Voting	Graham, Peter	Voting	McKelligan, Marcia	Voting
Chiarella, Thomas	Voting	Gropp, Jeffrey	Voting	McVorrán, Marcelle	Voting
Chiba, Hiroko	Voting	Guinee, David	Voting	Menzel, Kent	Voting
Conceatu, Marius	Voting	Gurnon, Daniel	Voting	Miles, Lori	Voting
Cope, Tim	Voting	Hahn, Susan	Voting	Millis, Kathryn	Voting
Cornell, Cynthia	Voting	Hale, Jacob	Voting	Mills, James	Voting
Cox, Brooke	Voting	Hansen, Jeffrey	Voting	Moore, Kevin	Voting
Crary, Sharon	Voting	Hanson, Bryan	Voting	Mou, Sherry	Voting
Crouse, David	Voting	Harms, Douglas	Voting	Musser, Thomas	Voting
Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan	Voting	Harris, Anne	Voting	Nasr, Ghassan	Voting
Cymerman, Claude	Voting	Harvey, David	Voting	Newman, David	Voting

Name	Status	Name	Status	Name	Status
Nichols-Pethick, Jonathan	Voting	Stewart, Shannan	Voting	Dugan, Gregory	Non voting
O'Bannon, Brett	Voting	Stimpert, Larry	Voting	Evans, Charles	Non voting
O'Dell, Cynthia	Voting	Stinebrickner, Bruce	Voting	Fenlon, Gigi	Non voting
Ota, Pauline	Voting	Stockton, Jamie	Voting	Fenlon, William	Non voting
Oware, Matthew	Voting	Suarez, Alicia	Voting	Good, Caroline	Non voting
Pannell, Kerry	Voting	Sununu, Andrea	Voting	Grammel, Deborah	Non voting
Paré, Craig	Voting	Tatge, Mark	Voting	Gregory, Andrew	Non voting
Patrick, Joyce	Voting	Thede, Scott	Voting	Hall, Kelley	Non voting
Perkins, Scott	Voting	Throckmorton, Nathaniel	Voting	Hardesty, Jacob	Non voting
Peterson, Clarissa	Voting	Timm, Steven	Voting	Hartnett, Owen	Non voting
Phang, May	Voting	Townsend, Gloria	Voting	Hasegawa, Yoshiki	Non voting
Pickerill, Marie	Voting	Tremblay, Sheryl	Voting	Hayes, Amy	Non voting
Pollack-Milgate, Howard	Voting	Tunguz, Sharmin	Voting	Hopson, Amanda	Non voting
Pope, Jeanette	Voting	Upton, Rebecca	Voting	Hreha, Timothy	Non voting
Prakash, Deepa	Voting	Vaglia, Janet	Voting	Huffman, Kristin	Non voting
Propsom, Pamela	Voting	Villinski, Michele	Voting	Jones, Rodney	Non voting
Provine, Rick	Voting	Vyas, Akshat	Voting	Jones, Thad	Non voting
Puga, Alejandro	Voting	Wachter, Daniel	Voting	Kim, Wonmin	Non voting
Raghav, Manu	Voting	Wagner, Christina	Voting	Lynch, Richard	Non voting
Rahman, Smita	Voting	Weisz, Eva	Voting	MacPhail, Josephine	Non voting
Reading, Amity	Voting	Wells, James	Voting	Martin, Gregory	Non voting
Risdon, Michael	Voting	White, Christine	Voting	Martin, Jayson	Non voting
Ristow, Gregory	Voting	Whitehead, Barbara	Voting	Mason, Bonnie	Non voting
Rizner, Dan	Voting	Wielenberg, Erik	Voting	McCoy, Darcy	Non voting
Roberts, Jacqueline	Voting	Wilkerson, Scott	Voting	Moore, Harriet	Non voting
Roberts, Michael	Voting	Wilson, Susan	Voting	Mote, Thomas	Non voting
Ross, Scott	Voting	Wilson, Wesley	Voting	Mueller, Jamie	Non voting
Sahu, Sunil	Voting	Wimbley, Karin	Voting	Nightenhelser, Keith	Non voting
Salman, Randy	Voting	Worthington, David	Voting	Paré, Barbara	Non voting
Sanders, Bruce	Voting	Wright, Brian	Voting	Pejril, Veronica	Non voting
Schindler, Rebecca	Voting	Wright, Lili	Voting	Pollack, Tamara	Non voting
Schlotterbeck, John	Voting	Wu, Zhixin	Voting	Prather, Deborah	Non voting
Schmalhofer, Victoria	Voting	Ziegler, Valarie	Voting	Rachford, Natalia	Non voting
Schneider, Henning	Voting			Reynolds, Anne	Non voting
Schwipps, Gregory	Voting	Name	Status	Richards-Greaves, Gillian	Non voting
Scott, Daniel	Voting	Abed, Larry	Non voting	Roberts, David	Non voting
Seaman, Francesca	Voting	Aherne, Tavy	Non voting	Seaman, Michael	Non voting
Serlin, Bruce	Voting	Alvis, Andra	Non voting	Sieg, Brandon	Non voting
Shannon, Daniel	Voting	Beckel, James	Non voting	Singh, Rohit	Non voting
Shaw, Misti	Voting	Bellani, Rajesh	Non voting	Sirotkin, Leonid	Non voting
Shifa, Naima	Voting	Bohmer, David	Non voting	Smith, Jeffery	Non voting
Sinowitz, Michael	Voting	Braley, Bethany	Non voting	Spicknall, John	Non voting
Smith, Caroline	Voting	Cantini, Stella	Non voting	Steele, Carol	Non voting
Smith, Orcenith	Voting	Carkeek, Maureen	Non voting	Stepp, Scotty	Non voting
Smock, Richard	Voting	Carter, John	Non voting	Stoffregen, Kori	Non voting
Smogor, Louis	Voting	Chiang, Li-feng	Non voting	Stolle, Kara	Non voting
Soster, Frederick	Voting	Clodfelter, John	Non voting	Szpunar, Ruth	Non voting
Spiegelberg, Scott	Voting	Coburn, Pamela	Non voting	Timm, Barbara	Non voting
Stanfield, Kellin	Voting	Cohen, Adam	Non voting	Weinstein, Anthony	Non voting
Stasik, Tamara	Voting	Dabney, Nicole	Non voting	Wells, Anastasia	Non voting
Steele, Robert	Voting	Danforth, Robert	Non voting	Whiting, Bonnie	Non voting
Steinson, Barbara	Voting	Derevyanskaya, Victoria	Non voting	Williams, Alexander	Non voting
Stewart, Khadija	Voting	Dortch, Roger	Non voting	Zellers, Deborah	Non voting

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
October 7th, 2013**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley, chair of faculty)

First to my usual reminders. If you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that you put it on vibrate. If you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself, I need as much name reinforcement as I can get. Don't forget to use a microphone and give Clay a minute to bring up the volume.

2. Verification of Quorum

The quorum was reached by 4:05 p.m.

3. Approval of Minutes from the September 2013 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections to the minutes. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockman)

A. Update on Committee Discussions of the "Sophomore W"

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

CAPP discussed this issue with Mike Sinowitz, Anne Harris, and Kelley Hall. This discussion helped us re-appreciate the value and commitment to the multi-tier emphasis on writing during each of a student's four years at DePauw. We believe that it is important to keep the component of the W requirement in the sophomore year. We can encourage students to take a W course during their freshman year, but we will continue to maintain the requirement for students to take a W course during their sophomore year. We are not planning to make any changes to the policy at this time.

Question from Ken Kirkpatrick, Registrar

The current policy doesn't address students who earn a W during their freshman year. A first-year student may be in a W class during their first year and can still earn a W, but the student still needs to earn a W in their sophomore year. So is it correct that the student can earn more than one W, but that they must earn a W in their sophomore year?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Yes, correct.

B. Update on Committee Discussions of Distribution Requirement Scheduling Issues for Transfer Students

CAPP has requested data. We have made no significant progress at this time. This issue will be on our agenda in the next few weeks.

C. Update on Committee Discussions of the Dissolution of the FYS Committee

CAPP voted to formally dissolve the FYS committee.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has no written announcements.

There were no other questions for CAPP.

5. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

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

REL 245: Jewish Writers (1 credit) – This class treats a range of modern and contemporary Jewish writers (European, American, and Israeli). Through writers such as Freud, Kafka, David Grossman, Dara Horn, Philip Roth, and Larry David, we will explore elements of Jewish identity, culture, history, theology and humor. Is there such a thing as a distinctly Jewish imagination? A distinctly Jewish aesthetic?

REL 285: Wisdom and the Parables of Jesus (1 credit) – This course studies the parables, as significant parts of the New Testament, within the framework of the biblical wisdom tradition, the prevailing consensus and contemporary approaches to parable interpretation including socio-historical criticism that interpret the parables in relationship to the context of Ancient Palestine. The course seeks to broaden students' understanding of the parables, and to identify the authority, interpretive possibilities, and legacy of the major parables in the formation of the Christian tradition.

REL 297: Religion and the Meaning of Life (1 credit) – The course explores the fundamental question whether life has meaning. The course poses the question and explores its relationship to religion as the human quest for meaning through reading and critical reflection on selected literature, and other related texts that illustrate the importance of meaning in the study of religion, and ways in which some of humankind's most important questions are grounded in religious sentiments. Texts include authors such as Karen Armstrong, Saint Augustine, Christina Baldwin, Viktor Frankl, Malcolm X, and Amy Tan.

REL 352: Modern Islam (1 credit) – Examines the developments, issues, events and ideas that have shaped modern Muslim thought and societies. Special attention will be given to the meaning of modernity/modernization, the way it was first encountered by Muslims, and its material and intellectual impact on Muslim societies.

REL 354: Women and Gender in Islam (1 credit) – This course examines women and gender in the Islamic tradition and Muslim societies. Through a variety of written and visual sources, it treats 1.) the history of women in Islam, 2.) the impact of the tradition on women's lives and gender categories, and 3.) the efforts of modern Muslims to challenge traditional gender definitions and create a useable past.

REL 360: Bob Marley, Caribbean Religion and Culture (1 credit) – This course is a close study and analysis of the religious core and communicative rationality in Bob Marley's life and music. It develops the intersections between Caribbean religion and culture based on Marley's affiliation to Rastafari.

Comment from Bridget Gourley

Would you like to provide a rationale for these changes?

Response from Jennifer Adams

The Religious Studies department is currently cleaning up their catalog. Some courses that have been taught regularly as topics courses are being converted to an official course with a number. Courses are also being renumbered in a more logical sequence.

There were no questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

B. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following new course in Computer Science:

CSC 240: Writing in Computer Science (0.5 credit) – In this course students learn to communicate technical and non-technical information about computer science to technical and non-technical audiences. This writing includes communication with users (e.g., user manuals), the general public (e.g., op-ed pieces related to technical issues), and other non-technical audiences (e.g., legislators, potential investors, customers). Students also develop a project proposal document. Some of the writing in this course deals with ethical and social issues. Prerequisite or co-requisite: CSC232

Comments from Jennifer Adams

This course will meet need for the writing in the major requirement. This course impacts the next motion as well.

There were no questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

C. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following changes to the major in Computer Science. Text to be inserted in the catalog copy is shown in bold and that to be deleted struck through.

Total courses required: ~~Ten~~ **Nine and one half** CSC + MATH 123 + **one allied course**

Core courses: CSC 121, CSC 122, CSC 231, CSC 232, CSC 233, **CSC 240**, CSC 498

Other required courses: One CSC course at the 400 level in addition to CSC 498

Number 300 and 400 level courses: ~~Five~~ **Four** including CSC 498

Senior requirement and capstone experience: The senior requirement is CSC 498. As a culmination of the computer science major, each senior completes an independent project with credit earned through the course CSC498. Each student describes his or her project idea in a formal project proposal. Projects typically involve the design, implementation, testing and documentation of a software system that builds on earlier coursework both inside and outside the department. Students are mentored by a faculty member and meet regularly in groups to present their work and to discuss related topics such as the ethical implications of their work. Additional information MATH 123 is also required. MATH 223 may be substituted for MATH 123 with approval of the advisor. **Students are required to take one allied course from a list maintained by the department; with approval of the advisor, students may substitute a 300/400 level CSC course for the allied course.** ~~With the approval of the advisor one of the 300 level CSC courses may be replaced by an allied course from a list maintained by the department.~~ Students are encouraged to complete an internship or research experience related to the major. This is not a requirement, however, and no departmental credit is awarded for these experiences. The advisor will offer guidance on selection of courses inside and outside of the department for students who may be interested in focusing on particular areas related to computer science.

The changes are summarized as:

- Requiring the new 0.5 credit writing course
- Dropping one of the other CSC courses at the 300/400 level
- Adding the requirement of an allied course

Comment from Jennifer Adams

These changes to the computer science major incorporate the newly approved writing course in the major.

Question from a faculty member

What is the rationale for the major requiring 9 ½ courses plus one allied course? Is the allied course the writing course? This suggests that the allied course is something else.

Response from Doug Harms, chair of the Computer Science Department

For the computer science major, we require computer science courses plus an allied course. We have a list of 15 or so courses that are related to computer science, such as physics. These are referred to as allied courses. Students are required to take one of these allied courses as part of the major. The writing course is a separate issue and is specific to the computer science major.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

D. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following new course in English:

ENG 396: World Literature: Advanced Topics (1 credit) – Study of works in world literature emphasizing a global context. Examples include *The Bildungsroman*, *Representations of the Artist*, *The Global Avant-Garde*, *The Great Novel*, and *Global Science Fiction*.

There were no questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

E. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following new course in Geosciences:

GEOS 190: Energy and the Environment (1 credit) – An introduction to energy resources and the environmental impacts of their use. The importance of nonrenewable fossil fuels in modern industrialized societies is examined and the effects of changing rates and costs of energy production on modern lifestyles are explored. The potential economic costs and societal impacts of transitioning to renewable and sustainable sources of energy are discussed.

Question from a faculty member

Is this a first-year seminar course that is being assigned a geoscience course number instead of a university course number?

Response from Fred Soster, member of the Geosciences Department

This is not a first-year seminar course, but is a typical intro-level course. This will also be a Q course.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

F. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following new course for the Environmental Fellows Program:

HONR 422: Environmental Fellows Senior Seminar (1 credit) – An interdisciplinary capstone course for Environmental Fellows. Students draw on field experience, leadership projects, and coursework in the program, across the curriculum and in their majors as they analyze environmental issues from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Students are expected to demonstrate their understanding of environmental complexity by discussion of, for example, ethics, science, art, culture, economics, and policy.

Question from a faculty member

What is the credit level for the senior seminar for our other honors programs, such as Honors Scholars, Science

Research Fellows, or Management Fellows?

Response from Bridget Gourley

The SRF senior capstone is ½ credit. Other programs have different credit levels, either ½ or 1. The environmental fellows program is our newest program and is just now at the point of needing a senior capstone experience.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

G. MAO announces the following changes in title, course number, prerequisites, and/or description:

ITAL 171 Elementary Italian I: Title change from Introduction to Italian I

ITALL 172 Elementary Italian II: Title change from Introduction to Italian II

ITAL 271 Intermediate Italian I: Title change from Intermediate Italian

ITAL 371 Advanced Italian: Title change from Advanced Conversation and Composition, adding of ITAL 272 as a prerequisite, and minor description change (available on request)

ITAL 375 Topics in Italian Literature and Culture: Title change from Introduction to Italian Literature; change in description from a survey class to be a topics course that can be repeated for credit with different topics; change in prerequisite from ITAL 371 to ITAL 272.

ITAL 470 Readings and Projects in Italian: Description slightly altered to match other departmental offerings (description available upon request)

REL 359 Religion in Modern Japanese Society: Course number change from REL 352 to allow for other departmental course numbers to better align.

CSC 498 Senior Project: Prerequisite of CSC 240 added

Written Announcements –

MAO has no written announcements.

There were no other questions for MAO.

6. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

A. Update regarding evaluation of the WCC program.

There is a separate student opinion form for writing-intensive classes. In conversations with Mike Sinowitz, COF understands that the Writing Coordinating Committee (WCC) will administer the same student opinion forms as they did in the spring of 2013. Last spring, the student opinion forms were returned as a whole. Rather than having them returned to the WCC as an entire data set, COF understands that the WCC wants to see the evaluations by section. The members of the WCC will not be able to connect the sections to specific faculty members. WCC will get something like “Section A, B, C...” not SOC numbers or faculty names. Individual faculty members may request the data for their section. COF has decided these evaluations (Fall 2013) cannot be used by faculty members in later promotion and tenure files (because it would create an uneven basis of evaluation if some did include them and others did not).

COF is reporting this to the faculty because COF is considering if such deeper student opinion data should be included in the decision file at some future time, as well as additional questions the S and Q programs may want to ask of their faculty. COF will coordinate with the directors of the programs and report back.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its work on chair reviews.

There were no questions for COF.

7. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Caroline Smith for Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

1. SLAAC has begun meeting with representatives of student groups. With Interfraternity Council we heard about plans to reduce alcohol consumption, and we discussed collaborations between faculty members and members of Greek-letter organizations.
2. SLAAC approved volunteers to serve on University Review Committees and Community Standards Committees. We need more volunteers for Community Standards, which addresses non-academic behavior. Serving on these panels provides an opportunity to have an immediate impact on the campus climate and activities.
3. SLAAC plans to focus significant work on academic integrity this year. Our survey last year (printed in Appendix G of the May 2013 faculty meeting minutes) found that many students consider several types of academic dishonesty “not at all” or only “slightly” severe, and that many know little about potential consequences. We’re talking about how to help students better understand *why* they ought not cheat or plagiarize, and will soon discuss how to disseminate summaries and statistics about hearings and penalties.
4. SLAAC welcomes our two newest members of the committee Samuel Autman and Akshat Vyas, representing Divisions 2 and 3 respectively. Kathryn Millis was officially elected as chair for AY2013-14.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

8. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

A. FGSC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

FGSC has no written announcements.

There were no questions for FGSC.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

9. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

A. Announcement of the Fisher Fellowship recipient.

The Fisher Fellowship is our most prestigious award. We only give one of these each year. There was a very competitive pool this year. This year’s recipient of the Fisher Fellowship is Rebecca Upton. Rebecca will use her semester off to work on a book, “What would Jesus haul?” The book is about long-haul truckers that balance family and work, and the perception that the truckers are so-called “bad boys” of Christian faith.

Written Announcements –

FDC reminds every one of the upcoming proposal deadlines:

Faculty Fellowship Applications – October 9

Sabbatical Leave Applications – October 28

Fisher Course Reassignment Applications – October 30

10. Committee on Administration – COA (Meryl Altman)

A. Overview of committee’s current and upcoming work.

In the next few weeks, COA will be meeting with the Vice President for Finance and the Director of Human Resources to hear about benefits and healthcare, and we’ll also be meeting with Mark McCoy to learn about the impact of a possible move to a 3-2 load on faculty and students at the School of Music.

COA has also been asked by the administration to look at the question of how DePauw evaluates faculty members after tenure and final promotion, and also to address the question of compensation beyond/ other than the base salary, an issue that is sometimes referred to as “merit pay.” We’ve just started talking about this in a general and preliminary way. We will be looking for ways to have faculty conversations about this that do not lead to what some of us older faculty remember as a difficult time of low morale, and ways for faculty to have input that do not lead to a proliferation of new committees and procedures. One general observation is that we currently actually have a system of additional compensation, through the University Professorships, Distinguished Professorships, and various other incentives and awards that are given, and we might begin by looking at whether something of that sort works well or whether something different might work better. We’re going to start by learning more about how these matters are dealt with elsewhere.

Please send us any thoughts or questions you have about these matters, or anything else.

Question from a faculty member

Regarding faculty review, are these questions for COF or is COA coordinating their discussions with COF?

Response from Meryl Altman

When FGSC meets, they will resolve the division of labor issues in an efficient way. We recognize that these issues cross borders and that everything is connected to everything else.

Comment from Bridget Gourley

FGSC advised COA to look at these issues because COA had time to explore it. There will certainly be overlap in the conversations between the committees.

Comment from Matthew Balensuela, chair of COF

COF talked about this issue and we thought COA was the appropriate committee to discuss this issue.

There were no other questions for COA.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

11. Committee on Experiential Learning – CEL (Anne Harris)

A. Overview of the committee’s work for the coming semester and introduction of committee members.

This year's members of the committee are Anne Harris (chair), Aaron Dziubinskyj, Naima Shifa, Robert Dewey, Jeff Hansen, and James Wells. Ken Kirkpatrick is the administrative representative of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The two student members are Cieara deCourcy and Alex Lemna.

The charge of the committee is to make policy recommendations related to on-campus and off-campus experiential learning opportunities, both domestic and international, for courses or programs that occur during the semester, during winter term, or during summer or other breaks. Experiential learning is defined broadly to include community-based research, service learning, community and civic engagement, internship opportunities, international and domestic study opportunities, and graduate and career development.

The committee has met twice since the start of the year and we have a jam-packed agenda. As of September 1st, the official name is Kathryn F Hubbard Center for Student Engagement, aka the Hubbard Center, aka the Hubb. This is where students should go when they have questions about experiential learning.

During fall semester, CEL is participating in the search for a new Director of Career Services. We are currently interviewing candidates by phone. Candidates should be visiting campus in late October and early November.

A sub-group of CEL is looking at how to increase the number of students who are pursuing semester-long off-campus study programs. We are reviewing the off-campus study fee, looking at a variety of models to ensure student access while being fiscally prudent. We are considering a redesign of off-campus study advising where departments would have a list of preferred programs of study for their students that fit within the context of the departmental or program curriculum. This will not work for all departments and as such we departments can work in partnership with the Hubbard Center.

CEL will be reviewing past policies and creating new procedural efficiencies. This is stage two of the process that came about with the merger of the International Education Committee and the Winter Term Committee.

Written Announcements –

CEL has no written announcements.

There were no questions for CEL.

Additional Business

12. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

First I want to thank those faculty members who are welcoming applicants and visitors to their classes on Fridays. We are moving toward having deeper programs for applicants on Fridays and we know that few things have as much of an impact on students than meeting and seeing faculty in classes.

In order to allow us to move to the conversation about Winter Term that Larry will lead, I wanted to speak briefly about this week's Board meeting. The main agenda items for the October Board Meeting are:

1. **Fundraising Update** – the Board wants to know how the University fundraising is going, so a large group will be in on Wednesday to discuss the University's fundraising efforts.
2. **The 2013-14 Budget** – the Board will review the final results of the 2012-13 fiscal budget and will review the plans for the 2013-14 budget. The budget is extremely tight as of this writing, given that we are now operating without a general endowment supplement for the first time since 2009-10. The Business and Finance Committee will spend a great deal of time with Brad Kelsheimer going over our

plans to manage the budget.

3. **Student Career Planning** – the Board is extremely focused on career preparation for our students and general student outcomes. They will want to hear about the Hubbard Center, career services, pre-law and pre-professional advising, and information about internships and other ways we are helping students succeed once they leave DePauw. A special subcommittee of the Board will meet for the first time to review all our efforts in this area.
4. **Admissions** – the Board remains deeply focused on Admissions and the ways in which we are applying financial aid to support students and to shape the class. They are also aware of the major shifts that will come over the next few years in Admissions, both in our national strategy and in the implementation of precipice admissions – and they will be pressing us on our planning efforts in all these areas.
5. **Academic Planning** – the Board and the Board Committee on Academic Affairs will hear from Larry Stimpert about the academic enterprise at DePauw. They will hear about the searches for the new directors of the Pulliam Center and the Prindle Institute as well as Winter Term, faculty development and workload, and a whole host of issues related to the academic enterprise.

I think it will be a very full agenda, before turning this over to Larry and his conversations, I'd be happy to answer questions.

There were no questions for President Casey.

13. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

My first impressions of DePauw are excellent. If you didn't go to Jeff Kenney's faculty forum last month, you missed a good one. I can only guess that Jennifer Adams will give an equally high quality presentation tomorrow.

There are other opportunities coming up for faculty to get together. This Friday, there will be an author's reception at the Roy O. West Library to celebrate the publications of our faculty. It is noteworthy that at least seven books have been published since I arrived on July 1st. This is a tribute to your creativity and scholarship.

Last Friday afternoon, we had a social event at the GCPA. On October 17th, we will host a family-friendly event at the DePauw Nature Park.

I echo Brian's thanks to the faculty for helping with recruiting efforts. Thank you to those faculty members who attended recent admissions events in Indianapolis.

September has been a wonderful month for me. I spent much of the month meeting with every department chair, program director, and director of every honors program. I am impressed by what we are doing here. I have met with the chairs group twice. We use this as an opportunity to discuss common challenges. We are systematically reviewing all programs and departments, and a report will be forthcoming. We are still compiling notes from the Faculty Institute. A summary of feedback will be forthcoming.

We are developing a job description for a grants coordinator. Let me know if you are interested in serving on the search committee for this position.

There will be three forums during October for faculty to discuss winter term. There will also be forums for

students to discuss winter term. We have already had terrific conversations.

The department chairs are working on key budget needs, identifying the most pressing needs for equipment, especially in the sciences.

We have organized an informal advisory group, including top people from Academic Affairs and Student Life. The advisory group will be discussing student culture. We will be bringing all the faculty into this conversation.

The rankings from the U.S. News and World Report suggest that we are an A+ school for B students. The U.S. News got half of this right. *The DePauw* (student newspaper) says the U.S. News got it all right. If we don't write our own narrative, then others will. We must get our own version of the story out there.

We will have an informal discussion about winter term after today's faculty meeting. My role is to be the prod or encourager. There have been no fewer than 13 groups that have looked at winter term over the years. In discussing this with Jane Griswold, the question that comes to mind is "what is the problem we are trying to fix?" I say the problem is consistency. We have some incredible experiences offered during winter term. During anecdotal conversations with students, I ask them "What is the best thing about their education at DePauw?" A remarkable winter term experience often comes up in the students' answers. But we're well aware of the other end of this experience.

A lack of consistency around the winter term experience is the issue of concern, along with unhealthy behavior during the on-campus winter term. There is concern that someone is going to die given the seriousness of the drinking problem. There is also a problem of access in that financial aid is not provided to students for their winter term experience.

During informal conversations with CAPP, we have explored many possibilities and considered the pros and cons. Can we take a minimally invasive approach? Can we assign grades? If the grade goes on the student's transcript, the student would know that the winter term experience becomes more serious. Some of us would like to do this right now. Another option is to have winter term count as a ½ credit course on the transcript. This would encourage us to take a serious and consistent approach across the board.

A more radical possibility would be to eliminate winter term altogether. But many of our students find winter term to be an incredible part of their experience at DePauw.

Another possibility would be to make winter term a full-fledged course. Winter term could be extended to 3 ½ weeks. This would be like the Colorado College model where all courses are taught one at a time for 3 ½ weeks. When I arrived at DePauw, this is what I thought winter term looked like.

None of us are wedded to any particular proposal. We want to find an optimal solution. We will take the input from the various forums and distill what we learn from these conversations.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

Written Announcements –

After the conclusion of the faculty meeting agenda an informal discussion of Winter Term/Summer Programs proposals will take place ending the discussion by 5:30 p.m. Proposals and helpful information will be shared later this week. Additional meetings and opportunities for input and discussion will be scheduled during the month of October.

14. Old Business (Bridget Gourley)

Written Announcements –

1. From Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus)

Giving advance notice of the motion to bring personnel procedures in the Department of Modern Languages in line with the procedures stated in the Academic Handbook has led to additional conversations that suggest that the Department does not yet have the final form of this motion in place. Faculty should anticipate seeing this motion (or advance notice of a revised motion) at the faculty meeting in November.

2. From Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Carol Steele)

The delayed report on Academic Integrity Issues at DePauw, academic year 2012-2013 will be provided in November.

15. New Business

There was no new business.

16. Announcements

A. Remaining Committee Vacancies

GLCA Representative – One-year sabbatical replacement – must be a current or recent member of CAPP

At-large Management of Academic Operations (MAO) – Three-year term – must be tenured or in at least the seventh year of full-time faculty status; may not be from Division 1, Modern Languages, Biology or Philosophy

At-large Teacher Education Committee – Two-year term – may not be from Library, Mathematics, Modern Languages Music, or Political Science

Division 2 Third Division Officer – one-year term

Division 1 Grievance Committee Alternate for service through 1/31/14

Division 1 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15 (two positions)

Division 2 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

Division 4 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

All potential Grievance Committee members must be tenured and may not be on COF.

Written Announcements –

1. The complete list of spring and fall election results can be found in Appendix A. Please thank all our colleagues for their willingness to serve on one of our faculty governance committees.

2. Call for Proposals

On behalf of Bob Steele the Chair of the Faculty noted the special call for proposals related to ethics projects and referred everyone to the email from Bob Steele that came out before the meeting the full text of which appears below.

Dear Colleagues:

Do you have a great idea for an *Ethics* program you would like to develop and present at DePauw in the spring semester 2014?

The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics offers \$5,000 in funding for such a program and invites DePauw faculty and staff to apply. This award is designed to contribute to the intellectual life of our DePauw students and

community with funding support from the *Douglas I. and Ann U. Smith Endowed Fund for Ethics*.

This funding is separate from the financial support that The Prindle Institute regularly provides faculty and staff to bring speakers to campus on ethics-related issues. This \$5,000 grant is designed to generate interest in a larger-scale program that goes beyond a single speaker, panel discussion or short workshop.

The program can be in any discipline. Your proposal should be compelling in its content and engaging in its method. Your program might entail a mini-symposium (over multiple weekdays or on a weekend) that intensely explores a provocative ethics issue. Or, you could propose a series of public conversations with notable DePauw alumni you invite to campus at different times in the spring semester to focus on the same significant ethics-related theme. Or you may propose a multiple-day, hands-on workshop that addresses a compelling ethics issue of importance to our DePauw community and brings together students, faculty and staff. Or perhaps you have another creative, substantive proposal in mind.

The key is that your proposed program must have an *integral relation to ethics*. (See further explanation on our Prindle website at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/academics/centers/prindle/governance/application-for-funding>

And, your program must be conducted and completed in the Spring 2014 semester.

Importantly, *you must be prepared to develop, plan and execute this program yourself (or with co-leaders)*. The Prindle Institute provides the funding and a wonderful venue to conduct your program. We also can help you think through the structure of your program and provide some basic administrative support. You will need to do the planning and coordinating of all events and lead the program.

The deadline to submit your proposal is October 17th. You must submit your proposal and application for funding using this form on the Prindle website:

<http://www.depauw.edu/academics/centers/prindle/governance/application-for-funding>

Please be as specific as possible in the content of your proposal.

The Prindle Advisory Committee will review proposals beginning October 28th and make a decision no later than November 6th.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Steele, Ph.D.

Phyllis W. Nicholas Director of The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics

Distinguished Professor of Journalism Ethics

17. Adjournment

Appendices

Appendix A. Election Results from Spring and Fall 2013 All elections completed through September 23, 2013

At Large (Position and Term)	Elected Candidate
CAPP (Three-year term)	David Guinee
CAPP (Spring semester leave replacement)	John Caraher
COF (Three-year terms)	Mark Kannowski Marcia McKelligan Gloria Townsend
MAO (Three-year term)	VACANT – must be tenured or in at least the seventh year of full-time faculty status; may not be from Division 1, Modern Languages, Biology or Philosophy
SLAAC (Three-year term)	Kathryn Millis
FDC (Three-year term)	Marnie McInnes
COA (Three-year term)	Francesca Seaman
Athletic Board (Three-year term)	Valarie Ziegler
Athletic Board (One-year term)	Dave Worthington
Committee on Experiential Learning (Three-year term)	James Wells
Teacher Education Committee (Three-year term)	Randy Salman
Teacher Education Committee (Two-year term)	VACANT – must be tenured or in at least the seventh year of full-time faculty status; may not be from Library, Mathematics, Modern Languages Music, or Political Science
Library Advisory Committee (Three-year term, librarian elected by the full faculty)	Bruce Sanders
Board of Control of Student Publications (Two-year terms)	Jacob Hale Christopher Lynch
Board of Control of Student Publications (One-year terms)	Naima Shifa
Committee on Honorary Degrees (Three-year term)	Geoff Klinger
Hartman Center Steering Committee (Three-year term)	Suman Balasubramanian
Parliamentarian (Three-year term)	Misti Shaw
GLCA Representative (Three-year term)	Sherry Mou
GLCA Representative (One-year sabbatical replacement)	VACANT – must be a current or recent member of CAPP

Division 1 (Position and Term)	Elected Candidate
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service through 1/31/14)	Kevin Howley
Grievance Committee (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Jennifer Adams
Division Chair (One-year term)	Jonathan Nichols-Pethick
Division Secretary (One-year term)	Valentin Lanzrein
Third Division Officer (One-year term)	Kerry Jennings
Grievance Committee (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Scott Spiegelberg

Grievance Committee Alternates (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	VACANT - Two positions available, must be tenured, may not be on COF.
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service through 1/31/14)	VACANT – one position available. must be tenured, may not be on COF.
Library Advisory Committee	Geoff Klinger

Division 2 (Position and Term)	Elected Candidate
CAPP (One-year leave replacement)	Francesca Seaman
FDC (Three-year term)	Maria Luque
Grievance Committee (for service through 1/31/14)	Hiroko Chiba
Grievance Committee (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Hiroko Chiba Maria Luque
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Francesca Seaman
Public Occasions Committee (Three-year term)	Francesca Seaman
Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) (Three-year term)	David Guinee
Teacher Education Committee (Three-year term)	Sandro Barros
Division Chair	Lynn Ishikawa
Division 2 Run-off for CAPP At-large Nominee (Three-year term)	David Guinee
Division 2 Run-off for FDC At-large Nominee (Three-year term)	Marnie McInnes
Division 2 Run-off for Hartman Center Steering Committee Nominee (Three-year term)	Maria Luque
SLAAC (One-year leave replacement – may not be from Modern Languages)	Samuel Autman
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	VACANT - must be tenured, may not be on COF
Division Secretary	Howard Pollack-Milgate
Third Division Officer	One-year term

Division 3 (Position and Term)	Elected Candidate
CAPP (Three-year term)	Scott Thede
MAO (Three-year term)	Kevin Kinney
SLAAC (Three-year term)	Akshat Vyas
Grievance Committee (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Jim Mills Scott Thede
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service through 1/31/14)	John Caraher
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Sharmin Tunguz
Academic Standing Committee/Petitions Committee (Fall semester leave replacement)	Mark Kannowski
Public Occasions Committee (Three-year term)	Christina Wagner
Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) (Three-year term)	Brian Howard
Teacher Education Committee (One-year leave replacement)	Zhixin Wu
Committee on Administration (COA)	Zhixin Wu

(Two-year term)	
Division Chair (One-year term)	Bruce Serlin
Division Secretary (One-year term)	Pat Babington
Third Division Officer (One-year term)	Bridget Gourley
Division 3 Run-off for Hartman Center Steering Committee At-large Nominee (Three-year term)	Suman Balasubramanian
Division 3 Run-off for Board of Control of Student Publications At-large Nominee (Three-year term)	Naima Shifa

Division 4 (Position and Term)	Elected Candidate
CAPP (One-year leave replacement)	Danielle Kane
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service through 1/31/14)	Michele Villinski
Grievance Committee (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Matthew Oware Dan Shannon
Grievance Committee Alternate (for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15)	Jeff Gropp VACANT
COA (Two-year term)	Manu Raghav
Public Occasions Committee (One-year leave replacement)	Deepa Parkash
Division Chair (One-year term)	Manu Raghav
Division Secretary (One-year term)	Smita Rahman
Third Division Officer (One-year term)	Christopher Marcoux
FDC (One-year leave replacement)	Christina Holmes
Library Advisory Committee (One-year leave replacement)	David Gellman
Committee on Experiential Learning (Three-year term)	Robert Dewey
Academic Standing Committee/Petitions Committee (Three-year term)	Misti Shaw
Academic Technology Advisory Committee (Two-year term)	Bert Barreto

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
November 4th, 2013**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom – Chair of Faculty (Bridget Gourley)

Hi everyone, welcome. First to my usual reminders. If you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that you put it on vibrate. If you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself, I need as much name reinforcement as I can get. Don't forget to use a microphone and give Clay a moment to bring up the volume.

2. Verification of Quorum

The quorum was reached at 4:16 p.m. We covered several announcements and offers to answer questions before the quorum was reached.

3. Approval of Minutes from the October 2013 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections to the minutes from the October 2013 faculty meeting. The minutes were approved via unanimous consent.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

A. CAPP's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

CAPP continues to work on issues related to Winter Term.

There were no questions for CAPP

5. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

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

GEOS 300: Writing in the Geosciences (0.5 credit) – In this course, students will further develop their writing skills by reading and discussing texts about writing in the geosciences, writing original papers for different audiences, providing feedback for other participants in the class, and editing and revising their own work. Students will be evaluated based on their ability to 1) effectively communicate their ideas using appropriate geologic terms and concepts, 2) adapt their writing style for different audiences, and 3) appropriately incorporate references and citations into their papers.

Comment from Jeane Pope, member of the Geosciences Department

I hope you will take this as a friendly amendment. The course designation is GEOS 300, not GEOL 300. The change has been corrected above for the minutes.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

B. MAO announces the following changes in title, course number, prerequisites, and/or description:

SOC 315: Sociology of Madness: Course number change from SOC 219 to better reflect the difficulty of the course.

BIO 156: Advanced Placement in Biology: Granting of AP credit for this course number, rather than BIO 135 (Organismal Bio) as was the case.

Announcements –

1. MAO is discussing a number of methods to better distribute course offerings across the timebanks. Appendix A shows the current breakdown of courses in each slot. If you have any thoughts on this issue, please speak to a MAO member.
2. MAO met with Carol Smith and Adam Hughes from Information Services to find small improvements to our current registration system, while we look towards a new system further down the road. We've asked them to make some changes to make the SPAC/wait list system less problematic. Faculty would be able to set expiration dates for SPACs to free up spots if not used. This will not be in place for the current registration cycle, but hopefully would be in the spring.
3. MAO is aware of the concern over the fact that the Greencastle schools did not align with DePauw's fall break this year. While our academic calendars are set several years in advance, we will attempt a conversation with K12 school officials to let them know of your concerns.

There were no questions for MAO.

6. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

A. COF's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its normal work for the year.

There were no questions for COF.

7. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

1. SLAAC has approved nineteen volunteers to serve as the faculty participants on Community Standards hearing boards! Thank you all.
2. We continue to focus on academic integrity. We are beginning to discuss procedures related to University Review Committees. We want to improve the process for assembling panels to deal cases that arise near the end of spring semester, and (without knowing details of any specific cases) to improve consistency of sanctions across "similar" cases. We will also consider how the university handles multiple students involved in the same case, and multiple charges against a single student during a very brief time. We appreciate hearing from interested faculty members.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

8. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

- A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve a suspension of parts of our by-laws and standing rules that would allow the faculty to trial the concept of a consent agenda for routine faculty business during the remainder of AY2013-14.

Rationale:

FGSC would like to test an idea for making faculty governance more effective and less burdensome, the concept of a consent agenda for routine business. If the trial appears successful the FGSC will bring forward a motion to formally update the bylaws to reflect the consent agenda practice. We anticipate bringing forward the motion in the spring. The anticipated motion is found in Appendix B.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

The motion comes from a coordinating committee therefore it needs no second and is before us. Because it is a motion to suspend our standing rules we will need a two-thirds (rather than simple) majority of those voting to approve the motion.

Since I chair the FGSC I am speaking to the motion on behalf of the committee. If I thought this might be controversial, I would have asked one of my colleagues on FGSC to represent FGSC while I stood as chair, or vice versa. However, I am hopeful this is not controversial.

This idea was part of a broader package of suggestions regarding governance from the January 2011 Intellectual Life working group. A colleague brought it up to us this fall and it was rattling around in our conversations about trying to make governance feel more effective and meaningful.

The FGSC decided that suspending the aspect of our by-laws related to agenda order to allow us to test how we as a body like a consent agenda was the logical incremental approach. If it works well the FGSC anticipates bringing a formal motion (or a close facsimile) like what is outlined in Appendix B.

Let me stress that any voting member of the faculty can request that any item on the consent agenda be moved to the regular agenda by objecting to that item when the Chair asks if there are any objections to the consent agenda. That item would then be discussed and debated as normal under its logical order of business. This change would just allow us to take routine items as a big block hopefully allowing everyone to feel like our time together was more productive.

Question from a faculty member

This seems like a reasonable idea but is there a capacity for a faculty member to anonymously request that an item be removed from the consent agenda?

Response from Bridget Gourley

Absolutely. We will make that explicit if we move to officially change our by-laws in the spring. Right now, we are proposing to suspend the by-laws, as a trial. During the trial I welcome any request either to me in advance of the meeting to remove an item from the consent again, just before the meeting starts in this room or when the official call is made as to whether there are any objections to the consent agenda.

Question from another faculty member

I had the same question as the previous faculty member, specifically a clarification of how to move something from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. "Other routine matters" are mentioned in the appendix. This phrase seems vague. What does this mean? Can this be clarified?

Response from Bridget Gourley

My logic is to give the Chair of the Faculty, myself and future chairs, the discretion to decide if there is a non-controversial issue that only comes up once every 5 years. This type of issue doesn't come to mind now as a regularly considered issue. It covers things items I might have missed when I looked back through past minutes to see what might fit under the consent agenda.

Question from another faculty member

What is the mechanism for restoring the by-laws in case we decide this isn't working?

Response from Bridget Gourley

If we decide in February 2014 or any month that this isn't working, we can take a vote to cancel the suspension of the by-laws effective immediately.

Comment from another faculty member

I can clarify the impetus for this. The way we do these faculty meetings is a little silly, and the silliness is enshrined in the by-laws. There is no point in continuing to hit our heads against the wall. This one seems like an easy one to fix. We can still talk about any issue on the consent agenda.

Comment from Bridget Gourley

We are only suspending the by-laws to try the consent agenda. We are not making the change permanent.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

Written Announcements –

1. FGSC has met twice since our last faculty meeting with VPAA Stimpert. Our main focus has been discussing mechanisms to make faculty governance more effective and less burdensome. Many ideas are under consideration.
2. The second early idea, with regard to more effective governance, we are considering is combining CAPP and MAO into an overarching Curriculum Committee. If you have any comments about combining the work of CAPP and MAO, please share your comments with any member of CAPP, MAO or the FGSC. Rosters for each of these committees can be found on the faculty governance webpages.
3. Other issues have been raised with the FGSC and we hope to address them in upcoming meetings. Although we weren't able to find a standing meeting time we do have a number of meetings scheduled. If you have any issues you would like FGSC to address please forward them to the Chair of the Faculty or a committee member.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

I particularly want to draw your attention to FGSC's second written announcement. We are in the early stages of considering combining CAPP and MAO into an overarching Curriculum Committee. Those of you who have served on either of these committees or more generally have been around awhile realize that often their work overlaps or it is somewhat ambiguous as to which committee ought to address an issue. We realize that with the volume of work these two bodies each manage we will have to look carefully to issues of workload but we hope by thinking through the issues carefully we'll be able to suggest ways that might streamline some of the work through subcommittees. We are also hopeful that after careful consideration of the issue in consultation with CAPP and MAO, we'll be able to develop something that actually saves effort and provides those serving with a more meaningful service opportunity.

Let me emphasize we are in the early stages of looking at these issues and we welcome any input. Please direct your thoughts to me as a clearinghouse, I promise to share any comments with all members of all three committees. If you prefer you are welcome to share your thoughts with any member of FGSC, CAPP, or MAO.

<p>Rosters for all of these committees can be found on the faculty governance webpages.</p> <p>There were no questions for FGSC.</p>
<p>Reports from other Committees Committee rosters are available at: http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/</p>
<p>9. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)</p> <p>A. FDC’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.</p> <p>Written Announcements – FDC has no written announcements.</p> <p>There were no questions for FDC.</p>
<p>10. Committee on Administration – COA (Meryl Altman)</p> <p>A. COA’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.</p> <p>Written Announcements – COA has no written announcements.</p> <p>There were no questions for COA.</p>
<p>11. GLCA Academic Council Representative (Sherry Mou)</p> <p>A. Offer to answer questions about the report from the GLCA Academic Council Meeting held in late September. The report is found in Appendix C.</p> <p>Comments from Bridget Gourley Fortunately for us, Sherry Mou, Department of Modern Languages, as our sole GLCA Representative, was able to attend the Academic Council Meeting in late September and wrote up some announcements about initiatives and opportunities for us with the GLCA. Please refer to Appendix C of this agenda.</p> <p>Written Announcements – The GLCA representative has no written announcements.</p> <p>There were no questions for the GLCA representative.</p>
<p>12. Athletic Board – AB (Tim Good)</p> <p>A. Updates to include information about reading groups to bring faculty and coaches together, November athletics coffee, AB discussions about scheduling conflicts, opportunities to serve as a faculty coach-for-a-day, and NCAC athletic summits during spring semester.</p> <p>Comments from Tim Good We are planning a reading group that is designed to bring coaches and faculty together – for spring 2014</p>

and/or for the 2014-15 academic year. Please notify the Athletic Board if you have ideas about this.

We have been arranging coffee hours for faculty and athletic staff members to meet. The first one was with the Department of Communication and Theatre. The second one was with departments housed in Harrison. Our next one will be with departments housed in Julian. We will continue until all departments have had this opportunity. Please look for upcoming announcements.

We are arranging “faculty coach-for-a-day” programming. A faculty member could follow a team for a short period of time, and sit on the bench with the team for a contest or two. Please contact Tim Good if you are interested.

There will be NCAC academic-athletic campus summits during the spring semester. Faculty members will be invited to a summit in the spring, probably to be scheduled on a Friday afternoon or Saturday morning. The summit will provide the opportunity to discuss a more intentional integration of academics and athletics. Faculty Athletic Representative Pam Propsom will moderate this forum.

A reminder of the current policy regarding students missing class for contests. See “Conflict Between Class and Extracurricular Activities” in Academic Handbook. Faculty have responsibilities to help resolve these conflicts. However, the Athletic Board will be discussing this with SLAAC. If students have any questions regarding the policy, the students can speak to the Director of Athletics, Student Life, or the Faculty Athletic Representatives, Tim Good and Pam Propsom.

Written Announcements –

The Athletic Board has no written announcements.

There were no questions for the Athletic Board.

13. Committee on Honorary Degrees – CHD (Michele Villinski)

A. Overview report about honorary degree candidate pool.

Comments from Michele Villinski

We will have an executive session later this afternoon with ballots for the Honorary Degree Candidates, as is our custom this time of year. Thank you to everyone who submitted nominations this year; we always like to have as many suggestions as possible. We had a healthy pool of nominees and also considered nominees from last year who were not previously selected for a degree. The committee members (Naima Shifa, Geoff Klinger, and me) presented our recommendations to our trustee counterparts, the Nominations and Trusteeship Committee. We worked together with them to determine a final slate of candidates. After the vote today our part of the process will be finished; the President’s Office will work on arrangements with the honorary degree recipients. The combined faculty and trustee committee believes the candidates on the ballot are excellent and represent the types of achievement we hope our students might aspire to after they graduate from DePauw.

Written Announcements –

CHD has no written announcements.

There were no questions for CHD.

Additional Business

14. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

First, I wish to say thank you to the Honorary Degree Committee. I echo what Michele Villinski said. This is an important thing that the faculty does. This is a real conversation and is exciting. I like the names that have come forward.

Next, I have a request. I wanted to inform the faculty about some major shifts in admissions that will happen this spring. We are going to see how best to engage the faculty in admissions recruiting. We have clear data that shows that our strongest admits respond extremely well to visits to campus that involve faculty. We have data showing that the yield moves up to about 80 percent when prospective students are involved with you during visits to DePauw or during receptions in different cities. This spring we are going to try to increase the number of events involving faculty on the campus as well as asking faculty to travel to admitted student events in different cities.

Third, I have news to share. As I think many of you have heard, DePauw today joined the Freedom Indiana Coalition to oppose amending the Indiana constitution to ban same-sex marriage. We joined this with Wabash College today and following Indiana University which joined the coalition last week. Thank you to President Gregory D. Hess of Wabash College. He is a great partner on this issue. I also wish to thank Jonathan Coffin for taking the lead on getting this issue through the Board and to the media.

There were no questions for President Casey.

15. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

As I was preparing for this position as VPAA, I received advice from other chief academic officers: “just listen and don’t do anything during your first year.” But I don’t think my boss is patient enough for this.

We are working on a grant-writing position. We have to build capability and the ability to get grants. The Office of Academic Affairs has already set up an office for this person. We wrote a grant proposal, and President Casey submitted the proposal to the granting agency. We will be moving forward with this new hire. We need to figure out what kind of person we want. Where should we search? What should the salary range be?

Bob Steele, Director of the Prindle Center for Ethics, and Dave Bohmer, Director of the Pulliam Center for Contemporary Media, are retiring this year. These are two very important searches. We are working on revisions to these job descriptions. Both positions are important parts of our academic program.

Today I will talk about four different areas as a follow-up to the discussions we had during the Faculty Institute. First, the faculty role in recruiting new students. A big part of our identity is our narrative and how we describe ourselves. I’m going to pick on one thing that I have heard lately: “DePauw is just like Indiana University only smaller.” We have had multiplication of programs and majors, but this doesn’t mean that DePauw is just like Indiana University only smaller. We need to communicate the vitality of our program. I don’t think our website conveys this. Some department websites effectively convey this but other department websites could be more effective. We are also looking at the materials we hand out to prospective students. I think that the materials are too generic. What is unique about DePauw? We are hosting receptions for prospective students in different cities. President Casey has called for volunteers to attend the receptions. Dave Berque and Terri Bonebright are keeping a list of volunteers and are coordinating with the Office of Admissions.

I come from a management background and my guiding principle is that “strategy is how we achieve our plans.” We have a great plan that commits us to being a great liberal arts college. A strategy is a plan in a stream of decisions. We make decisions all day long, such as how we involve students in our research and how we organize staff at the senior level. All these decisions help us achieve our goal. There is a need for consistency. We will get farther faster if we are all moving in the same direction. And some things seem small at the time but are made into big items.

Since moving back to the Midwest, I have appreciated the diversity of trees here. In Colorado, we have three types of trees: ponderosa pine, aspens (which are beautiful this time of year), and a juniper that looks like a weed. The trees in the Midwest are so much more diverse. As I walk across campus, I think what will the trees along Burkhardt Walk look like 20 years from now? The decisions we are making now – how will these affect DePauw 20 years from now?

We have heard a lot of feedback during the winter term faculty forums. The proposal has changed given the feedback. We are proposing to keep winter term the same length. We are also proposing that extra-curricular or co-curricular activities will be coupled with curricular experiences, i.e., actual courses. We think winter term teaching should count and be evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process. We are also interested in access. One idea that has been floated is students would receive an opportunity grant of \$3000 that would supplement their financial aid and provide them with access to the rich winter term opportunities. There are two committees involved with these discussions: CEL (Center for Experiential Learning) and CAPP (Committee on Academic Policy and Planning). We hope to bring a proposal to you during the next faculty meeting.

Next, I wish to discuss high-impact practices. Terri Bonebright sent an email with what we think we learned from the breakout sessions at the Faculty Institute. We know that high-impact practices have an effect on student learning. Students take the NSSE survey (National Survey of Student Engagement) and the results indicate that students are involved with high-impact practices. Students learn best when they have the opportunity to apply what they are learning and when they have the opportunity to synthesize what they are learning. The bottom line is that we need to have a more concerted effort associated with faculty development. There is a tension between content and process in teaching. I come from a content-rich discipline. But it’s often the process that’s more important than the content. Regarding student writing, I’m proud of the W program at DePauw, but there is concern that we are not getting the type of results we want through the W program. There is some interest in team teaching and linked courses and exposing students to more diverse viewpoints during one course. There are some faculty who are committed to service learning, and there are many faculty who don’t know anything about service learning. There are some different perspectives within departments regarding our curriculum and how students view our curriculum.

There is a book written by Andrew Grove, CEO of Intel. The title of the book is “Only the paranoid survive.” I think this is the kind of mentality we need to have with our teaching. How can we do it better?

I think that some of our committees seem to be gun-shy. COF is going about its routine business but I have given them a set of questions regarding the tenure and promotion process. Some of our policies look strange to me. We have been having a great discussion about these. I think COF has an obligation to bring the questions to the faculty and provide the opportunity to discuss these.

Some of the issues I have been concerned about regarding tenure and promotion are:

- Shouldn’t we have an explicit expectation regarding scholarship?
- Why aren’t tenure and promotion directly linked? Why are these separated?
- Why do we have an open file policy? How do we bring up real concerns about our colleagues while maintaining good relationships among our colleagues?

- What about external review? It's not that we need another hurdle. The reason for external review is to get our faculty's work out to a larger audience. This can be especially important during the interim review stage for junior colleagues. Advice from external reviewers can be very helpful.
- Why don't we continue reviewing faculty members after they have been promoted to full professor?
- What is the best way to award meritorious service? We currently award this through professorships and fellowships. Is this the right way to award meritorious service?

These are questions to help us move forward with "how do we get better?"

Two more things...

I think we need to make sure we reach every student. Every student matters. President Casey challenged us to think about student culture. This is an important dialogue. Do we have a university culture that brings out the best in our students? Student culture is important from the perspective of winter term. Students say that we can tweak winter term but that we're not going to change the student culture.

We now have an Academic Council. Members of the council include top staff members from Academic Affairs and Student Life. Dave Berque, Kelley Hall, and Cindy Babington produced a great report about the quality of our advising efforts. Perhaps we should send this to the faculty. There are four areas of action items that can be improved upon to improve our advising of students. This can have a big impact on our culture.

Question from a faculty member

Where are we in the move to a 3-2 teaching load?

Response from Larry Stimpert

This is a challenging issue, every bit as challenging as David Harvey said it was. My biggest concern is our ability to finance a move to a 3-2 teaching load. We're trying to understand our staffing needs. We pushed departments to see what the capacity of our academic program is. I think we're less tightly staffed than we think we are. One way to make this happen is to pull back release time. How much release time do we pull back and how much do we reserve? But part of the problem is that release time is not evenly spread across departments.

Question from another faculty member

You have talked about your expectations regarding research. Do you think that this expectation is directly connected to the 3-2 teaching load? I think these go hand in hand. I need time to produce quality research that could be published in top-tier journals. What do you think about the connection between these two issues?

Response from Larry Stimpert

There are faculty fellowships and other forms of release time. We should consider whether we are distributing these in the most equitable way across campus. I am concerned about the behavioral side of release time. I believe that not all of our colleagues would use release time effectively.

Follow-up question from faculty member

Are you saying that you think the 3-2 teaching load and research expectations are not connected? That a faculty member can teach a 3-3 load and meet research expectations?

Response from Larry Stimpert

Yes, correct.

Question from another faculty member

We have rebuilt the web site three times from the ground up during the last ten years. The web site is more dynamic than static. We have also redesigned the admissions materials, and I am impressed with what DePauw provides. I have a daughter who is a senior in high school. We receive hand-written notes from the Office of Admissions. I think we have recently spent tens of thousands of dollars redesigning our admissions materials and web site. Can you comment on this?

Response from Larry Stimpert

I think there is a lot of variation among departments. Our students are active. They are doing hands on research with faculty in research labs. I don't think we communicate this well enough to prospective students. We have some great pages on the web site, but I think there is room for improvement.

There were no additional questions for Larry Stimpert.

16. Old Business**From Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus)**

A. The Modern Languages department gives advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty approve the following changes to the departmental constitution. The sections of the departmental constitution outlining the department's governance structure and the existing language for the personnel committee and search can be found in Appendix D. Advance notice of different configurations were given in September 2013. Discussions that resulted from that advanced noticed led to the revised motion below.

Motion:

The Department of Modern Languages would like to follow standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to the membership of DPCs, with the following exception: if there are fewer than two members of a DPC with expertise in the language, the DPC may request, in consultation with the faculty member under review, the COF, and the VPAA, one or more members from outside the department with expertise in both the language and a related field.

The Department of Modern Languages would like to follow standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to search committees, except that we would like to retain a provision for weighted voting, giving faculty members in the corresponding language section of the department 50% of the vote.

Comments from Carrie Klaus, Chair of Modern Languages Department

I begin with a brief history. The Department of Modern Languages was formed in 1998 with the *Constitution*. In 2008-2009, we began to review the *Constitution*, and it was discussed over the course of several years. We looked particularly at our procedures with regard to personnel and search committees (the other items in the *Constitution* are mainly internal). As you know, we gave advanced notice in September of a motion to bring these procedures in line with University policy. That advance notice gave rise to more conversations within the department and with COF. The motion of which we are giving advanced notice today is the result of those conversations.

There are two main changes in the revised motion:

First, we would like to follow standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to the membership of DPCs, with the following exception: if there are fewer than two members of a DPC with expertise in the language, the DPC may request, in consultation with the faculty member under

review, the COF, and the VPAA, one or more members from outside the department with expertise in both the language and a related field.

Second, we would like to follow standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to search committees, except that we would like to retain a provision for weighted voting, giving faculty members in the corresponding language section of the department 50% of the vote.

Here is the rationale for the changes. The previous motion came from a majority vote, but not a unanimous one. Conversations led us to understand that COF's current position is that they are neutral, so we felt free to continue working on this issue and come to something close to consensus. We defer to the *Handbook* language as much as possible in this motion, so that we don't have to keep updating the departmental *Constitution* if/as language in the *Handbook* changes (much simpler).

The motion now says that fewer than two members of DPC with expertise in the language (not necessary as often); that we may request an outside member in consultation with the faculty member, COF, and the VPAA (more flexibility); and that the outside member of DPC must have expertise in both the language and a related field (higher bar).

We retain weighted voting, giving 50% of the vote to the corresponding language section, though not to outside members of a search committee (to maintain program autonomy, which was one of the key considerations at the time of the formation of the department)

Question from a faculty member

The motion says that the DPC may request additional members. Is it possible for the candidate to bring this up?

Response from Carrie Klaus

We discussed this and decided that it should be worded this way because the review is the task of the DPC. But the candidate can also initiate this discussion.

Question from another faculty member

The motion mentions a "related field"? Can you clarify what this means?

Response from Carrie Klaus

We thought it was most useful to leave this language broad. Most often when we bring in an outside member, it is someone from within the university. We don't want to define too narrowly or we may not find someone from within the university. We want to keep this broad but still recognize that this person must have the appropriate expertise.

B. Report on Academic Integrity Issues at DePauw, AY2012-13 (Dave Berque)

Report on Academic Year 2012-2013

1.) Historical Context: total reported violations

- In AY 2009-2010, there were 33 cases during fall/spring.
- In 2010-2011, 49 cases fall and spring.
- In 2011-2012, 45 cases fall and spring.
- Finally, in 2012-2013, 49 cases fall and spring.
- Typically only a very small number of cases during WT.

2.) Historical Context: reported violations beyond a first offense.

- In 2009-2010, there was one report beyond a first offense.
- In 2010-2011, there were five such reports.
- In 2011-2012, there were seven such reports.
- In 2012-2013, there were two such reports.

3.) Most first violations are concluded with settlement form.

- 2009-2010, 1 student did not sign form.
- 2010-2011, 6 students did not sign form.
- 2011-2012, 4 students did not sign form.
- 2012-2013, 7 students did not sign form.

4.) Primary types of academic dishonesty reported

- The vast majority of cases last year were some kind of plagiarism.
- Next were students cheating on a test or quiz.
- Large number of plagiarism cases is typical.

What does this mean? Is this a reflection of the importance we place on writing, on how much writing our students are doing? Conversely, is it a sign that we need to attend more to writing?

5.) Facilitated by technology in some cases, though these cases are not qualitatively different from “old-fashioned” academic dishonesty

- Many cases of cut-and paste from websites.
- A few cases of electronic copying from other students’ papers.
- Other cases included facilitating academic dishonesty by another student.

Recommendations from Academic Life

Academic Life has received the Academic Integrity report from the survey done by SLAAC last year. Among other things, the report asks Academic Life to make suggestions to the faculty about best practices, and presents some best practices in the report. Here are a few thoughts, but I welcome you to share your ideas with me:

- Be aware that practices vary from class to class. For example, some faculty members allow (encourage) students to share electronic copies of their papers for peer editing. Others discourage this.
- Because of this variation, be absolutely—excessively—clear about expectations such as permitted collaboration on group work, cell phone use during exams, etc.
- Treat citations explicitly in all writing assignments, at all levels.
- Have students practice paraphrasing in the context of your discipline.
- Help students manage their time by providing staged due dates.
- Think about the format and structure of your exams and assume that previous versions of exams are available to students.
- Be consistent in applying the Academic Integrity Policy. It can be heartbreaking to invoke the policy, but it is both heartbreaking and unfair if other students do not face similar consequences.

Academic Life is working on some of the other recommendations in the report, most notably a request for us to publish an annual summary of academic integrity violations on a web site, and to make this information available to *The DePauw* each fall. I am considering the most appropriate level of detail to supply, as well as

the best publication venue, and welcome suggestions on this or anything else.

There is a Teaching Roundtable scheduled for November 13th on the topic of Academic Integrity. Watch for an email with more details.

Comment from a faculty member

The process of reporting academic integrity violations seems burdensome.

Response from Dave Berque

There is no question that some faculty members avoid the process because the process is burdensome.

There were no additional questions or comments about academic integrity issues.

There was no other old business to come before the faculty.

17. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

18. Announcements (Bridget Gourley)

Please note we are still looking for a couple of volunteers to serve on committees with vacancies.

A. Remaining Committee Vacancies

One volunteer, Carla Edwards, agreed to fill one of the Division 1 Grievance Committee vacancies. Thank you! All other vacant positions announced in October are still vacant. If eligible for any of the positions please consider serving.

19. Executive Session to Consider Honorary Degrees (Brian Casey and Naima Shifa)

The faculty entered executive session to consider honorary degrees.

20. Adjournment

After the executive session to consider honorary degrees, the meeting was adjourned.

Appendices

Appendix A. Time bank usage

Schedule Distribution, Spring 2014

Courses	721
Labs	76
Total	797

Time	M	T	W	TR	F
8:00	3.0%	0.6%	3.1%	1.0%	2.9%
8:20	4.0%	4.1%	4.1%	4.4%	2.9%
8:40	4.3%	5.4%	4.6%	6.3%	2.9%
9:00	3.9%	6.0%	4.3%	6.9%	2.8%
9:20	8.7%	6.0%	9.0%	6.9%	7.0%
9:40	8.7%	5.8%	8.9%	6.9%	6.9%
10:00	7.7%	8.4%	7.9%	9.3%	6.9%
10:20	10.2%	8.8%	10.2%	9.5%	9.4%
10:40	10.0%	8.9%	10.0%	9.7%	9.3%
11:00	10.0%	8.3%	10.0%	9.0%	9.3%
11:20	9.0%	7.9%	9.4%	8.8%	8.3%
Lunch					
12:40	8.0%	8.2%	8.5%	8.2%	6.8%
13:00	8.0%	8.2%	8.5%	8.2%	6.8%
13:20	8.0%	8.2%	8.5%	8.2%	6.8%
13:40	5.8%	7.3%	6.3%	7.2%	4.6%
14:00	5.8%	7.2%	6.3%	7.0%	4.6%
14:20	8.7%	8.2%	9.7%	8.2%	5.3%
14:40	8.5%	8.2%	9.5%	8.2%	5.3%
15:00	6.8%	8.2%	7.8%	8.2%	3.4%
15:20	6.8%	7.7%	7.8%	7.7%	3.4%
15:40	6.0%	5.1%	6.5%	5.1%	3.4%
16:00	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
19:00	0.1%	1.6%	0.3%	1.3%	0.0%
20:00	0.1%	1.6%	0.3%	1.3%	0.0%

Appendix B. Potential handbook changes to allow for a consent agenda for routine business

FGSC gives advance notice of intent to have the faculty vote on the following motion at the <insert spring month> 2014 Faculty Meeting:

Motion: That the faculty approve changes to faculty meeting allowing for a consent agenda to address routine business. This motion requires several changes to the academic handbook, which are shown as an appendix.

Rationale: This motion was suggested by a colleague and considered by the FGSC. It is in line with goals to make faculty governance more effective and less burdensome. This would allow the faculty to handle routine business as a block leaving more time for meaningful discussion during faculty meeting. Any faculty member may object to any item on the consent agenda, thus moving it to the proper order of business for full consideration.

Appendix:

Revisions to Academic Handbook:

(Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike-through~~; text to be inserted is shown in **bold**.)

Changes under Faculty Meetings:

3. Voting

- a. Full-time faculty members holding positions with academic or nominal rank, including those on sabbatical, pre-tenure, or academic leave, may vote. (See [Article I.B of the Personnel Policies](#) for a definition of full-time faculty positions.) The President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Registrar also have voting privileges.
- b. Faculty members in part-time positions may attend faculty meetings and participate in debate, but not vote; however, Senior (Emeriti) Professors are eligible to vote during any semester in which they are teaching at least one course.
- c. A quorum shall consist of 40% of the faculty eligible to vote and not on approved leave (rounded to the nearest whole number). This number shall be determined for each semester by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, using the faculty roster as of the Friday immediately preceding the first faculty meeting of each semester. Immediately after the call to order at the first faculty meeting of each semester, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall announce the quorum requirement for that semester. The next order of business after the call to order at each faculty meeting shall be the verification of a quorum by the Chair of the Faculty; (for the first meeting of the semester, the quorum verification shall occur after the Vice President for Academic Affairs has announced the requirement).
- d. All voting in meetings, unless otherwise stipulated, shall be by show of hands. However, at the request of any faculty member the vote shall be by secret ballot.
- e. **Any voting faculty member may object to including an item on the Consent Agenda. Such an objection will result in full debate of the item under the appropriate order of business.**

4. Order of Business

At all regular faculty meetings the following items must be included in the order of business:

- 1) Call to order and verification of quorum,
- 2) ~~Correction and approval of minutes,~~ **Consent Agenda,**
 - a) **Approval of minutes**
 - b) **Approval of new courses (as needed)**
 - c) **Approval of election results (as needed)**
 - d) **Conferring of baccalaureate degrees (as needed)**
 - e) **Other routine matters (as needed)**
- 3) Reports from coordinating committees,

- 4) Reports from other committees,
 - 5) Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs,
 - 6) Remarks from the President,
 - 7) Old business,
 - 8) New business,
 - 9) Announcements, and
 - 10) Adjournment.
5. Parliamentary Procedure
- a. The following shall be circulated at least three days before each faculty meeting: copies of the minutes of the last meeting and an agenda including the specific committee motions to be voted on at the next meeting **including the exact text of the consent agenda**. All committee motions on which there is to be a vote at a faculty meeting must have been announced in the agenda circulated before that meeting.
 - b. All business shall be conducted according to proper parliamentary procedure as set forth in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

Appendix C. Report on the GLCA Academic Council Meeting, September 27-28, 2013
Sherry Mou

On September 27 & 28, Sherry Mou attended the GLCA Academic Council meeting in Ann Arbor, MI. Representatives from each campus gave an updates on their academic programs and the GLCA staff presented on consortial initiatives. Greg Wegner, GLCA Director of Program Development reported on a series of new programs, and I would like to draw your attention to the following:

1. GLCA Expanding Collaboration Initiative: A new Mellon-funded program, it supports collaborative curricular initiatives from several campuses. Examples of such collaborations may include Undergraduate Research, Digital Humanities, Hybrid Courses, Globalization of the Curriculum, and Joint Summer Institutes.
2. GLCA Library of Congress Research Initiative: The pilot program between the GLCA and the Library of Congress develops research seminars for which a team of students, a faculty mentor, and a home campus librarian work for ten days at the Library of Congress during the summer (July 28-August 6, 2014) with designated research librarians at the Library of Congress. The program has expanded to include teams from the Global Liberal Arts Alliance institutions from around the world. Three teams will be selected this year. Deadline for application is February 7, 2014.
3. The GLAA (Global Liberal Arts Alliance): The program has thirteen international institutions now. It may be adding one or two more schools from India and Japan.
4. The Lattice for Pedagogy Research and Practice: A new consortial program, funded by the Teagle Foundation, it will fund research projects, digital communication network, and other collaborations among faculty members and chief academic officers across campuses on works related to pedagogy.

Detailed descriptions of all these programs can be found on the GLCA website at GLCA.org (click the Programs for a drop-down menu).

Appendix D. Excerpts from the Department of Modern Languages Constitution approved by the faculty in May 1998

Department structure

The Department of Modern Languages shall consist of five major language program units with a Department Chair and four language-section coordinators who shall represent the interests of each language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Asian—the Department Chair shall represent his/her own language, and Italian and Portuguese will be represented by the Spanish coordinator). To the extent possible, all decisions affecting the department as a whole and/or individual language programs within the department shall be arrived at via consensus among the Department Chair, the section coordinators, and the members of each language section.

Department Personnel Committee

The Department Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall consist of all continuing tenure and term faculty members of the department. It shall exclude the person being reviewed, those in their first year of service, and (with the exception noted below) those serving in full-time administrative positions. Departmental faculty members on leave may participate at their discretion. Nontenured members may withdraw from any case. The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being recruited or evaluated—including, as needed or appropriate, selected faculty from the Area Studies programs. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from this area of expertise or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee shall select additional tenured members according to a procedure established by COF and the administration. The additional members shall be drawn from the faculty of related departments or programs but may include departmental members serving in full-time administrative positions. When considering a recommendation from a search committee, the DPC shall include two members from other departments, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

For example, in the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Japanese or Chinese, the majority membership of the DPC (in number or weighted votes) would be from tenured, tenure-track or term faculty in the Asian Studies program. In the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Russian, they would be from the Russian Studies program. In the case of German—where no German Studies program exists—such majority members would be from tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty in related departments who have some expertise in this language or its culture.

In order to streamline and facilitate these DPC evaluative procedures, the DPC of the Department of Modern Languages will normally delegate the responsibility for drafting the initial report to a representative subcommittee. The exact configuration, charge, and procedures of such a subcommittee shall be agreed upon by the DPC as a whole in consultation with the AVP, and its membership shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being evaluated.

Department Search Committee

If there is a new or vacant full-time position in any language section within the Department of Modern Languages, a departmental Search Committee shall be formed, comprised of all the full-time faculty of that particular language, selected faculty members from the Studies program (when appropriate), the Department Chair, and no fewer than two representatives from the other language sections. The Search Committee's functions shall be those specified in the Academic Handbook.

**Appendix E. Department of Modern Languages Full Constitution
as approved by the faculty in May 1998**

Department structure – The Department of Modern Languages shall consist of five major language program units with a Department Chair and four language-section coordinators who shall represent the interests of each language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Asian—the Department Chair shall represent his/her own language, and Italian and Portuguese will be represented by the Spanish coordinator). There shall be monthly meetings of the section coordinators with the Department Chair, and the entire department will meet as a group at least twice per semester. The individual language sections will meet as often as needed to conduct their business. To the extent possible, all decisions affecting the department as a whole and/or individual language programs within the department shall be arrived at via consensus among the Department Chair, the section coordinators, and the members of each language section. The Department Chair shall be appointed to a three-year renewable term only after discussion with all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the language sections. As per standard faculty procedures, COF and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs shall be responsible for conducting these discussions and making this appointment. As feasible, the position of Department Chair shall be rotated among the tenured members of the department (with preference to those who are serving or who have served as section coordinators), with no Department Chair normally serving for more than two consecutive terms. Section coordinators shall be selected annually by the faculty of those language sections. There shall be no limitations on the term of section coordinators. Among the other responsibilities of the Department Chair (as outlined in the Academic Handbook) shall be the support and development of all the foreign-language programs at DePauw, with particular attention to the needs of the smaller programs

Department faculty – The Department of Modern Languages, in the fall of 1998, shall consist of the following: five full-time professors of Spanish (who shall also be responsible for Italian and Portuguese), four of French, two of German, one of Russian, and one of Japanese. There shall also be part-time instructors, as needed, for Chinese, Spanish, French, Italian, German, Russian, Portuguese, and Japanese. The language section, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall be responsible for selecting and recommending to the AVP the appointment of part-time instructors in their language. Faculty titles shall designate rank in the primary language field, e.g. Associate Professor of Russian, Professor of Spanish, etc. and not in “Modern Languages.”

Department Personnel Committee – The Department Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall consist of all continuing tenure and term faculty members of the department. It shall exclude the person being reviewed, those in their first year of service, and (with the exception noted below) those serving in full-time administrative positions. Departmental faculty members on leave may participate at their discretion. Nontenured members may withdraw from any case. The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being recruited or evaluated—including, as needed or appropriate, selected faculty from the Area Studies programs. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from this area of expertise or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee shall select additional tenured members according to a procedure established by COF and the administration. The additional members shall be drawn from the faculty of related departments or programs but may include departmental members serving in full-time administrative positions. When considering a recommendation from a search committee, the DPC shall include two members from other departments, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

For example, in the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Japanese or Chinese, the majority membership of the DPC (in number or weighted votes) would be from tenured, tenure-track or term faculty in the Asian Studies program. In the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Russian, they would be from the Russian Studies program. In the case of German—where no German Studies program exists—such

majority members would be from tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty in related departments who have some expertise in this language or its culture.

In order to streamline and facilitate these DPC evaluative procedures, the DPC of the Department of Modern Languages will normally delegate the responsibility for drafting the initial report to a representative subcommittee. The exact configuration, charge, and procedures of such a subcommittee shall be agreed upon by the DPC as a whole in consultation with the AVP, and its membership shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being evaluated.

Department Search Committee – If there is a new or vacant full-time position in any language section within the Department of Modern Languages, a departmental Search Committee shall be formed, comprised of all the full-time faculty of that particular language, selected faculty members from the Studies program (when appropriate), the Department Chair, and no fewer than two representatives from the other language sections. The Search Committee’s functions shall be those specified in the Academic Handbook.

Language curricula – The teaching faculty of each language—in consultation with the Department Chair and the Director and members of the area studies program committees (the latter where appropriate) and subject to the approval of the AVP—shall have the responsibility for deciding and maintaining the curriculum for that language and the most effective teaching methodology to be used for that language. While there are implicit curricular and methodological similarities between the teaching of French and Spanish, for example, there are far fewer between French and Japanese or Spanish and Russian. Different languages often require different approaches to maximize student learning. Some autonomy and self-determination among the different languages must be preserved in both the nature of the courses offered and the manner in which those courses are taught. Therefore, curricular matters affecting a single language program may be deliberated, but no matters may be decided without the majority agreement of the language section involved. Language sections shall be responsible for consultations and obligations shared with area studies colleagues outside the department.

Teaching workloads and class size – The normal teaching workload for all full-time faculty in the Department of Modern Languages shall be equivalent to three (1-credit) courses per semester. The Department Chair shall receive no fewer than two courses released time per year plus a stipend. Section coordinators shall receive neither released time nor stipend. Class size shall be no larger than 25 students without the consent of the instructor. Classes of fewer than 5 students may or may not count toward the normal teaching load—depending, for example, on whether a course is required for the major, whether it is integral to a particular language program, whether it is an upper-level offering or an introductory one, and the availability of other sections and/or staff. In such cases, a decision shall be made only after discussion among the faculty member involved, the section coordinator, the Department Chair, and the approval of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Courses offered as independent study, over and above the normal teaching load, shall be at the discretion of the individual faculty member, the section coordinator, and the Department Chair.

Faculty offices and classrooms – To the extent possible (and at the discretion of the individual faculty member), all faculty of the Department of Modern Languages shall have offices in proximity to each other and to the office of the Department of Modern Languages. The new Department of Modern Languages shall have its main office located on the lower-level of East College. -Selection of faculty offices shall be according to seniority, or as otherwise appropriate.

Department annual budget – As one of the largest academic departments at DePauw (slightly smaller than the English and HPP departments and the School of Music), the Department of Modern Languages must have an adequate annual budget. The heterogeneous nature of the department will also require proportionately

higher expenditures than those of a department where all the faculty are teaching the same subject matter and tend to share certain teaching materials, supplies, and equipment. This is particularly true of audio-visual and computer materials—each language requires its own collection and its own software. Therefore, the annual budget for the Department of Modern Languages must be commensurate with, but no less than, that of other academic departments of similar size (measured by the number of full-time and part-time staff). All department funds pertaining to telephone and photocopy usage, permanent equipment, AV materials purchases, and other teaching-related expenditures (such as available work-study help) shall be distributed proportionally among the various languages wherever possible according to a formula agreed upon by the section coordinators in consultation with the Department Chair. Similarly, shared equipment and space in language-equipped classrooms shall be circulated or allocated by agreement with the section coordinators in consultation with the Department Chair. Prize funds, endowed library funds, etc. which are designated for specific language programs remain for the language sections to spend at their discretion, whereas work-study money, the Walker Prize Fund, etc. now shared with other language sections shall be appropriated through consultation by approximately the same guidelines as have prevailed before the formation of the Department of Modern Languages.

Faculty offices and classrooms – To the extent possible (and at the discretion of the individual faculty member), all faculty of the Department of Modern Languages should have offices in proximity to each other and to the departmental office. Ideally, the offices of Global Teaching Fellows and Language Assistants should also be in close proximity. The office of the Department of Modern Languages is located on the first floor of East College. Selection of faculty offices is according to seniority, or as otherwise appropriate. As a department we believe that classroom configuration is an important factor in successful foreign language instruction (i.e. rooms that are carpeted with movable chairs, that have built-in media and computer technology, sufficient blackboard space, good acoustics). Common-area study spaces for each language should be located in proximity to faculty offices for those languages. Decor and use will be decided by individual language sections.

Department annual budget – As one of the largest academic departments at DePauw (slightly smaller than the English department and the School of Music), the Department of Modern Languages should have an adequate annual budget. The heterogeneous nature of the department also requires proportionately higher expenditures than those of a department where all the faculty are teaching the same subject matter and tend to share certain teaching materials, supplies, and equipment. This is particularly true of audio-visual and computer materials—each language requires its own collection and its own software. All department funds pertaining to telephone and photocopy usage, permanent equipment, AV materials purchases, and other teaching-related expenditures (such as available work-study help) shall be distributed proportionally among the various language programs, wherever possible.

Evaluation of the new departmental structure – During the 2000-2001 academic year, the new Department of Modern Languages will conduct a self-evaluation. All members of the department will be asked to assess the new department structure and to make recommendations for any changes deemed necessary to improve the efficiency and overall operation of the department. The structural plan of the department as a whole may be modified as agreed upon by a majority vote of the language sections.

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
December 2nd, 2013**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom, Chair of Faculty (Bridget Gourley)

As we get started let me make a couple reminders. If you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings, please check that it is silenced.

While I know it seems our community is small enough we should all know each other, we always have new individuals in our community so if you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself.

Lastly, the acoustics in here mean that for everyone to be able to fully participate we need the microphones. Please allow us to pass you one and give Clay a minute to bring up the volume.

2. Verification of Quorum

We reached our quorum of 85 members.

3. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of Minutes from the November 2013 Faculty Meeting

B. Confer Degrees for December Graduates

The faculty authorizes the Board of Trustees to confer degrees on candidates eligible for graduation at the conclusion of the semester ending in December 2013.

There were no requests in advance of the meeting to move any items from the consent agenda to the main agenda. There were no requests during the meeting to move an item. There were no objections to approving the consent agenda. The consent agenda was approved.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

A. CAPP gives advance notice of intent to have the faculty vote on the following three motions at the February 2014 Faculty Meeting.

Motion 1:

That the number of what are currently called "Winter Term" experiences required for graduation be reduced from three to two. The required changes to the University Catalog can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Motion 2:

That while students may in general fulfill what are now called "Winter Term obligations" (currently bearing the working name "Extended Studies opportunities" or ESOs) by participating in any activity that has been granted WT/ESO status, at least one of the WT/ESO activities required for graduation must be taken during the January/Winter Term or the May Term period. The required changes to the University Catalog can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Motion 3:

That the sentence in the Academic Handbook stating that “Faculty members also must teach periodically in the Winter Term program” be suspended for a period of three years (one WT cycle), pending reevaluation at the end of that three-year period. The required changes to the Academic Handbook can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Rationale for Motions 1 and 3:

For the last few months, CAPP has been in discussions with VPAA Stimpert, the Committee on Experiential Learning (CEL), and various other campus offices about looking at what is currently called Winter Term in a new way. Based on these discussions and on feedback from faculty and student forums held in the last several weeks, CAPP is proposing an expansion of the Winter Term program into something that has had the working name of Extended Studies and that includes various types of academic and co-curricular offerings. A more detailed explanation of the current (but not final) imagining of the Extended Studies program can be found in Appendices A and B of this agenda. This framework is still under refinement. In the two months between the release of this agenda and the meeting in which the faculty will be asked to vote, updated information will be publicized as it becomes available. The details will not materially affect the substance of the motions on which the faculty is being asked to vote.

CAPP has heard strong opinions on both “pro” and “con” sides about the twin issues of required participation for students and for faculty. While CAPP believes that moving to a model of voluntary participation on the part of faculty is in the long-term best interests in the program, and hopes that by some point in the not-too-distant future Extended Studies has become a strong, self-sustaining program based entirely on voluntary participation by both faculty and students and is something that both students and faculty actively look forward to taking part in, CAPP also feels that responsible stewardship of the academic health of the program and the graduation requirements of the university calls for a gradual lessening of obligation rather than an immediate and complete release. CAPP proposes that an initial step which reduces but does not yet eliminate required Winter Term/Extended Studies experiences for students, coupled with a trial period in which mandatory faculty participation in Winter Term/Extended Studies activities is suspended, will provide a way to pilot an Extended Studies program with increased offerings and reduced obligation without undue risk to the immediate viability of the program.

Please refer to Appendices A and B for a more detailed picture of the Extended Studies proposal.

Rationale for Motion 2:

CAPP presents this motion as a referendum, without either endorsing or opposing it. This motion came to us from VPAA Stimpert, with the caveat that the deans and staff of Academic Affairs are not unanimously either in favor of or against the proposal.

It seems probable that some form of what we have been calling Extended Studies is likely going to be implemented, as it seems to align well with the ways in which many faculty and students believe our program can be strengthened. If this happens, DePauw will be able to offer academic and co-curricular courses and activities previously limited to Winter Term and May Term at other times during the calendar year. The impetus for Motion 2 comes from the sense that for many people (including students, faculty, alumni, and trustees) the traditional Winter Term period in January and the May Term period are periods that have been deliberately set aside with an intentional focus on meaningful academic and co-curricular inquiry, that these “timebanks” are valuable for that very reason, and that the degree of value is such that institutionalized requirements should be in place to ensure that they remain viable in a sea of other “timebank” options (spring/fall break, summer, etc.).

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

CAPP is pleased to give advance notice of these three motions. Regarding motion #2, not everyone is in agreement on this, and there are good arguments on both sides. Regarding motion #3, we have discussed a lot of ideas. We think the best way to do this is to expand the range of options for faculty members. The programs would be more inclusive and would include a variety of less traditional activities plus traditional activities that are not typically offered outside of the regular semesters.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

While debate of this motion will occur in at the next faculty meeting in February and VPAA Stimpert may have some additional comments to make during his remarks, if anyone would like to ask a clarifying question that will help you in thinking about this important issue, please ask it now.

Question from Kevin Kinney

I recognize that the motions are a preliminary approach and that there are a lot of points that remain to be hammered out. Are we going to get those details before we vote or are we voting on the vagueness of this motion?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Yes, the motions are vague. We will be working on the some of the details during winter term. I'm not comfortable asking you to vote on something that is vague. From my perspective, we will present the details to you in January, and then we will vote during the faculty meeting in February.

Comment from Bridget Gourley

The first faculty meeting of spring semester is Feb 4th. There will be one full week of classes before the faculty meeting. We may have some open forums during this week to discuss the issues. Editor's note: Since the faculty meeting open meetings have been scheduled for Wednesday January 29 at 11:30 am and Thursday January 30 at 4:00 pm, both in the Julian Auditorium.

Follow-up comment from Kevin Kinney

This is important because some of us will be gone during winter term so it will be helpful to have time to read more about the specific details and discuss them.

Question from Alicia Suarez

If the obligatory part of winter term is suspended, how will faculty who do participate be compensated or rewarded?

Response from Larry Stimpert, VPAA

The rough plan is that you would provide two types of offerings. If you teach an experiential course, like we currently do during winter term, faculty members would be compensated with a stipend. Alternatively, if you teach a curricular course for a ½ unit of credit that is graded, faculty members would receive half a unit of teaching credit, and the credit could be banked for a future year or a sabbatical.

Question from David Worthington

These motions are not contingent on each other, correct? Could we vote in favor of motions 1 and 2 and vote against motion 3?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Yes. I think the bigger issue is it is very likely that changes to winter term will be decided by the administration. A new and larger program will evolve. As a result, what we understand winter term to be will

change. The parts that need faculty approval are actually quite small. There is a lot involved here that faculty do not have much control over by voting. For example, the faculty could decide to vote down motion #1. But motion #3 is an advisory to the administration. The portion of the Academic Handbook that addresses faculty work load isn't subject to faculty vote.

Follow-up comment from David Worthington

So fundamentally, this is "window dressing." The administration can override our decision. What we do here has no real impact.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

I think what we do here matters a lot. The voting is where we have the opportunity to shape the direction of winter term. When it comes down to a vote, we can either say yes or no, but we haven't put anything in its place. The faculty has control over graduation requirements, but only as they are presented to us from a menu provided by the Board and the administration. It's not under our control to change the menu completely.

Comments from David Guinee

I do think it matters. We do have control over the curriculum. We do get to decide if students are required to do 2 or 3 winter terms. Some people want it to be 0. Some of these things are steps toward larger changes that are evolving over time. There doesn't seem to be a groundswell among students or alumni about abolishing winter term. Having anything required during winter term may eventually go away. We're also giving faculty the option to decide if students can receive winter term credit in other ways.

Comments from Anne Harris

I'm not speaking on behalf of the Committee for Experiential Learning. The Committee for Experiential Learning is eager to support details as they crystallize. My opinion is that I hope this process can help clarify the importance of two issues to the administration. First, winter term is not validated during the review process of faculty members. Second, there is no faculty development support for winter term, such as pedagogical workshops.

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Yes, we have been talking about this. Thank you for mentioning this.

Question from Akshat Vyas

David Guinee suggested that students will receive credit for summer research. Will we have the opportunity to vote on whether students will receive credit for summer research projects, including SRF?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

I anticipate we will provide general guidelines to help individual departments decide what they think students should be doing to receive credit for this time period. We will leave it up to each department to decide what types of projects would count, and we anticipate integration with existing programs, such as summer research.

Comment from Bridget Gourley

Eventually we will have more specifics about extended studies opportunities. We will retain that decision-making in the future.

Comments from Larry Stimpert, VPAA

To speak to David Worthington's point, these issues have everything to do with the faculty. Let's address the so-called "elephant in the room." As soon as Bridget Gourley sent the agenda out, I got a note from David Harvey, the previous VPAA, confirming that there is a section of the faculty handbook regarding faculty

workload that was written by the administration. This section is not approved by the faculty. We can rewrite this administratively. We would appreciate input and advising. Motion #3 comes from the part of the handbook that doesn't require faculty approval. Regarding the nature of our curriculum, the faculty owns this and will have complete discretion over these issues.

Question from Howard Pollack-Milgate

I am confused about the difference between extended studies credit and academic credit. Can we use different terminology to differentiate these?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Academic credit is academic credit, such as 0.5 credit or 1.0 credit. Extended studies credit is co-curricular credit. This shows up on the student's transcript but doesn't count as academic credit. There are cases where co-curricular activities, such as SRF, are reflected on a student's transcript.

Question from Jeff Hansen

Can you clarify about how these different types of credit would affect student financial aid?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Anything associated with academic credit would be covered by financial aid.

There were no more questions or comments for CAPP regarding the motions.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has no written announcements.

There were no other questions for CAPP.

5. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

A. MAO's report is an offer to answer questions.

Announcements –

MAO has no written announcements.

There were no questions for MAO.

6. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

A. COF's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its normal work for the year.

There were no questions for COF.

7. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

1. SLAAC work related to the academic integrity policy and process continues.
2. SLAAC is beginning discussions about the conflict of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities with classes. The conversation is preliminary and they anticipate conferring with other committees, particularly MAO and Athletic Board as the conversations move forward.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

8. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

FGSC's written announcements bring you up to date on our activities since we last met. If you have feedback about the potential reconfiguration of CAPP and MAO into an overarching Curriculum Committee please share your thoughts with any member of FGSC, CAPP or MAO.

- A. FGSC's report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

1. FGSC has consulted on the "Extended Studies Opportunities" proposal.
2. FGSC plans to have a joint meeting with CAPP and MAO very early in the spring term related to bringing the governance work of CAPP and MAO together with the goal of providing advance notice of a plan the faculty could consider in February to vote in March and implement for AY14-15. If anyone has any feedback about this issue please share it with any member of CAPP, MAO or FGSC so it can be considered as these groups debate the merits of this reorganization.
3. Other issues have been raised with the FGSC and we plan to address them before the semester ends.

There were no questions for FGSC.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

9. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

- A. FDC's report consists of an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

FDC has no written announcements.

There were no questions for FDC.

10. Committee on Administration – COA (Meryl Altman)

- A. COA anticipates providing an update on their work during the fall semester.

Comments from Meryl Altman

At the beginning of the semester, Larry Stimpert asked COA to consider two questions. First, whether DePauw ought to institute some kind of post-tenure reporting and review; and second, whether DePauw should address the issue of "merit pay" in a different way than how we do it now.

While this is very much a work in progress, we have come to consensus on some general approaches which we

want to share with you.

To the second question, we're agreed that rather than come up with a new "merit pay" system, we should work with the approach we currently have – a set of incentives tied to particular projects, plus some freestanding awards for achievement that do not become part of the base salary – while finding ways to address the problems people see with the current system, which include concerns about a lack of transparency to the process, and a sense that the awards are not as well spread across the faculty as they might ideally be.

To the first question, we're agreed that we do think it would be valuable to have some sort of system of post-tenure reporting and feedback that would be developmental in nature, and meaningful without being burdensome.

Finally, the committee agreed that we should keep these two issues separate, that post-tenure review should not be linked to pay.

So that's as far as we've gotten. For both questions, COA is going to continue to discuss the details of what might work well. We thank those colleagues who shared ideas and resources with us, and invite people to continue to do so by writing either to me, or to Scott Spiegelberg who will become chair in the spring when I'm away. I'd like to thank the committee and Larry as well for some very productive discussions.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

There were no questions for COA.

Additional Business

11. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

Comments from Bridget Gourley

On behalf of President Casey, Christopher Wells and Doug Reddington (Manager of Campus Project Implementation) will be sharing some highlights about the new dining hall and Union Building renovation projects, which include the Wallace Stewart Faculty Room. These remarks will help frame upcoming campus conversations about these spaces.

Comments from Christopher Wells, Vice President for Communications and Strategic Initiatives

The Hoover Dining Hall project is part of the overall Campus Master Plan for DePauw, approved by the Board of Trustees in 2010 and designed to make the core of campus a place of greater connection, contemplation, and creativity. The funding supporting this project comes primarily from a number of large gifts and donations, including the lead gift from Dave and Suzanne Hoover, and a gift from Sarah Wallace and Jim B. Stewart supporting the creation of a Faculty Dining Room.

The design conversations for this project began this past spring, and have included faculty, staff, and students. Dave Berque and Terri Bonebright have represented the faculty on the design team.

In May, the Board's Buildings and Grounds Committee of the met with the Sustainability Committee. We agreed on a set of recommendations about how to use the new dining hall to demonstrate our commitment to environmental sustainability. We are currently identifying potential ways to design the building in an environmentally responsible manner. Some of these are large ticket items that come with significant financial cost and practical challenges. We will be hosting faculty forums to discuss the relevant issues associated with

this project.

The new dining facility will replace the Hub, which currently serves meals to more than 1,000 students daily. The Hub is not equipped to meet this task and does not provide the ideal environment for personal interactions on campus. The new dining hall will provide new spaces for conversation over meals, fostering community and collaboration.

Hoover Hall is expected to serve between 1,100 and 1,300 students daily, in addition to faculty, staff, and visitors. The current design includes four separate dining spaces for smaller groups, in addition to the Wallace-Stewart Dining Room. Some site preparation work will take place soon, but the main construction effort will not begin until May 2014. The project is expected to be completed by the fall of 2016. Construction in the center of campus will therefore span two academic years. A number of offices on campus will need to make adjustments to the construction. For example, the Office of Admissions will be promoting a new dining hall when there is only a big hole in the ground. However, the construction project should not affect pedagogy on campus. Details of the project's implementation will be communicated to the campus community through periodic e-mails, the University website, and a timeline to be posted in the Hub.

Comments from Doug Reddington, Manager of Campus Project Implementation

The overall site plan shows East College to the north and Hanna Street to the south. This project will be transformational for the campus. There are three separate components of the project. The existing kitchen in the Hub will be demolished, and an outdoor plaza will be constructed between the Hub and the new dining hall. This will provide a connection between the historic parts of campus (e.g. East College) and Bowman Park. The new dining hall is designed to be a porous hall. People can enter from the east (through the plaza) or from the west (Burkhardt Walk).

The first floor plan shows the main dining hall located on the north side of the building. This takes advantage of the nice views of East College. On the south side of the building, the loading dock will be concealed to minimize visibility. People will enter the dining hall from the east and west. The entries will lead into a pay area where students will swipe their id cards, then into a circulation pattern that goes around the servery in the center of the building. The various venues in the servery will have different kinds of foods. An elevator will connect the servery with the kitchen below.

The main dining room is in the north end of the building. There are smaller gathering areas to the east and west of the main dining hall. There are bay windows located along the north wall of the building. The central gathering area faces a fireplace, and a stairway leads to a mezzanine on the upper level. The Wallace-Stewart dining room for faculty is located in the southwest portion of the building and has its own restrooms. There are four special dining rooms that can be reserved for meetings. The rooms vary in size and can accommodate 15 to 45 people. The upper mezzanine opens to the main dining area. Large windows in the mezzanine will provide natural light. There is a beverage station and a dish return located between the servery and the main dining room.

In the lower level, the center is the loading dock with an elevator to unload food and supplies. The kitchen is laid out to maximize the efficiency of preparing food. There are stations for catering, bakery, hot and cold food preparations, and dishwashing. The mechanical, electrical, and plumbing will be housed in the lower level. There is an elevator to take trash out to the trash containers in the loading dock.

Comments from Bridget Gourley on behalf of Jen Everett

I've been asked to read a question regarding the dining hall project from Jen Everett who is away on sabbatical: "David Orr argues that campus buildings and the processes by which they are built constitute a kind of 'crystalized pedagogy' that inevitably teach students what the so-called grownups of the world value,

what they think is important, and what they think is possible. In some of the courses I teach, it would make sense to use the construction of this new dining hall as an 'object lesson' for exploring DePauw's institutional priorities. Indeed, I suspect faculty members across many disciplines could exploit the curricular potential of this building project in ways that suit their own teaching and learning goals.

"I have two questions:

"First, has the administration actively considered the pedagogical lessons the new dining hall will impart in its decision-making about what 'sustainability interventions' are worth pursuing, or have economic and technological matters played the determining role? That in itself would be important for faculty and students to know.

"Second, if I were to construct course content interrogating Orr's claim that the construction of campus buildings typically teaches students that '[campus] architecture is the prerogative of power and not [the prerogative] of those who teach or learn,' using this building as a case study, would the administration cooperate by making the design and decision-making process wholly transparent?"

Response from Christopher Wells

Regarding the first question, have pedagogical considerations played a part? At this point, we are considering options on this front, and have not ruled anything out. Doug has helped make sure that the Sustainability Committee is involved. I represent both Communications and the Sustainability Committee. There are a lot of challenges, including financial considerations and pedagogical considerations. There is a lot of work yet to be done.

Regarding the second question, the concern is in terms of those who teach and learn vs. those who have power. We are ensuring that the design process is transparent to faculty and other groups. I do not think there is a concern, but I recognize that it is important that everyone has an opportunity to speak to the relevant issues and have their voices heard. There is no hidden piece of the planning process, but the decision making process is complex. We may not satisfy everyone's concerns.

Question from Dana Dudle

Several years ago, I was on a campus planning committee. The committee went away because we hired a consultant to develop a campus plan. I was wondering how Dave Berque and Terri Bonebright came to be involved in the decision-making process? I am also wondering about the specific sustainability issues that have been adopted and the specific sustainability issues that haven't been decided on yet. I'm not on the Sustainability Committee, but presumably there are e-mails regarding who is making these decisions. Can you give some specific examples?

Response from Christopher Wells

Regarding faculty representation, Dave Berque and Terri Bonebright were selected to handle the process of working with the outside consultants. This is a tedious assignment. We can ask Dave and Terri to take this on as part of their administrative roles. This doesn't mean that others in this room don't have a voice. Everyone who has an opinion should feel free to share their concerns with Dave and Terri or members of the Sustainability Committee.

Comments from Terri Bonebright, Dean of Faculty

There was another practical reason why Dave and I were asked to do serve this role. Dave and I can speak to what types of spaces are appropriate for faculty development. We have been advocating for spaces for campus events.

(Note added by Christopher Wells: Dave and Terri were not asked to play a central role in sustainability conversations; their role was to focus on the functions of the building and the needs of the faculty.)

Comments from Christopher Wells

Regarding what we have included in the design and what we are still working on... We are still looking at photovoltaic hot water and at microtubines, which have a high-end cost of \$3.5 million. It will be tricky to make this work financially and we are considering whether this is the most efficient thing to do. We have already included specific levels of energy efficiency and sustainable site development following LEED criteria.

Notes from U.S. Green Building Council web site, www.usgbc.org

LEED is an abbreviation for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, and is a program that provides third-part verification of green buildings. The number of points a project earns determines the level of LEED Certification that a project will receive. Levels of certification are: Certified (40-49 points), Silver (50-59 points), Gold (60-79 points), and Platinum (80+ points). (The current design of the dining hall has earned 49 points so far.)

Comments from Doug Reddington, Manager of Campus Project Implementation

LEED silver is our minimum target. If we designate a certain number of parking spaces for high efficiency vehicles, we get a point toward a higher LEED level, but we have to take this through various committees to get this approved.

Question from David Newman

I don't anticipate using the new dining hall very much, but I do want to work at a university that makes me proud. A high LEED certification for this building would make me a proud member of the DePauw community. Are we developing publicity around this? What about our admissions strategy? How are we communicating this to the larger community?

Response from Christopher Wells

The answer is yes. This is one of the things that the Sustainability Committee is working on, specifically how to publicly communicate our commitment to sustainability and the educational value of sustainability. We have some work to do in terms of gathering better data, such as how students will be affected by these changes. We are likely to get better data for our current cycle. This is a nontrivial concern. We are definitely working on strategies to demarcate our achievements in this area.

Comments from Michele Villinski

The questions regarding the building design are very important. A lot of people care about what is going to happen. In fact, people don't know much about what is happening. If you think you're being transparent, maybe you're not being transparent enough. The existing Hub says a lot about what we value and what we don't value. We don't want the new dining hall to do this. So it's important to think about this. Regarding admissions tours, prospective students are already receiving information about buildings that don't exist yet. We're already bragging about the building even though it doesn't exist yet. I urge you to consider more than LEED silver as the minimum.

Response from Christopher Wells

I take your point. I recognize that it will be helpful for more information to be available regarding the planning process. I agree that LEED silver is not necessarily an impressive goal. We would like to aim higher. The Building and Grounds Committee is supporting this. But the LEED process is imperfect. For example, you lose points if you have outside lighting, which we need for public safety.

Comments from Meryl Altman

don't have the relevant expertise to speak to the specifics of a building project -- If you do release the list of what all the relevant LEED criteria are, I probably won't even be able to understand what they mean. (What is a turbine?) But I want you to know that I do care deeply about the environmental impact of DePauw's building projects, and that a lot of faculty members do care, beyond the list of "the usual suspects" who always stand up for sustainability.

I agree with David Newman's comment about "being a proud member of the DePauw community," and if this project and others are done right, I'll be proud, too; but there's a balance, because if we're too easily "proud" of what we say we're doing, but we're not really *doing* it, not doing all we could, that has the potential to make things worse rather than making them better.

Comments from Christopher Wells

We are not going to say we're doing something that we're not going to do. West-central Indiana is not a good place for wind, solar, and other sustainability options. LEED platinum would be excruciatingly difficult for us to achieve here, but certainly we want a building we can be proud of.

Questions and comments from Joe Heithaus

Is this the first time we have had a meeting like this? Did we have a meeting like this about the renovations to Lilly? How sustainable is the construction at Lilly? I'm on the Sustainability Committee. I've been to Oberlin University's campus. Oberlin has a building that is completely sustainability, including a waterfall that handles the sewage. Members of the Oberlin community have great pride in this. We're not going to achieve that here. But the Sustainability Committee is trying to making this process an object lesson. For example, there is a new urinal in the gym in Lilly. There's a sign that says use this one, not the other one, because this one doesn't use water. This gives students a choice to be sustainable or to be not sustainable. I hope there are parts of this building that will have little tiny lessons and that will make us proud that we're doing the right thing. I don't know if there will be solar panels on the building, but it will be valuable to provide lessons to students that this will be a building of the 21st century and will be different from other buildings on campus.

Response from Christopher Wells

The Sustainability Committee did work with the consultants during the planning of the Lilly renovations. Renovation is very different from new construction. The Lilly renovations will exceed the threshold for LEED silver certification. It is a much smaller project and is less likely to have a universal impact on all community members compared to the new dining hall.

Comments from Jeane Pope

I am a member of the Sustainability Committee. I think that what we treasure needs to be made known to the administration. The faculty needs to communicate what we value to the administration. It's unclear to me about how to make sure this happens. We assume things are being taken care of. But as decisions are being made, what criteria are being used? How do we make sure that sustainability remains a high priority?

Response from Christopher Wells

There are a number of faculty members who have expressed concern or interest in the new dining hall and what it represents for campus. It's important to remember that we can't satisfy everyone's requests without infinite funds. In addition, there are a lot of details in the planning process and it is difficult to communicate all of these details to everyone in the community, but we will continue to work towards transparency.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Can there be a way to communicate specific decisions as they are made to make the process more transparent? Can we make this available through a web site or a public document?

Response from Christopher Wells

Perhaps we would communicate through a Moodle blog, particularly with larger-scale decisions. I will take this under advisement.

Question from Anne Harris

Are the donors involved with the conversations about sustainability? It seems like \$2.5 million invested now will yield great savings in the future.

Response from Christopher Wells

These are large-scale donors, and yes, the donors are involved in the overall design process. The architects came up with an initial plan that cost \$60 million but we only have \$23 million available in the budget, so we are considering other designs.

Question from Alicia Suarez

Are you considering photovoltaic solar panels on the roof of the building?

Response from Christopher Wells

Yes, we are considering a couple of photovoltaic options.

There were no additional questions for President Casey, Christopher Wells, or Doug Reddington.

12. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

First, I wish to say that I think Nicole Brockmann may have undersold the amount of work that CAPP put into the winter term proposal. The committee, guided by Nicole, has done a great deal of work this fall, and the proposal CAPP and CEL are bringing forward today has been carefully thought out. I encourage you to carefully read the appendices of the agenda. We received a lot of input from various forums with faculty and staff and this input has been incorporated into the proposal.

I am not the first person to raise concerns about the consistency of the quality of our winter term offerings. Our winter term experiences have been addressed by committees in the past. I think that it is important to emphasize what is good about our existing winter term. The questions are: (1) how do we ensure consistency in the quality of our winter term offerings? and (2) how do we ensure equity of access because financial aid does not apply to our current winter term offerings?

I also wish to applaud the efforts of everyone who has been involved. We had three different forums with faculty. We also had student sessions. Thank you to Cody Watson, Walker Chance, and Olivia Flores, members of student government. We had one session with members of student government and two open forums with students. CAPP and the Committee on Experimental Learning have shared jurisdiction over winter term and have had input on the motions that we bring to you today.

One of the dangers with having a lot of people involved is that you can produce a camel (i.e., "a camel is a horse designed by committee"). I believe we have done the opposite of that. Our proposal is incomplete but it is much better than where we started out. Faculty involvement and shared governance have provided important contributions.

It is important to recognize that there are 20 or so weeks outside of our traditional semesters. The question is, how can we promote outstanding student learning opportunities during all times of the year? This led to the idea of "extended learning opportunities" beyond the traditional semester. Faculty members will have the

opportunity to offer a wide variety of educational experiences, during winter term and May term. These can be 0.5 credit courses. Many courses currently offered during winter term could be modified. We would charge tuition and students would be eligible for financial aid. Travel trips could be turned into curricular experiences.

We recognize there is a lot of devotion to current winter term offerings. Rather than discard those, this proposal keeps those in the mix. We can consider a wide range of experiential opportunities. We can also do a better job of identifying these activities on a student's transcript in the future.

Regarding motion #1, I don't think there are any strong opinions from CAPP. This motion will be open to discussion and amendment at the February meeting. Motion #2 can also be discussed and amended. We think it's not a period of time but the quality of the experience that we should be concerned about. There's something very special about the winter term time period. This motion gives you the opportunity to weigh in on this. Regarding motion #3, there is a significant section of the Academic Handbook written by the administration. This section of the handbook addresses faculty workload. The motion would change winter term from a requirement to an option for faculty members. This doesn't require a faculty vote.

We will have open forums during the first week of spring semester. Hopefully we will have most of the details ironed out at that point. I want to thank everyone who participated and attended the sessions. I want to thank CAPP, CEL, and the office of Academic Affairs.

I close with two final comments... First, we shouldn't worry about a "perfect curriculum." There's no such thing as a perfect curriculum. The perfect should not be the enemy of the good, especially when the good is better than what we currently have. And, we do want to get to a better place than where we've been. Second, we shouldn't worry about these changes as being "forever." Our curriculum should always be viewed as a work in progress. Our curriculum is not set in concrete. Let's give this a try. If we need to tweak this in a year or two, let's tweak it. It doesn't have to be perfect for all time.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

13. Old Business

From Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus)

- A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the Department of Modern Languages proposed changes to the departmental constitution related to personnel and search committees. The sections of the departmental constitution outlining the department's governance structure and the existing language for the personnel committee and search can be found in Appendix C. Since giving advance notice in November a friendly amendment was suggested and is supported by the department. <Note from the Chair of the Faculty: this amendment does NOT change the scope of the motion and so has been added and is underlined within the motion below.>

New Department of Modern Languages Constitution description of personnel and search committees:

The Department of Modern Languages follows standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to the membership of DPCs, with the following exception: if there are fewer than two members of a DPC with expertise in the language, the DPC may request, in consultation with the faculty member under review, the COF, and the VPAA, one or more members from outside the department with expertise in both the language and a related field. If the faculty member under review wishes to have two members on the DPC with expertise in the language, the DPC must request that the COF and VPAA appoint the additional member(s).

The Department of Modern Languages would like to follow standard University procedures (as articulated in the *Academic Handbook*) with regard to search committees, except that we would like to retain a provision for weighted voting, giving faculty members in the corresponding language section of the department 50% of the vote.

The motion was seconded by Howard Pollack-Milgate. There were no questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

14. New Business

There was no new business.

15. Announcements

Please note the official call for nominations for committee vacancies accepted through Friday, December 6. In addition to previously announced vacancies, we have an additional vacancy on the Committee on Administration for spring due to a special leave.

One additional announcement – our first meeting of spring semester is Monday, February 4, so the agenda deadline is the day we return for spring semester classes, i.e., Monday, January 27.

A. Committee Vacancies

Nominations for the following vacancies will be taken until Friday December 6. An election will follow with balloting Tuesday December 10 through Thursday December 12.

Division 2 spring semester vacancy on Committee on Administration (COA)

At-large Management of Academic Operations (MAO) – Three-year term (2.5 years remain) – must be tenured or in at least the seventh year of full-time faculty status; may not be from Division 1, Modern Languages, Biology or Philosophy

At-large Teacher Education Committee – Two-year term (1.5 years remain) – may not be from Library, Mathematics, Modern Languages Music, or Political Science

Division 2 Third Division Officer – one-year term

Division 1 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

Division 2 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

Division 4 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

All potential Grievance Committee members must be tenured and may not be on COF.

16. Adjournment (Bridget Gourley)

If there is no further business to come before the faculty then we will consider ourselves adjourned. Good luck with the end of your semester. I hope everyone enjoys the holiday break and has a productive Winter Term. I look forward to seeing you in this venue in February when we should be prepared to vote on CAPP's motions, allowing changes that re-envision Winter Term and allowing us to build the new program currently being referred to as extended studies.

Appendices

Appendix A. The evolution of the idea of the Extended Studies program

At the beginning of the Fall 2013 term, incoming VPAA Stimpert brought to the faculty some ideas for revamping Winter Term and for ushering in some new teaching opportunities through summer courses, workshops, and institutes. He asked several interested constituencies, including CAPP, for their thoughts on how we might best improve Winter Term, an issue which has come before the faculty several times.

The three motions in the agenda are part of a larger effort, made in response to VPAA Stimpert's charge, to revamp Winter Term into a larger and more inclusive program which has the working name of Extended Studies — however, they do not depend either on the implementation or on any particular configuration of this developing program in order for the faculty to vote on them. The motions apply to WT as it currently stands just as well as they apply to any new program that might be introduced. It is vitally important to us that faculty feel they have a voice in the evolution of WT, but the number of items requiring a formal vote is relatively small. We hope faculty members will be enthusiastic about the development of the Extended Studies program, and we welcome discussion and feedback.

Ideally, if CAPP hoped to ask the faculty to vote on something in February, CAPP would be able to give advance notice in January, by which time we expect the details of the overarching program will be more or less worked out. However, as we have no January meeting, CAPP is required to give advance notice of those things now, in November in advance of the December faculty meeting. In the interests of maximum transparency, CAPP is providing a “construction update” on the current status of the Extended Studies idea, so that the faculty can get some idea of the evolving conception of this new program. However, if this were a midterm grade report, this appendix would come with the statement “true evaluation impossible now,” since we are still in the middle of working out some important aspects of the program.

To this end, the changes to catalog and handbook language below include both the old nomenclature (“Winter Term”) and the new nomenclature (“Extended Studies opportunities”). By the time the faculty vote rolls around, we expect that one or the other of these ideas will have gained traction, and we will most likely move to amend the exact language accordingly, since it will not alter the fundamental content of the motion (i.e., reduce obligations from 3 to 2 [Motion 1], require that at least one of these obligations be fulfilled via work in January or May [Motion 2], and make Winter Term teaching requirements optional for faculty for a period of 3 years [Motion 3]).

CAPP would like to stress that this is a work in progress, and that while we think the broad outlines of the program are more or less in place, we are aware that there are many logistical details that still need to be worked out. Some of those known questions and unresolved details are included in Appendix B, so that you know we are aware of them. We welcome feedback pointing us to other as-yet-unanswered questions. We are two months out from a faculty vote on the three items mentioned earlier, and during those two months CAPP, other faculty committees, and various administrative offices will be continuing to work on refining the ideas of the program and putting logistical details into place. We will provide the full faculty with updates via email between now and the February meeting as details and solutions emerge.

Changes to University Catalog Language for Motion 1 and Motion 2:

Existing text is in *italics*. Proposed text has no special font.

EXISTING TEXT:

Winter Term

Every DePauw student must complete three Winter Term projects with a satisfactory grade. (Winter Term projects are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.) Only one of the three required Winter Term projects

may be satisfied by participation in a semester off-campus study program or Fellows internship. Students opting to fulfill one of their Winter Term credits in this way will not receive additional credit if they participate in a Winter Term project during January of the same academic year.

One Winter Term project is considered full time, and students may be enrolled in only one project per January session. DePauw Winter Term projects do not receive regular units of academic credit and do not meet distribution requirements for graduation or requirements toward a major. Students are expected to be aware of and follow all appropriate procedures and deadlines, which may be found on the [Winter Term web site](#).

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in a Winter Term project must complete the project by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to an unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Winter Terms may petition to the director of Winter Term to make up a project during the summer. Graduating seniors who receive an unsatisfactory Winter Term grade during the senior year may petition to make up the project during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make-up Winter Term project.

Transfer students receive credit for one Winter Term project for every full year of full-time study at another institution.

PROPOSED TEXT:

[NOTE: Motion 1 asks the faculty to approve this following proposed text *except for* the second sentence in the first paragraph. Motion 2 asks the faculty to approve the inclusion of the second sentence in the first paragraph.]

Extended Studies

Every DePauw student must complete at least two Extended Studies opportunities with a passing or satisfactory grade. At least one of these opportunities must be completed through participation in a course, internship, or program offered in Winter Term or May Term. Options for completing the Extended Studies requirement include: completing a Winter Term or May Term course or another Extended Studies opportunity, including participation in an approved semester-long off-campus study opportunity, an internship or research opportunity, or an independent study project. Students are expected to be aware of and follow all appropriate policies, procedures, and deadlines, which may be found on the [Extended Studies web site](#).

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in an Extended Studies opportunity must complete the course by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to a grade of failure (F) or unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Extended Studies opportunities may petition to make up a course in an alternative way. Graduating seniors who receive a failing or unsatisfactory Extended Studies opportunity grade during the senior year may petition to make up the course during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make-up Extended Studies opportunity course.

Changes to Academic Handbook Language for Motion 3:

EXISTING TEXT:

f. Teaching duties

The normal teaching duties of a full time member of the DePauw faculty shall be equivalent to twelve contact hours per week each semester and the whole range of attendant duties involved in teaching (preparation, evaluation, and reflection) necessary to support these twelve hours. Departments are responsible for determining, with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, what counts as a normal teaching load under this general guideline. Faculty members also must teach periodically in the Winter Term program. (See Article XXXII of the General Policies.)

PROPOSED TEXT:

f. Teaching duties

The normal teaching duties of a full time member of the DePauw faculty shall be equivalent to twelve contact hours per week each semester and the whole range of attendant duties involved in teaching (preparation, evaluation, and reflection) necessary to support these twelve hours. Departments are responsible for determining, with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, what counts as a normal teaching load under this general guideline. (The previous requirement that “Faculty members also must teach in the university’s [Winter Term/Extended Studies Opportunities] program” is suspended for academic years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17, pending review of the requirement during the 2016-17 year.) (See Article XXXII of the General Policies.)

Appendix B. DePauw Extended Studies: Combined CAPP/STIMPert DRAFT

DePauw’s Extended Studies program would consist of four types of learning opportunities offered throughout the year, including:

	<p>1. DePauw Intensive Courses <i>Offered: Winter Term, May Term, and Summer</i></p> <p>Key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-campus or field-based courses, from 3 weeks to 1 month or more in length, graded (A-F) and offering DePauw academic credit (ranging from 0.5 units to 1.0 or 2.0 units, depending on course) • taught by DePauw faculty members, visiting faculty • DePauw students would pay tuition, but they would also be eligible for financial aid • courses could be open to other college students, community members, alumni, high school students, who would pay tuition and earn academic credit • DePauw students could also propose independent study, research, and travel projects to be taken for academic credit • students may take only one DePauw Intensive at a time (though they might combine one Intensive with one DePauw Academy course.)
<p><i>This proposal does not grant transcript credit for Academy courses for students. We are aware that some members of the campus community would like to see these kinds of courses count. We are also aware that in general there seems to be increasing feeling among the faculty that things for which students earn any kind of transcript credit (whether co-curricular or academic) should maintain a certain level of rigor which some of these courses might not be well-placed to deliver. However, there are good reasons to offer these courses as part of an extended studies program. We welcome your feedback.</i></p>	<p>2. DePauw Academy <i>Offered: Winter Term, May Term, Summer, and Fall and Spring Breaks</i></p> <p>Key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-curricular and extra-curricular courses (like those currently offered during Winter Term) • opportunity for summer bridge program for entering first-year students • graduate admission test preparation classes (LSAT, MCAT, GRE, etc.) • taught by DePauw faculty members, visiting faculty, local community artists, etc. • grant DePauw “Extended Studies” credit (like credit currently earned during Winter Term) • DePauw students pay fees to cover the costs of the courses • courses could be open to other college students, community members, alumni, high school students, who would also pay fees to cover the costs of the courses
	<p>Learning opportunities continue on the next page.</p>

<p><i>This draft proposal is organized by the types of credit students and faculty may earn, with each category being distinct. After discussion, VPAA Stimpert has proposed combining categories 2 and 3 (DePauw Academy and Service/Educational Travel) because he feels they share an affinity of intent. CAPP has no vested interest in any specific categorization system, nor in the names of any of these types of programs, but does feel that the organizational structure should be easy to understand, especially for students and faculty who will want to know which kinds of activities “count” toward requirements or incentives. Discussion of this aspect of the proposed program is ongoing.</i></p>	<p>3. DePauw Service and Educational Travel <i>Offered: Winter Term, May Term, Summer, Fall Break, Spring Break</i></p> <p>Key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • off-campus service and/or educational travel trips, close to home or abroad • 1-2 weeks in length, depending on the trip and time of year • open to community members, faculty/staff, and regular DePauw students (no high school students unless on a summer trip accompanied by parent) • DePauw students earn “Extended Studies” credit; could be upgraded to academic credit if paired with a 2-week intensive on-campus course (or with a course during the regular semester) to supplement academic content • community members pay travel fees but would not be required to attend classes ahead of time; they would get access to most tours and outings the group gets (others could be added for a fee)
<p><i>We are looking into ways to offer continuing education/ professional development transcript credit from DePauw for professionals who come to campus for these institutes.</i></p> <p><i>At one point it was suggested that these might earn co-curricular credit for students, but it would have to be only for a workshop or institute of substantial length and content; these might be exceptions to the general no-credit rule.</i></p>	<p>4. DePauw Institutes <i>Offered: May Term and Summer (and possibly Winter Term)</i></p> <p>Key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • professional conferences, institutes, and workshops, typically 3-7 days in length • sponsored by a DePauw faculty or staff member or a department, program, or center • designed for a variety of audiences, including college students, college and university faculty and staff members, visiting professionals, elementary and secondary teachers, high school and middle school students • raise DePauw’s profile and visibility, enhance our reputation, generate income from campus facilities during a time when campus would otherwise be underutilized • may grant credit towards participants’ ongoing professional development, depending on program; otherwise, grants no DePauw academic credit • participants pay fees to cover the costs of the institutes; financial aid for DePauw students is probably not available but organizational scholarships or work-study-type arrangements may be possible

Known Questions and Unresolved Issues — these are a sample of some things we are discussing now. We are happy to share where we are in each of these discussions with you if you would like. By January we anticipate having ironed out the vast majority of the logistical wrinkles.

- What types of Extended Studies Opportunities “count” for students?
- What types of Extended Studies Opportunities “count” for faculty?
- What are the options for part-time faculty?
- Which courses should receive letter grades and which (if any) P/F or S/D/U?

- Is teaching Intensives in the Extended Studies program evaluated in the same way as regular teaching in the academic year? Are there evaluations? Does this teaching count towards tenure/promotion?
- Who approves courses? On the student side, who decides what kind of opportunity goes in which category and yields which type of credit (and how much)? On the faculty side, who decides what kinds of courses or opportunities are paid by flat fee, and what kinds are paid by a percentage of salary or by credit towards sabbatical?
- How does this fit into a possible change to a 3/2 load?

Appendix C. Excerpts from the Department of Modern Languages Constitution approved by the faculty in May 1998

text that will be replaced with the Department of Modern Languages motion under “Old Business” is shown as ~~struck through~~

Department structure

The Department of Modern Languages shall consist of five major language program units with a Department Chair and four language-section coordinators who shall represent the interests of each language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Asian—the Department Chair shall represent his/her own language, and Italian and Portuguese will be represented by the Spanish coordinator). To the extent possible, all decisions affecting the department as a whole and/or individual language programs within the department shall be arrived at via consensus among the Department Chair, the section coordinators, and the members of each language section.

Department Personnel Committee

~~The Department Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall consist of all continuing tenure and term faculty members of the department. It shall exclude the person being reviewed, those in their first year of service, and (with the exception noted below) those serving in full-time administrative positions. Departmental faculty members on leave may participate at their discretion. Nontenured members may withdraw from any case. The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being recruited or evaluated—including, as needed or appropriate, selected faculty from the Area Studies programs. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from this area of expertise or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee shall select additional tenured members according to a procedure established by COF and the administration. The additional members shall be drawn from the faculty of related departments or programs but may include departmental members serving in full-time administrative positions. When considering a recommendation from a search committee, the DPC shall include two members from other departments, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.~~

~~For example, in the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Japanese or Chinese, the majority membership of the DPC (in number or weighted votes) would be from tenured, tenure-track or term faculty in the Asian Studies program. In the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Russian, they would be from the Russian Studies program. In the case of German—where no German Studies program exists—such majority members would be from tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty in related departments who have some expertise in this language or its culture.~~

~~In order to streamline and facilitate these DPC evaluative procedures, the DPC of the Department of Modern Languages will normally delegate the responsibility for drafting the initial report to a representative subcommittee. The exact configuration, charge, and procedures of such a subcommittee shall be agreed upon by the DPC as a whole in consultation with the AVP, and its membership shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being evaluated.~~

Department Search Committee

~~If there is a new or vacant full-time position in any language section within the Department of Modern Languages, a departmental Search Committee shall be formed, comprised of all the full-time faculty of that particular language, selected faculty members from the Studies program (when appropriate), the Department Chair, and no fewer than two representatives from the other language sections. The Search Committee’s functions shall be those specified in the Academic Handbook.~~

**Appendix D. Department of Modern Languages Constitution
as approved by the faculty in May 1998**

Department structure - The Department of Modern Languages shall consist of five major language program units with a Department Chair and four language-section coordinators who shall represent the interests of each language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Asian—the Department Chair shall represent his/her own language, and Italian and Portuguese will be represented by the Spanish coordinator). There shall be monthly meetings of the section coordinators with the Department Chair, and the entire department will meet as a group at least twice per semester. The individual language sections will meet as often as needed to conduct their business. To the extent possible, all decisions affecting the department as a whole and/or individual language programs within the department shall be arrived at via consensus among the Department Chair, the section coordinators, and the members of each language section. The Department Chair shall be appointed to a three-year renewable term only after discussion with all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the language sections. As per standard faculty procedures, COF and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs shall be responsible for conducting these discussions and making this appointment. As feasible, the position of Department Chair shall be rotated among the tenured members of the department (with preference to those who are serving or who have served as section coordinators), with no Department Chair normally serving for more than two consecutive terms. Section coordinators shall be selected annually by the faculty of those language sections. There shall be no limitations on the term of section coordinators. Among the other responsibilities of the Department Chair (as outlined in the Academic Handbook) shall be the support and development of all the foreign-language programs at DePauw, with particular attention to the needs of the smaller programs

Department faculty - The Department of Modern Languages, in the fall of 1998, shall consist of the following: five full-time professors of Spanish (who shall also be responsible for Italian and Portuguese), four of French, two of German, one of Russian, and one of Japanese. There shall also be part-time instructors, as needed, for Chinese, Spanish, French, Italian, German, Russian, Portuguese, and Japanese. The language section, in consultation with the Department Chair, shall be responsible for selecting and recommending to the AVP the appointment of part-time instructors in their language. Faculty titles shall designate rank in the primary language field, e.g. Associate Professor of Russian, Professor of Spanish, etc. and not in “Modern Languages.”

Department Personnel Committee - The Department Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall consist of all continuing tenure and term faculty members of the department. It shall exclude the person being reviewed, those in their first year of service, and (with the exception noted below) those serving in full-time administrative positions. Departmental faculty members on leave may participate at their discretion. Nontenured members may withdraw from any case. The Personnel Committee of the Department of Modern Languages shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being recruited or evaluated—including, as needed or appropriate, selected faculty from the Area Studies programs. If there are fewer than three eligible department members from this area of expertise or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the Committee shall select additional tenured members according to a procedure established by COF and the administration. The additional members shall be drawn from the faculty of related departments or programs but may include departmental members serving in full-time administrative positions. When considering a recommendation from a search committee, the DPC shall include two members from other departments, approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

For example, in the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Japanese or Chinese, the majority membership of the DPC (in number or weighted votes) would be from tenured, tenure-track or term faculty in the Asian Studies program. In the case of an evaluation of tenure-track position(s) in Russian, they would be from the Russian Studies program. In the case of German—where no German Studies program exists—such

majority members would be from tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty in related departments who have some expertise in this language or its culture.

In order to streamline and facilitate these DPC evaluative procedures, the DPC of the Department of Modern Languages will normally delegate the responsibility for drafting the initial report to a representative subcommittee. The exact configuration, charge, and procedures of such a subcommittee shall be agreed upon by the DPC as a whole in consultation with the AVP, and its membership shall include a majority (in number or in weighted votes) of tenured, tenure-track, or term faculty who have some expertise in the language or foreign culture of the position being evaluated.

Department Search Committee - If there is a new or vacant full-time position in any language section within the Department of Modern Languages, a departmental Search Committee shall be formed, comprised of all the full-time faculty of that particular language, selected faculty members from the Studies program (when appropriate), the Department Chair, and no fewer than two representatives from the other language sections. The Search Committee's functions shall be those specified in the Academic Handbook.

Language curricula - The teaching faculty of each language—in consultation with the Department Chair and the Director and members of the area studies program committees (the latter where appropriate) and subject to the approval of the AVP—shall have the responsibility for deciding and maintaining the curriculum for that language and the most effective teaching methodology to be used for that language. While there are implicit curricular and methodological similarities between the teaching of French and Spanish, for example, there are far fewer between French and Japanese or Spanish and Russian. Different languages often require different approaches to maximize student learning. Some autonomy and self-determination among the different languages must be preserved in both the nature of the courses offered and the manner in which those courses are taught. Therefore, curricular matters affecting a single language program may be deliberated, but no matters may be decided without the majority agreement of the language section involved. Language sections shall be responsible for consultations and obligations shared with area studies colleagues outside the department.

Teaching workloads and class size - The normal teaching workload for all full-time faculty in the Department of Modern Languages shall be equivalent to three (1-credit) courses per semester. The Department Chair shall receive no fewer than two courses released time per year plus a stipend. Section coordinators shall receive neither released time nor stipend. Class size shall be no larger than 25 students without the consent of the instructor. Classes of fewer than 5 students may or may not count toward the normal teaching load—depending, for example, on whether a course is required for the major, whether it is integral to a particular language program, whether it is an upper-level offering or an introductory one, and the availability of other sections and/or staff. In such cases, a decision shall be made only after discussion among the faculty member involved, the section coordinator, the Department Chair, and the approval of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs. Courses offered as independent study, over and above the normal teaching load, shall be at the discretion of the individual faculty member, the section coordinator, and the Department Chair.

Faculty offices and classrooms - To the extent possible (and at the discretion of the individual faculty member), all faculty of the Department of Modern Languages shall have offices in proximity to each other and to the office of the Department of Modern Languages. The new Department of Modern Languages shall have its main office located on the lower-level of East College. -Selection of faculty offices shall be according to seniority, or as otherwise appropriate.

Department annual budget - As one of the largest academic departments at DePauw (slightly smaller than the English and HPP departments and the School of Music), the Department of Modern Languages must have an adequate annual budget. The heterogeneous nature of the department will also require proportionately

higher expenditures than those of a department where all the faculty are teaching the same subject matter and tend to share certain teaching materials, supplies, and equipment. This is particularly true of audio-visual and computer materials—each language requires its own collection and its own software. Therefore, the annual budget for the Department of Modern Languages must be commensurate with, but no less than, that of other academic departments of similar size (measured by the number of full-time and part-time staff). All department funds pertaining to telephone and photocopy usage, permanent equipment, AV materials purchases, and other teaching-related expenditures (such as available work-study help) shall be distributed proportionally among the various languages wherever possible according to a formula agreed upon by the section coordinators in consultation with the Department Chair. Similarly, shared equipment and space in language-equipped classrooms shall be circulated or allocated by agreement with the section coordinators in consultation with the Department Chair. Prize funds, endowed library funds, etc. which are designated for specific language programs remain for the language sections to spend at their discretion, whereas work-study money, the Walker Prize Fund, etc. now shared with other language sections shall be appropriated through consultation by approximately the same guidelines as have prevailed before the formation of the Department of Modern Languages.

Faculty offices and classrooms - To the extent possible (and at the discretion of the individual faculty member), all faculty of the Department of Modern Languages should have offices in proximity to each other and to the departmental office. Ideally, the offices of Global Teaching Fellows and Language Assistants should also be in close proximity. The office of the Department of Modern Languages is located on the first floor of East College. Selection of faculty offices is according to seniority, or as otherwise appropriate. As a department we believe that classroom configuration is an important factor in successful foreign language instruction (i.e. rooms that are carpeted with movable chairs, that have built-in media and computer technology, sufficient blackboard space, good acoustics). Common-area study spaces for each language should be located in proximity to faculty offices for those languages. Decor and use will be decided by individual language sections.

Department annual budget - As one of the largest academic departments at DePauw (slightly smaller than the English department and the School of Music), the Department of Modern Languages should have an adequate annual budget. The heterogeneous nature of the department also requires proportionately higher expenditures than those of a department where all the faculty are teaching the same subject matter and tend to share certain teaching materials, supplies, and equipment. This is particularly true of audio-visual and computer materials—each language requires its own collection and its own software. All department funds pertaining to telephone and photocopy usage, permanent equipment, AV materials purchases, and other teaching-related expenditures (such as available work-study help) shall be distributed proportionally among the various language programs, wherever possible.

Evaluation of the new departmental structure - During the 2000-2001 academic year, the new Department of Modern Languages will conduct a self-evaluation. All members of the department will be asked to assess the new department structure and to make recommendations for any changes deemed necessary to improve the efficiency and overall operation of the department. The structural plan of the department as a whole may be modified as agreed upon by a majority vote of the language sections.

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
February 3rd, 2014**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley, Chair of Faculty)

Hi everyone, welcome. As we get started let me make a couple reminders. While I know it seems our community is small enough we should all know each other, we always have new individuals in our community so if you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself. The acoustics in here mean that for everyone to be able to fully participate we need the microphones. We are using the stands to facilitate efficient flow of conversation. Please leave the microphone on the stand, it will take a moment to turn it up so we don't have feedback from multiple microphones or pick up voices near microphones accidentally. Lastly, if you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that it is silenced.

2. Announcement of Spring Semester Quorum by VPAA (Larry Stimpert, VPAA)

There are 246 voting faculty members; 26 faculty members are on leave for the entire academic year, 2 are on leave during spring semester, and 3 are on medical leave. This leaves us with 215 eligible voting faculty members. Our quorum for the semester is 86 faculty members (40 percent of 215).

3. Verification of Quorum

The quorum was reached shortly after 4 p.m.

4. Consent Agenda (Bridget Gourley)

A. Approval of Minutes from the December 2013 Faculty Meeting

B. MAO Announces the following experimental courses will be offered for the first time during spring semester 2014.

UNIV 315: Tutor Training (0.5 credit)

UNIV 320: Academic Excellence Seminar (0.5 credit)

UNIV 325: Tutor Fellow (0.25 credit)

There were no requests in advance of the meeting or during the meeting to move any items from the consent agenda to the main agenda. There were no objections to approving the consent agenda. The consent agenda was approved. Thank you to Vanessa Fox for December's minutes and good luck to everyone offering experimental courses this spring.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

B. CAPP gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote to approve the creation of a new minor in Italian.

A full rationale can be found in Appendix B of this agenda.

There were no clarifying questions about this motion.

- A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following two motions related to changes in WT. Advanced notice of motions with identical intent but slightly different wording was given at the December 2013 faculty meeting.

Motion 1:

That the number of what are currently called “Winter Term” experiences required for graduation be reduced from three to two. The required changes to the University Catalog can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Motion 2:

Specifying what types of experiences may count for what will moving forward be referred to as “Extended Studies.” The required changes to the University Catalog can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Note: What was announced as Motion 3 at the December 2013 faculty meeting does not need faculty action as it is not part of the handbook that requires faculty approval. Again, a full explanation can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

A full rationale for these motions is outlined in Appendix A.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Before I turn the floor over to Nicole let me make some general remarks about how I hope we can approach this discussion. It is important to me that everyone who wants to speak has the opportunity to be heard. To facilitate a smooth flow of conversation, please move toward one of the microphones. Remember we should allow new voices to speak before individuals speak a second time. If, as we discuss a particular issue within the broad umbrella of extended studies and someone comes up to speak to that point, if you’d allow them to move forward in the line I would appreciate it. I think it will make for a more holistic discussion. If at any point you are unclear on where we are, dealing with a main motion or amendment, motion one or motion two please wave wildly and ask for clarification. I hope we will all use common sense and good will to productively get through a healthy discussion. I am reminded about something Nancy Lovett in the Development Office said recently, “It’s nice to have passion. It implies people care about the good of the institution.”

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

CAPP is pleased to see so much interest at the forums last week where we discussed the winter term issues. The discussions made it clear that these are issues that we care deeply about. It also became apparent during those discussions that some of the issues are still very much open for debate. These are issues that the whole faculty should decide upon. The motions are from CAPP’s perspective. When we looked at the language of the motions, we realized that the way we presented the proposal made it difficult for faculty to make amendments. We made some changes in the motions in response to this concern. The result is what is on the pink sheet today. Some faculty members are interested in changing the number of required winter term experiences. We have made it easier for faculty to make amendments. The scope of the motions remains the same. There hasn’t been much concern about the “extended studies” concept or the language of the program. Instead, most concerns were regarding the specifics, such as the required number of experiences and why students would need to take one during the traditional winter term period. We will start our discussion with the general concepts of the revisions, then move on to the specifics.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

The motion before us is on the pink sheet. CAPP has made this substitution. This comes from a coordinating committee so it needs no second. Is there any objection to switching to what is on the pink sheet instead of going with what is on the original agenda?

There were no objections.

The exact content of the pink sheet is found in Appendix C.

Comments from Larry Stimpert

First, I wish to acknowledge the extraordinary dedication of CAPP and the Extended Studies Committee. These two committees put in countless hours of discussion. Thank you especially to Nicole Brockmann and Anne Harris who went above and beyond the call of duty by hosting the faculty forums. I also acknowledge all of you who attended one or more of the faculty forums. Every time we received input, the proposal was improved. We also hosted two student forums, and the students provided valuable input. I also wish to acknowledge the deans, Terri Bonebright and Raj Bellani, who tracked down valuable data to include in the rationale for the motions.

During the December 2013 faculty meeting, I commented that “the perfect should never be the enemy of the good, especially when the good leaves you in a better place than where you are now.” There is no perfect curriculum, but this is a very good proposal, thanks to the input from you. Today is not the end of the story. CAPP has already committed itself to an ongoing review of winter term and ensuring that we can continue to improve winter term in the future.

I have been asked, “Why are we looking at winter term?” My answer is that we need to look at inconsistencies in the winter term experience. For every positive comment about winter term, we also hear negative comments from the other end of the continuum. The primary objective is to make the winter term consistently positive. The other issue is ensuring that our students have equal opportunities to explore winter term experiences.

The proposal would expand and enhance the winter term experience through co-curricular, off-campus, for-credit offerings (which have great appeal from students and faculty), and institutionalize independent and creative endeavors.

We hope to make winter term voluntary for faculty members. There is a lot of precedent for relying on faculty to volunteer a good part of our curriculum – such as the first-year seminars, and the W, Q, and S competencies. At the same time, if we cannot staff winter term on a volunteer basis, we will take whatever steps are necessary to cover winter term on a rotational basis. We think we can adequately staff winter term on a volunteer basis, based on existing data. We know that some of you are interested in retaining the requirement of 3 winter terms and not changing the requirement to 2 winter terms. If we continue to require three winter terms, this could affect our ability to staff winter term on a volunteer basis.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

CAPP has no additional comments to frame the discussion. CAPP’s arguments are included in the agenda in written form.

Comments from a faculty member

I was gone last semester so I missed some of the discussions. I am concerned about the “extended studies” concept. What is the purpose of winter term? If we’re trying to correct some of the inconsistencies, I think the proposed changes may exacerbate the inconsistencies, such as the issue of credit vs. non-credit courses. Maybe we’re rushing too quickly and this proposal is premature.

Comments from Larry Stimpert

In the CAPP discussions, we were focused on the winter term time period. As we continued our discussions, we talked about the other 20 weeks of the year that are not part of our academic semesters. There are a lot of

possibilities associated with these other 20 weeks. The proposal is focused on winter term and May term as focused intensive times for learning. Part of our desire to see the change in the catalog is to be able to use these other 20 weeks more effectively. The proposed changes will expand the range of opportunities for our students and everything offered in these categories would be offered at a very high and consistent level.

Comments from another faculty member

I don't know if this proposal will keep winter term as part of our academic calendar. If students can complete the requirement through study abroad or internships, there will be a lot less activity on campus. My life course was changed thanks to a course in mediation that I took at Oberlin. This course was offered outside of the scope of the normal curriculum. There were no undergraduate programs in mediation. I believe that winter term is supposed to be a pedagogical space to allow us to do different things. I would be sorry to see this space go away.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

In my "CAPP-acity," I respect your view. We tried to ensure that the proposed changes would do no harm. We want to allow the things that work to continue to work. We don't want to make things harder or less successful. The proposal doesn't make anything worse, it makes some things immediately better, and allows some things to be improved in the future. I definitely think there is a place in our winter term for the "outside the box" life-changing experiences. At the same time, there may be room in the program for credit courses. There won't be strict categories. We want to be as inclusive as possible in terms of intensive learning experiences or "extended studies" that are beyond the regular coursework during the semester. Inclusion of one should not eliminate other types of courses.

Comments from another faculty member

I agree. The proposal changes seem like they might diminish the winter term experience, especially by adding internships and cutting the required number to two instead of three. One specific question I have is regarding the externships. The proposal states that the faculty will no longer supervise externships. Why? Externships have involved setting up a learning contract, related the experience to the classroom, and assigning specific readings. The new model proposes that staff at the Hubbard Center would be responsible for externship supervision. Wouldn't this be removing the academic component of externships? I am also concerned about the 0.5 credit courses. Experimental 0.5 credit courses would be ok, but if people start cramming material from a semester-long course into a 0.5 credit winter term course, I believe this could cause harm. I am also concerned that we are voting on a lot of things that aren't solidified.

Response from Nicole Brockmann

We will have to carefully monitor the types of courses that are offered for credit.

Comments from Raj Bellani, Dean of Experiential Learning

There will continue to be an option for faculty to supervise externships. If the faculty would like to be more involved, we will accept this.

Comments from another faculty member

I am in favor of this motion for two main reasons. The first reason is because I see an advantage of teaching experiential academic courses on a regular basis. I think there is a lot of room in this space to teach new and unique courses with heavy academic content. For example, there is a course that Jen Everett and I have been team-teaching. We need to teach the course during an extended studies period because we have multiple field trips that wouldn't fit within the regular schedule of time banks during a semester. The class addresses handling of waste and includes field trips to a landfill, an incinerator, and a recycling plant. These field trips are not easily replaced by videos and are not easily scheduled on Saturdays. We hope to eventually turn this course into a first-year seminar. The 3½ week time period creates a nice opportunity for us to teach this

course. We have taught this course and will continue to teach this course regardless of whether the motion passes. The second reason is because the proposed changes would take away some of the serious problems associated with winter term. I have always liked winter term because I think it offers a unique opportunity. But I recognize that the way winter term goes is hurtful and dangerous for some students. We can be resistant to change at this institution. I hope we don't vote this down. It's time to make a change. I'd like to see this move forward and I think this proposal meets some of the objectives.

Comments from another faculty member

I also wish to speak in favor of the motions. Like the previous faculty member who spoke, I support it for a multitude of reasons but I'll try to focus on just a couple. I have supervised externships, conducted study trips, taught on-campus courses, and supervised independent projects; in other words, I have been involved in a wide range of winter term experiences. As an aside, and in contrast to some of my colleagues, I think the Hubbard Center staff could do a fine job supervising internships/externships, provided the system is set up well. Faculty members would then be free to apply their talents and expertise to other aspects of winter term. A primary reason I support the motions is that that I believe they will increase access to winter term opportunities, especially travel opportunities. I also like how this proposal enables us to provide financial aid for students during winter term. And I like how the second motion requires students to complete at least one experience during May or January because this will help ensure that winter term won't "go away" as some people seem to fear.

Comments from another faculty member

I wish to propose a friendly amendment, to change the required number of experiences in the proposal from two to three. I believe this will more effectively keep the current winter term atmosphere. Requiring only two experiences seems weak, given that students can complete the requirements during winter term, May term, and summer. Perhaps we could require students to complete two winter terms with a faculty member, not necessarily on campus, but directly related to a faculty member on campus.

Announcement from Bridget Gourley

There has been a friendly amendment proposed, to change the required number of experiences from two to three. Technically, Robert's Rules does not treat a friendly amendment separate from any other type of amendment so do we have a second.

The friendly amendment was seconded. This pushed the focus of the discussion to the amended motion.

Comments from another faculty member

The issue as I see it is that we aren't sure if we can support the requirement of three experiences for students by relying on a voluntary effort from the faculty. In fact, we are lacking data on how this might work. We have no data on whether we could support three or two required experiences. I would like to see more data on whether we can support three or two. Can we proceed with a survey before we make a decision on this?

Response from Bridget Gourley

I think we have some data that people have participated on a voluntary basis.

Follow-up comments from the faculty member

These data are based on the current scheme. We don't know if the changes in compensation will affect faculty members' willingness to volunteer.

Response from Nicole Brockmann

I am a little dubious about the value of asking people, "Would you participate in this program?" I'm hesitant to proceed with a survey at this point. Let's proceed with a yes or no vote from the faculty and then we can ask

the relevant committees to proceed with surveys. I don't want to ask committees to do more work without a vote of confidence or no confidence from the faculty.

Comments from another faculty member

I am in favor of the friendly amendment, to require three winter term experiences. We want to make a decision based on what is best for our students. If we think three is best for our students, and if we can't staff it with volunteer efforts, then we can make it non-voluntary. I suggest we start with three, then if we can't staff it, but we think it is ideal educationally, then we make it non-voluntary for faculty members.

Question from another faculty member

I have a question regarding financial aid. Students currently receive some money, such as a type of grant to go on winter term trips but this usually covers less than half of the cost. How much financial aid will students receive given this new system?

Response from Larry Stimpert, VPAA

We discussed this issue with Craig Slaughter, the Director of Financial Aid. It's difficult to talk about "the hypothetical student" because each student's case is unique. But, we know that there are problems with the current system of applying financial aid to non-credit bearing courses. The money that is currently awarded to students for winter term must be treated as taxable income, and therefore incurs a tax liability. In some cases, this may push students into a new category of income that affects their financial aid in other cases. We do not have an unlimited pool of financial aid. There will have to be a budget. We think it will be helpful to address students with the highest level of need, or guaranteeing access to one trip abroad, or providing access to low-interest loans for credit bearing courses.

Comments from Brian Casey, President

There are few topics since I've been at DePauw that have brought as much chatter from students and alumni to me than the proposed changes to Winter Term. Everyone recognizes that we have problems with our current system. We must do something. There are behavioral problems associated with having students here in campus with, to be frank, little to do in the middle of winter. So most people who speak with me about Winter Term clearly agree that the behavioral issues associated with Winter Term need to be addressed. But so many students and alumni have communicated to me their sense of the real value of the time they have spent during winter term. An alum has said, "I interned at a doctor's office, and then I knew that wasn't what I wanted to do." For many, this time becomes a pivot, both intellectually and personally, during the course of their DePauw enrollment. So, for this and for many reasons, institutionally, we must keep Winter Term but we must make it better. It is interesting to note that many of our aspirant liberal arts colleges have kept this valuable time in the academic calendar. According to Dan Meyer (Vice President of Admissions), our strongest applicants view winter term as an extremely valuable part of the academic culture. Alumni say across the board, "This was an important time for me." On a personal note, I think three required Winter Term experiences are better than two. Part of the danger of our current Winter Term experience is students often have the sense of being alone or isolated on campus. The campus can feel too empty. If we reduce the requirement to two, lots of people could check out and this could make the campus empty. So if we are going to change Winter Term, let's do it big. Let's provide a robust on-campus experience.

Question from another faculty member

In the past, research students have worked with me during the summer. Would these students in the future be eligible for extended studies credit? These would not be SRF students. Last summer, they were funded through faculty development funds for faculty-student summer research.

Response from Nicole Brockmann

We will have to look at this, to see if students can receive academic credit and be paid for summer research.

Yes, the students would continue to be paid. We wouldn't take this away.

Comments from another faculty member

I'm not passionate about the issue of three vs. two required experiences. I like the voluntary nature of the proposal. I hate hearing from faculty members that, "I have to be here" or "This is hell," etc. I don't want us to go back to "hell" if we require three experiences and must coerce faculty to participate again.

Question was called

A member of the faculty called the question on the friendly amendment. Calling the question was approved by faculty vote (show of hands). There was a call for a secret ballot. For clarification, a "yes" vote indicated that a person was in favor of the friendly amendment, i.e., in favor of changing the number of required experiences from two to three in the proposed motion. A "no" vote indicated that a person was not in favor of the friendly amendment, i.e., to keep the language of the proposed motion as-is.

The vote was taken. The results of the vote were a dead tie with 62 votes in favor of the friendly amendment (yes), 62 votes against the friendly amendment (no), and 2 abstentions. According to Robert's Rules of Order, a tie is not a majority vote. Therefore, the friendly amendment was not approved. The required number of experiences for students in the proposal remains two and is not changed to three.

Discussion continued on the clarified motion from the pink sheet.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

CAPP does not want to see the winter term experience die or go away or be diminished. We only proposed two required experiences to ensure that the program will be successful in the long term. If you are worried that the friendly amendment was not approved, please rest assured that CAPP will look at this issue every year. In addition, anyone is welcome to propose a motion in the future to have this go back to the requirement of three.

Comments from another faculty member

I am concerned about the issue of credit vs. noncredit courses and how these distinctions will be made. I am more likely to teach experiential courses and I worry that experiential courses will carry less "weight" in terms of student interest and faculty compensation. From what I understand, an academic course with credit could count toward a faculty member's sabbatical. A non-credit experiential course would not count toward a faculty member's sabbatical. I hope we are gracious about what counts as an academic course. I also hope we don't resort to teaching mini courses like we normally teach during the regular semester.

Response from Nicole Brockmann

The decision of whether a course is academic or non-academic will be made by each department. If you decide you want to offer your course for credit, the approval process will go through MAO. If you decide you want to offer a non-credit course, the approval process will go through the Committee on Experiential Learning and the Hubbard Center, and they will come up with the guidelines. I believe that "experiential" is sometimes perceived as "not rigorous." However, my teaching is almost entirely "experiential" during the academic year and my teaching is definitely rigorous. You should feel free to offer the type of course that will benefit students the most. You are welcome to emphasize freedom to experiment without penalty or emphasize grades and GPA.

Response from Larry Stimpert

Regarding the issue of compensation, we do have a precedent for experiential vs. for-credit courses. The precedent is that we pay faculty members who supervise student research during the summer. This is an example of experiential learning. In comparison, we compensate faculty members who teach courses with

academic credit based on the amount of credit the course is worth. So a 0.5 credit course would be compensated as a 0.5 unit of teaching credit. There is a FAQ in the appendix that addresses this issue.

Comments from another faculty member

I love this proposal the way it is now. I don't understand why three is the magic number. In my experience, if students take one field trip, they will do it again. One seems to be enough. There also seems to be a misunderstanding that experiential and for-credit courses are mutually exclusive. They're not. In geosciences, we talk about different types of experiential learning. Should our students go out and see the rocks, like a tourist? Or should our students go out and produce a product and actually do geology? The former is all we do now, but the latter is actually a more powerful form of experiential learning.

Comments from another faculty member

I'm all for this if this will create funds for students to go do cool things, such as going to Ghana, which was sight-seeing to a large degree, but exposed students to a wide variety of disciplines. Or a trip to Maine with Cindy O'Dell. How do we decide if this is experiential or academic? There are a whole lot of hoops that we already have to jump through to take students on these trips. Do I need to now jump through more hoops to make these trips academic?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

The UNIV designation can cover interdisciplinary courses or cross-disciplinary courses. We ask that you do your due diligence to make sure your course doesn't belong in a specific department.

Comments from another faculty member

I favor the motion for a couple of reasons. Rather than thinking just about the use of a particular time period, the motion recognizes that students can learn from a wide variety of experiences beyond the traditional semester-long class. Some of these, such as internships, study abroad, and service learning, we already offer. One we do not currently offer with much regularity is an intensive "block-style" course. There are a lot of faculty who would like to offer an academic course during Winter Term and others who would like to continue offering the sorts of programs we offer now, and the proposal allows us to play to our strengths. I object to the rhetoric, which has been floating about in our discussions of this motion, that teaching intensive for-credit courses would involve "jamming," "shoving," or "shoehorning" an existing course into a 3-week schedule. MAO will set good standards for teaching a half-credit course, Faculty Development will offer some opportunities to gain skills in teaching in an intensive atmosphere, hopefully by consulting with faculty at institutions which do so regularly, and our colleagues will take seriously the task of designing and teaching these courses.

Question from another faculty member

What about courses that don't go to MAO? What about experiential courses that aren't particularly rigorous? How will we ensure that these courses will be rigorous and consistent?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Approval of these courses will go before the Committee on Experiential Learning. We want there to be a level of rigor, for everything to be at a high standard. I haven't asked the committee to come up with an approval process yet. But if these motions pass, I expect this will move to the top of CAPP's and CEL's agendas.

A faculty member called the question. Calling the question was approved by faculty vote (show of hands). There was a call for a secret ballot. For clarification, a "yes" vote indicated that a person was in favor of the proposed text on the pink sheet. A "no" vote indicated that a person was not in favor of the proposed text on the pink sheet.

The vote was taken. There were 100 “yes” votes, 24 “no” votes, and 1 abstention. Motion 1 carried. The faculty then proceeded to discuss motion 2.

Question from another faculty member

What types of courses would be included? Would the GRE prep class or the EMT class be included? Is it possible that a student can complete the requirement without interacting with a DePauw faculty member?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Yes, it would be mathematically possible that a student can complete the winter term requirement without interacting with a DePauw faculty member.

Question from another faculty member

Isn't this part of what the Committee on Experiential Learning would be deciding, the criteria in terms of what counts? This could be an unintended consequence.

Question from another faculty member

My question is regarding the academic calendar. I don't remember seeing May Term as part of the academic calendar. Do these experiences have to occur in January or May (from the perspective of the Gregorian calendar)?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

You are correct. Our May Term is not officially on the academic calendar. Our May Term has started after graduation and usually extends into June. In the future, there may be opportunities to teach a course during the summer.

Question from another faculty member

Is there a possibility of teaching a course just before the semester begins in the fall, such as a Servicios course?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

Right now, we're talking specifically about the January and May time periods. We're likely to be more flexible about this in the future.

A faculty member called for a quorum. The voting members were counted. There were over 100 voting members present and the quorum was still present.

A faculty member called the question. Calling the question was approved by faculty vote (show of hands). There was a call for a secret ballot. For clarification, a “yes” vote indicated that a person was in favor of motion 2. A “no” vote indicated that a person was not in favor of motion 2.

The results of the voting were 82 “yes” votes, 19 “no” votes, and 1 abstention. Motion 2 carried.

Written Announcements –

CAPP had no written announcements.

There were no additional questions for CAPP.

6. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

A. MAO's report is an offer to answer questions.

Announcements –

MAO has no written announcements other than those that appeared on the consent agenda.

There were no questions for MAO.

7. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

A. COF will update the faculty on discussions they are having about updates to processes and procedures.

Comments from Matthew Balensuela

Several colleagues have written to COF asking that portions of a candidate’s file be made available on-line. Some review material is available on-line to COF, such as student opinion forms. COF has discussed whether all materials should be available on line. We are concerned about internet security and the time necessary to scan and post materials. Would the candidate, COF, or a staff member be responsible for this? We’re still discussing the issues. We have heard the concerns, we are discussing the issues. We will not take immediate action given our current work responsibilities.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its normal work for the year.

There were no questions for COF.

8. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

SLAAC has no written announcements.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

9. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

A. FGSC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

1. FGSC continued to consult on the extended studies proposal as it has evolved and considered implications to our various committees related to implementation.
2. FGSC has scheduled a meeting with division officers next week to strategize best ways to seek a full slate of nominees for committee vacancies in academic year 2014-15.

There were no questions for FGSC.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

10. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

A. FDC’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

FDC has not yet met for spring semester and has no written announcements.

There were no questions for FDC.

11. Committee on Administration – COA (Scott Spiegelberg)

A. COA’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.

Comments from Scott Spiegelberg

We are currently addressing two issues: post-promotion review and merit compensation through fellowships, endowed chairs, and other awards. We welcome any other issues you would like to bring to us.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

There were no questions for COA.

12. Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC) (Caroline Jetton)

A. DEC’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.

Written Announcements –

A subset of DEC members began organizing the committee for spring work. Our first meeting will be held in mid-February. Prior to our first meeting, committee members are reviewing various documents, such as the 2013 Campus Climate Survey Data Summary, December 2013 Memo regarding Classroom Climate Issues Experienced by Domestic Students of Color and International Students, and the 2007-2008 Campus Climate Task Force for Faculty, Staff, and Students of Color. After reading the documents, committee members will develop an agenda for our semester work and invite various members of the DPU community who can offer insight on our agenda items. If you are aware of any issues DEC should address this spring please contact the chair or any committee member. Faculty members serving on the committee are Caroline Jetton, Mac Dixon-Fyle, Maria Forcadell, Naima Shifa, and Veronica Pejril. The complete committee roster is found on the faculty governance website.

There were no questions for DEC.

Additional Business

12. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

I wish to start off by saying thank you to Nicole Brockmann, Anne Harris, Terri Bonebright, and Dave Berque for their work on the extended studies proposal and hosting the forums.

I have three issues to share with you this afternoon: diversity, admissions, and the upcoming board meeting.

Diversity:

I have formally appointed Terri Bonebright to serve as the liaison to faculty for matters relating to diversity and the climate in the faculty surrounding matters of diversity. She has been charged to serve as the first person a

faculty member should contact should any issue arise or if there are thoughts and concerns she should know of. She will report to the Cabinet no less than once a semester on the faculty climate and should, where appropriate, bring to Larry or me specific issues.

I have also charged the DEC to update all demographic data we have on faculty, student and staff diversity, and to offer this to the Cabinet and the Faculty at the end of this semester.

Finally, I have asked Terri to work with the faculty members on the DEC to consider whether we are taking all necessary steps to ensure that our faculty hiring process results in a rich, strong and diverse faculty.

Admissions Numbers:

February 1st is the deadline for all admission applications. We are still receiving applications. This will sort itself out over the next several days. The completed applications are up 6 percent compared to last year and the total applications are up 5.5 percent compared to last year. We are still sorting through the quality indicators. Given this growth, we expect that we will be bringing down the rate of admissions by at least 5 percent. So far, the numbers are encouraging but it is very early in the season. One thing that we do know for this cycle is that we will raise the floor below which students are essentially certain not to be admitted. Last year we admitted a very small fraction of students with a high school GPA less than 3.0. This year, we have raised the floor to a high school GPA of 3.2

We are also beginning a long term shift in our merit aid award package levels to what we think of as “Midwest market” levels – that is, merit awards seen at St. Olaf, Denison, Centre and Macalaster. That said, we are likely to remain, by far, the most generous of the GLCA institutions in awarding aid, particularly aid that supports diversity, the School of Music, and other specific programs, such as Bonner Scholars.

Upcoming Board Meeting:

We begin the Board meetings in a few days. The meetings will begin this Wednesday and end on Saturday. The Board will consider the University’s tuition, its budget, and most importantly, how we continue to expand the footprint of the University, in the nation and around the world. How can we determine tuition levels and aid levels both to support our students and to provide the necessary resources to fund our ambitions?

The Board will hear updates on the ongoing and planned capital projects, including the athletics facilities, Hoover Dining Hall, and the renovation of the Student Union to provide space for Academic Affairs and the Hubbard Center. The Board will hear very preliminary plans for significant library (Roy O West) renovations.

But if I had to summarize where we are, with the Board, it seems like we are having a major gut check on what it means to strive to become a national liberal arts college. Do we have the resources we need, and if we don’t where can we get them? How do we fix the operating budget deficit (still largely driven by our underfunding deferred maintenance expenditures)?

We will have a serious conversation about what is truly required in terms of resources. In my estimation, in order to provide this form of education and have it available to students from all walks of life, we have to have \$1 billion in endowment. The vast majority of this must be in the form of scholarship support. The campaign will seek well over \$100 million in new endowment for student support in the form of the DePauw trust, but how do we get even more?

We will then speak about the other needs we want to address, beyond the many that are in our current list of priorities in the campaign. How can we address student housing? What investments should we make in

Greencastle? What facilities on campus should be addressed through revenues that will come from sources other than an improved operating budget? How do we connect the Nature Park and the Prindle Institute more directly to the campus?

To be excellent means we have to be relentless, on all fronts. And we need profound support from our alumni and friends and a financial foundation equal to those seen at the very best institutions – a rank to which we most certainly aspire.

I will send out an e-mail next week, after the Board meetings conclude. I have vowed always to communicate out what happens at the Board meetings. I also plan to use my time at the March Faculty Meeting to talk about what I hope are robust discussions with the Board this week. I hope to give the same presentation that I will give to the Board, depending on what other issues come before the faculty for the March meeting.

There were no questions for President Casey.

13. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

I wish to begin by expressing gratitude to everyone in this room. The extended studies proposal got infinitely better as it moved through faculty forums and student forums. As we go forward with building a better DePauw, we will be seeing cataclysmic changes in higher education during the next decade. We need to have a process of thoroughly vetting proposals as we did with the extended studies proposal. Whether or not the extended studies proposal passed, we heard that we need to ensure that faculty development is provided for intensive teaching and experiential learning. We will start figuring out our needs for faculty development while ensuring that the experiences for students will be high quality across the board, thus ensuring the consistency of the winter term experiences.

Please join President Casey and me congratulating our four newest faculty members who have been awarded tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: Meredith Brickell in the Art and Art History Department, Manu Raghav in the Economics and Management Department, Michael Roberts in the Psychology Department, and Alicia Suarez in the Sociology and Anthropology Department.

Each year, COF interviews individual members of a department to make recommendations on department chairs. COF then deliberates over the discussions and makes a recommendation to me. I have accepted the COF's recommendation, and next year we will have six new chairs: Lori Miles in the Art and Art History Department, Andrew Hayes in the Communications and Theatre Department, Jamie Stockton in the Education Studies Department, Fred Soster in the Geosciences Department, Marcia McKelligan in the Philosophy Department, and Alex Komives in the Physics Department. Please join me in congratulating these faculty members who have stepped forward to do one of the most important jobs on campus.

Gary Lemon, after many years of dedicated service, will be stepping down from his leadership position in the McDermond Center for Management and Entrepreneurship. The Management Fellows program and the other fellows and honors programs are very important to our recruiting efforts. Fully 20 percent of our new students are recruited through the fellows and honors programs. Gary has offered extraordinary opportunities to our students through his service in this program.

We have now launched the search for a new director of the Prindle Institute for Ethics. The position is now posted on Chronicle for Higher Education web site. We welcome your participation in soliciting nominations. Members of the search committee are Sharon Crary, Marcia McKelligan, Kevin Moore, Chris White, Christopher Wells, and a student, Garth Synnestvedt, who is an active intern at Prindle. The deadline for applications is Feb 28th, 2014.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

14. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

15. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

16. Announcements

A. Library announcements (Rick Provine, Director of Libraries)

Comments from Rick Provine

1. Change in Library System

Our Library is a member of, and shares a system with, the Private Academic Libraries of Indiana (PALNI). PALNI has voted to migrate from our current system (ExLibris) to OCLC's Worldshare Management Services. The new system will provide more sharing among libraries, less overhead to operate, a more current and scalable system architecture, and a similar interface to our current search system. The scheduled change will take effect on July 1, 2014. We will be in touch prior to that time to share information, updates and a chance for you to look at the new system prior to launch.

2. Acquired BePress Digital Commons software

We will be using a new type of software for publishing text-based works, to be known as *Scholarship and Creative Work from DePauw University*. The new system can house student and faculty publications, and some library collections. The software can house open access journal publishing, including mechanisms for peer review, editing, etc. It will also provide an avenue for open-access publishing. LAC (Library Advisory Committee) will be reviewing the Open Access Policy for faculty consideration.

3. Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) receives Lilly Grant

This grant will help us develop comparative collections data for all Indiana academic libraries. This will benefit and inform future sharing and collecting of library materials

4. Renovation of Roy O. West Library

We are currently in the pre-planning stages. We are working with an architectural consulting firm and developing fund-raising materials. There will be plenty of opportunities for input and more precise planning once funds have been committed.

There were no questions for Rick Provine.

B. Committee Vacancies for Spring 2014 (Bridget Gourley)

We have a vacancy on FDC and we still need to complete the membership for MAO. I hope you will consider

one of these opportunities. Nominations for the vacancies will be accepted until Friday, February 7. An election will follow with balloting from Monday, February 10 through Wednesday, February 12.

At-large Faculty Development Committee (FDC) – 1.5 years remain on the term – may not be from Geosciences, English, Music, Modern Languages, or Women’s Studies

At-large Management of Academic Operations (MAO) – Three-year term (2.5 years remain) – must be tenured or in at least the seventh year of full-time faculty status; may not be from Division 1, Modern Languages, Biology or Philosophy

Division 2 Third Division Officer – one-year term

Division 1 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

Division 2 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

Division 4 Grievance Committee Alternate for service 2/01/14 through 1/31/15

All potential Grievance Committee members must be tenured and may not be on COF.

17. Adjournment

There was no further business to come before the faculty. The faculty was adjourned.

Appendices

Appendix A. Winter Term memo to faculty colleagues 1-27-14 overviewing the proposed Extended Studies program, and providing rationale for the proposed CAPP motions related to WT

January 2014

Dear Faculty Colleagues:

At the December faculty meeting, we promised a more complete description of the proposed changes and enhancements to DePauw's current Winter Term program. This document aims to do just that. It also aims to have the conversation about DePauw's Winter Term broadened into a larger conversation about the ways in which we educate our students and prepare them for lives of meaning, empathy, and purpose and how best to use those periods of time—Winter Term and May Term—for the development of our students.

The proposal that is before you is the result of three faculty and two student forums held in the fall semester; of ongoing discussions between faculty, students, and alumni; and of a semester's worth of discussions between members of CAPP, the Committee on Experiential Learning (CEL), the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC), the academic deans, Dean Raj Bellani, and VPAA Larry Stimpert over this year's Winter Term. The faculty will be asked to vote specifically on changes regarding what students must do to satisfy graduation requirements in this new framework, but the vote we will be taking does not represent the end of our work. CAPP, CEL, MAO, and many academic offices will continue to hammer out the fine details of putting these ideas into operation; what you in essence will be voting on is whether we have your permission to continue working.

The faculty and student forums produced a remarkable variety of ideas. Some wanted a Winter Term that was wholly voluntary for both faculty and students; others wanted to continue mandatory participation by one or both groups. Some wanted Winter Term to be longer; some wanted it to be shorter. Some wanted to extend Fall and Spring Break to two weeks to accommodate service travel and other mid-semester opportunities. [Even now, we know there are concerns about how many Winter Term experiences should be required and what types of experiences should count.](#) CAPP and other faculty committees listened carefully to these ideas and considered each of them at length and in good faith.

In crafting these proposals, we took as a fundamental principle the Latin phrase *primum non nocere*, or "first, do no harm." We heard from faculty, students, and alumni alike that many successful and meaningful Winter Term experiences already exist, and we are committed to preserving the structures that allow those experiences to flourish while providing varied frameworks for new and restructured courses and projects.

I. Winter Term in a Broader Context: Education beyond Traditional Semesters at DePauw

One of the comments most often made about WT is that the best kinds of WT experiences provide a truly meaningful "deep dive" into a single area of focus for a concentrated period — an intensive period of study not possible within the demands of a regular semester, and one that often provides students with memories and insights they remember vividly long after the experience is over. In considering how to approach restructuring WT, we wanted to reaffirm our commitment to the centrality of the WT experience as a signature feature of a DePauw education. When DePauw students graduate, we want their transcript to reflect that—in addition to standard semester-long coursework in a particular major or majors and a broad range of critical thinking courses across the curriculum—they have also had concentrated, intensive, immersive experiences that represent a different but equally powerful way of learning. We believe that the array of

experiences that students undertake through these “deep dives” can be made more intentional, more challenging, and more directly part of the path of students’ intellectual and social development.

Keeping to the principle of “do no harm,” we concluded that WT required not an overhaul but an expansion. Perhaps, we thought, the way to “fix” WT was not to force the wonderful variety of course offerings we have into one mold, but rather to come up with a larger framework that allows new opportunities to flourish and existing offerings to continue or to be revised. Because these projects would be considered more deliberately as *extensions* of students’ regular coursework, we began to refer to this framework as an “Extended Studies” program.

Current Winter Term and May Term offerings give students unique opportunities to:

1. Engage in more experiential or on-site learning experiences to supplement learning that takes place in specific courses
2. Learn and experience personal growth through community service opportunities
3. Explore and prepare for various career opportunities
4. Engage in independent study programs

Our expanded framework would also allow the following:

5. Earn academic credit in curricular courses on-campus and abroad, supported by both institutional and federal Financial Aid.

Once we explored the idea of expanding our offerings, it became very easy to envision many other ways in which this framework can grow in the future. DePauw Extended Studies could be a potent tool to reach out to community members, alumni, high school students and teachers, and other area programs to strengthen our ties to our community and to help us in recruiting, preparing, and retaining an ever-stronger student population.

II. The Old and the New

The tables and text on the following pages show various comparisons between what exists and what is proposed and detail some of the options available under the new Extended Studies program.

TABLE 1: Current WT vs. new Extended Studies

	Current WT	Extended Studies
Faculty participation	Required once every 2-3 years	Voluntary
Student participation	Minimum of three required for graduation	Proposed: Minimum of two required for graduation
When offered?	Winter Term and May Term	Winter Term and May Term. *** Areas for future development: one or two terms in summer; fall/spring breaks
Types of credit earned by students	"Winter Term" credit	Academic credit and/or "Extended Studies" credit. Internships, for example, would earn one ES credit but no academic credit. A course taken for academic credit would earn 0.5 credit in the appropriate department AND one ES credit. (The registrar has already come up with a way to clearly document this in the SOC and on transcripts.) The 0.5 academic credit would count toward a student's GPA as well as toward graduation requirements.
Financial aid for students?	No	Yes, for courses earning academic credit. This includes study travel courses.
Grading	S/D/U; grades do not count in student GPA	For courses bearing academic credit: A-F scale; grades count in student GPA. For courses not earning academic credit: S/U or S/D/U, at the discretion of the instructor.
Courses approved/reviewed by	Winter Term Office	For academic courses: MAO, according to MAO's standard procedures. For courses not bearing academic credit: CEL and the Hubbard Center.
Credit/incentives for faculty	Standard required participation earns no special credit; additional voluntary WTs taught may be banked towards sabbatical	All participation now completely voluntary. Non-academic courses and projects earn a flat stipend. Academic courses earn 0.5 credit which may be applied to a future sabbatical (or, in special circumstances, to remedy irregularities in a faculty member's normal load).
Faculty development available?	No	Yes

TABLE 2: Details of options within Extended Studies

	DePauw Curricular Offerings	DePauw Co-Curricular Offerings	Research and Artistic Work
Types of experiences	Intensive on-campus courses; credit-bearing study/service travel courses	On-campus courses; non-credit-bearing study/service travel; MCAT; EMT; DePauw-Kelly (IU) business courses; externships	Summer lab work; on-site work (e.g., archaeological digs); intensive artistic work; independent study projects
Types of credit earned by students	0.5 academic credit, attributed to either the sponsoring department or UNIV (depending on how the course is listed), <i>plus</i> one ES (extended studies) credit.	One ES credit; no academic credit.	One ES credit; no academic credit.
Course/trip/project appears on transcript?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grading	A-F scale. Grade counts in student GPA.	S/D/U; Grade does not count in student GPA.	S/D/U; Grade does not count in student GPA.
Courses approved/reviewed by	MAO, in accordance with standard procedures for all other academic courses	CEL and the Hubbard Center	Academic Departments -- students must obtain approval for research and creative projects from the sponsoring department, not from the Hubbard Center
Financial aid for students?	Yes	No	No
Credit/incentives for faculty	0.5 load credit earned towards sabbatical. In special circumstances and when approved by the VPAA, academic credit earned through ES courses may be applied to a faculty member's regular teaching load during the academic year.	Stipend plus expenses	None

Further details appear on the following pages.

DEPAUW CURRICULAR OFFERINGS:

- 0.5 credit courses that may be based on existing Winter Term courses and service learning opportunities, which may be modifications of existing courses in DePauw's curriculum, or which may be entirely new courses designed to complement existing offerings or explore new areas. Students will be held to the same expectations of rigor and coursework shared by courses offered during the academic year.
- Courses may be held on campus, may link on-campus and off-campus work, or may be held entirely off campus. Courses involving travel must have an academic component.
- Courses will be graded using the regular A-F scale or be designated as P/F by the instructor; these grades appear on the transcript and are calculated in a student's GPA.
- Tuition will be charged and financial aid will apply for these courses. Fall and Spring semester tuition currently covers 4.5 units of credit. We are proposing that fall semester tuition be extended to cover the succeeding Winter Term, and spring semester tuition do the same for the succeeding May Term.
 - *** *We are aware that some students, especially students in the Honors Scholars, SRF, and other programs, as well as students in the SoM, may already be routinely taking 4.5 credits per semester, which would mean that they would be charged overload fees for an ES experience attached to one of these semesters. We are committed to finding a solution for that so that these students are not penalized.*
- Students may only take 0.5 credits per year in either WT or May term combined.
- Faculty members who wish to teach a curricular ES course will earn 0.5 units of teaching credit for each course offered. In most cases this credit will be banked toward a full-year sabbatical, but under some circumstances and with the permission of the VPAA the credit may be applied to remedy an imbalance in a faculty member's teaching load during an academic year.
 - *** *Areas for future development: Should this framework be successful, we may be able to offer curricular coursework in one or two blocks during the Summer.*

DEPAUW CO-CURRICULAR OFFERINGS:

- This is a category with enormous potential for growth, so for now we are not describing it by the kinds of courses and projects it contains so as not to exclude future developments.
- This is the place for courses and service/educational travel opportunities that students and faculty feel are valuable but that faculty members may not want to convert into credit-bearing courses. Not all courses or trips will benefit from being forced to fit into a credit-bearing curricular model, but that does not make them less worthy of being offered.
- Our EMT-certification and MCAT-preparation courses are part of this category, as are the courses that will be offered in conjunction with the Kelly School of Business at IU.
- Students would pay the cost of participating in these experiences and financial aid would not apply, but some kinds of opportunities in this category (including some of our service trips) are supported by endowments and other funds that offset the cost of these opportunities for participating students.
- Faculty and others teaching courses in this category would be paid a flat stipend.
 - *** *Areas for future development: There has been some discussion about whether and how this category might be expanded to include courses for advanced high school students, bridge programs for entering first-year students, courses taught and open to community members, etc. Again, we will be starting with on- and off-campus experiences for current DePauw students, but there is the potential for expansion in many interesting ways.*

RESEARCH AND ARTISTIC WORK:

- Students may propose to a faculty member that they engage in independent research or creative projects or that they may work with faculty on already existing faculty research projects that take place during Winter Term or May Term
- These projects would be considered, approved, and overseen by academic departments and the sponsoring faculty members. Students must go through departments to have these projects approved, not through the Hubbard Center.
- Groups of students could propose a Group Independent Study Project to be overseen by an individual faculty member and approved by an academic department.

III. The Proposed Changes and Motions before the Faculty; Clarification of Teaching Responsibilities

CAPP and the Committee on Experiential Learning are asking the faculty to approve two motions: one to make a slight reduction in graduation requirements related to the new Extended Studies program, and one to further specify what kinds of experiences count toward that requirement. The existing text, the proposed revision, and the rationale for each motion can be found below.

EXISTING TEXT:

Winter Term

Every DePauw student must complete three Winter Term projects with a satisfactory grade. (Winter Term projects are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.) Only one of the three required Winter Term projects may be satisfied by participation in a semester off-campus study program or Fellows internship. Students opting to fulfill one of their Winter Term credits in this way will not receive additional credit if they participate in a Winter Term project during January of the same academic year.

One Winter Term project is considered full time, and students may be enrolled in only one project per January session. DePauw Winter Term projects do not receive regular units of academic credit and do not meet distribution requirements for graduation or requirements toward a major. Students are expected to be aware of and follow all appropriate procedures and deadlines, which may be found on the [Winter Term web site](#).

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in a Winter Term project must complete the project by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to an unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Winter Terms may petition to the director of Winter Term to make up a project during the summer. Graduating seniors who receive an unsatisfactory Winter Term grade during the senior year may petition to make up the project during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make-up Winter Term project.

Transfer students receive credit for one Winter Term project for every full year of full-time study at another institution.

PROPOSED TEXT:

Extended Studies

Every DePauw student must complete at least two Extended Studies opportunities with a passing or satisfactory grade. Options for completing the Extended Studies requirement include:

- a Winter Term or May Term credit-bearing course
- an approved non-credit-bearing course, externship, travel, or service learning program
- a semester-long off-campus study opportunity or internship
- an independent study, research project, or creative project

Each of these experiences must be pre-approved to count toward the Extended Studies requirement. *At least one of these opportunities must be completed through participation in a Winter Term or May Term course or opportunity.*

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in an Extended Studies opportunity must complete the course by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to a grade of failure (F) or unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Extended Studies opportunities may petition to the Committee on Experiential Learning to make up a course in an alternative way. Graduating seniors who receive a failing or unsatisfactory Extended Studies grade during the senior year may petition to make up the course during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make-up Extended Studies opportunity that is a credit-bearing course.

Rationale for Motion 1 (reducing the number of required WT/ES experiences from three to two):

CAPP has heard and considered a variety of views on this topic. On the one hand, we are expanding the types of opportunities available for students to choose from and opening up new opportunities for courses bearing not just ES credit but also academic credit that could count towards fulfillment of a major. To reduce the number of ES experiences required for graduation under those circumstances seems strange. On the other hand, we are simultaneously making the ES program voluntary for faculty, but not for students. Although we think that many faculty members will find these new opportunities energizing and will be eager to participate, we cannot ignore the possibility (no matter how remote) that all 200-odd faculty members will suddenly decide that this year they will not offer a WT course, leaving students in the impossible position of having a requirement to fulfill but no way to fulfill it. **** Including the ES offerings at the department level during the SOC planning for the following academic year should also help with this issue, and it is under consideration as part of the possible implementation of this proposal.*

Responsible stewardship of the academic program dictates that we cannot run the risk of having too few Extended Studies offerings to satisfy student demand. CAPP is confident that the Extended Studies program will flourish, but knowing that any startup venture hits bumps in the road, CAPP felt that it would be prudent to relax slightly the requirement for graduation in the initial years of this new enterprise, so as to best set the program up for success.

It is also for this reason that CAPP chose not to bring forward to the faculty this fall a motion to raise University graduation requirements to 32 credits. While normally this is the kind of proposal that puts a twinkle in CAPP's collective eye, the timing of it in conjunction with the voluntary nature of ES for faculty members seemed risky. CAPP's reticence to bring such a motion to the faculty should not be interpreted as a "no, never," but merely a "not yet." CAPP anticipates that this or a similar motion will be again on its agenda within a few years,

and welcomes those future discussions.

CAPP plans to have a yearly consultation with CEL, the Hubbard Center, and the VPAA about the ongoing development of the Extended Studies program, with a more extensive review after the third year. By then, we anticipate that we will better be able to judge whether we can return the requirement to three, leave it at two, or try a different option entirely. The yearly or three year reviews may also show that there needs to be other changes, such a return to a requirement for faculty participation in the program [or changes to the number and type of Extended Studies experiences mandated for students](#). CAPP will provide reports to the full faculty after each of these consultations and the third-year review.

Rationale for Motion 2 (at least one ES experience must take place during Winter Term or May Term)

The language of this motion anticipates the idea that with the new ES framework, we will soon be able to begin offering ES opportunities to students during the summer. Since at the moment, Winter Term and May Term offerings are all that exist, it seems redundant to write handbook language specifying that at least one of a student's required experiences must take place during one of these periods. However, soon that may not be the case.

The impetus for this motion comes from the many comments we have heard not just from students and faculty but from alumni who welcome the new opportunities offered by the ES framework but who feel the three-week periods in January and May that are set aside for concentrated study offer a special kind of immersion that is worth preserving. These time periods do something important for DePauw that a summer program may not. More than just a tradition, these periods of concentrated study in a close-knit group on or off campus help build community among our students and faculty and shared respect for the academic endeavor. For this reason, CAPP is asking you to vote to help ensure the continuation of the Winter Term and May Term time periods by requiring that students participate in at least one ES experience during one of these two times.

Students who are pursuing off-campus study for a semester receive ES credit for the Winter or May Term attached to their off-campus semester, so off-campus study or semester-long internships satisfy this requirement.

Clarification of Teaching Responsibilities

Some confusion arose at December's faculty meeting about a proposal to modify a portion of the Academic Handbook that addresses teaching duties and responsibilities of faculty members. While the faculty typically proposes and approves changes to the Academic Handbook, the portion of the Handbook that deals with teaching duties is not a section under faculty approval. In the interests of transparency, the following change will be made if the faculty approves the proposed changes to graduation requirements described above. However it is important to note that the Academic Affairs will closely monitor the opportunities that are offered to students for the curricular and co-curricular options and reserve the right to reinstate the teaching requirement if needed to preserve the programing for students.

EXISTING TEXT:

f. Teaching duties

The normal teaching duties of a full time member of the DePauw faculty shall be equivalent to twelve contact

hours per week each semester and the whole range of attendant duties involved in teaching (preparation, evaluation, and reflection) necessary to support these twelve hours. Departments are responsible for determining, with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, what counts as a normal teaching load under this general guideline. Faculty members also must teach periodically in the Winter Term program. (See Article XXXII of the General Policies.)

PROPOSED TEXT:

f. Teaching duties

The normal teaching duties of a full time member of the DePauw faculty shall be equivalent to twelve contact hours per week each semester and the whole range of attendant duties involved in teaching (preparation, evaluation, and reflection) necessary to support these twelve hours. Departments are responsible for determining, with the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, what counts as a normal teaching load under this general guideline. Faculty members may also teach in the university's Extended Studies program. (See Article XXXII of the General Policies.)

IV. Frequently Asked Questions (and Frequently Raised Objections)

1. How is the Extended Studies program an improvement on what we currently offer?

The expanded framework insures that Winter Term and May Term include high-caliber credit-bearing and experiential courses, and since participation by faculty members would be voluntary, incentives will be aligned toward making the ES experience positive and stimulating for all involved. Students engaged in valuable and intensive experiences should also have fewer reasons for engaging in unhealthy behaviors. In addition, since financial aid will be applicable to credit-bearing ES courses, including those involving off-campus travel, there is an opportunity to provide more equitable access to these experiences.

2. What happens to Winter Term if the faculty votes down these motions?

Then we keep what we have. Winter Term is not going away. However: the proposed changes to grading and credit policies, the shift from obligatory to voluntary participation by faculty members, and the provision of faculty development for the teaching of compressed courses are designed to make teaching in the program more attractive and fulfilling. If the faculty votes down these motions, it will be difficult for the administration to justify moving to a voluntary program for faculty, and the question of faculty engagement in the program will need to be revisited.

3. When would these changes take effect?

If approved by the DePauw faculty at its February meeting, these changes will begin to take effect as early as the 2014-2015 academic year. Students who entered DePauw prior to the fall 2014 will be permitted to follow the old Winter Term requirements or the new ones, while those students entering DePauw in the fall of 2014 or later would follow the new Extended Studies requirement.

4. I have used Winter Term teaching opportunities as ways to support a full-year sabbatical. Won't that option go away if we change WT as proposed here?

“Banked” time that has been already earned for voluntary Winter Term teaching will be maintained and applied toward future sabbaticals. Faculty members teaching curricular courses during Winter Term and May Term will continue to have the option of banking this “teaching credit” toward a full-year sabbatical.

Instead of increasing the amount of Winter Term teaching needed to earn credit toward a full-year sabbatical this proposal would result in either no net increase or possibly even a reduction in the amount of teaching needed to earn credit toward a full year sabbatical. Faculty members are now obligated to offer a Winter Term course once every three years. So, all faculty members must teach at least two Winter Term courses (with no opportunities for banking teaching credit) between sabbaticals. They must then teach two additional Winter Term courses in order to bank sufficient teaching credit to earn approximately 87 percent of their full-time salary during a sabbatical year. Under the proposal offered here, teaching four Winter Term for-credit courses would allow faculty members to bank sufficient teaching credit to earn approximately 91 percent of their full-time salary during a sabbatical year.

5. Will there be opportunities to link regular semester courses to Winter Term or May term travel courses?

Yes, there are a number of ways this could be done. For example, it would be possible to offer a Winter or May Term experiential travel opportunity or a for-credit trip that has a regular semester course as a pre-requisite.

Appendix B. Rationale for proposed minor in Italian

(condensed from documents provided by the department)

In spring 2013, the Department of Modern Languages discussed the creation of a minor in Italian that would be in line with other minors in the department (particularly, minors in those languages that do not have a major at DePauw: Chinese, Japanese, and Russian) and sustainable in terms of current staffing (i.e., one fulltime, now tenured faculty member in Italian).

In September 2013, Francesca Seaman and the chair of the Department of Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus) drafted a proposal for a minor in Italian that they shared with faculty in the Department at meetings in October and November. This proposal is the result of revisions after those meetings and has been reviewed and approved by all continuing, fulltime faculty members in the Department. (NB: CAPP approved this minor in December 2013.)

No new faculty will be needed in order to offer regularly all courses necessary for a student (even a student entering DePauw with no previous knowledge or prior study of Italian) to complete a five-course minor in Italian, where the first course to count toward the minor is Italian 271, in four years or less. A sequence of study for a student who begins Italian at DePauw might be as follows (note that, upon completion of ITAL 272, a student could take the remaining courses in any order).

First year: ITAL 171 (fall) – ITAL 172 (spring)

Second year: ITAL 271 (fall) – ITAL 272 (spring)

Third year: ITAL 371/ML 164C/ML 295 (fall) – ITAL 375 (spring)

Fourth year: ITAL 371/ML 164C/ML 295 (fall) – ITAL 375 (spring)

All courses listed are already regularly offered at DePauw. If the minor in Italian is approved, the Department of Modern Languages would commit to the following course offerings in Italian each semester.

Fall:

ITAL 171

ITAL 271

ITAL 371 or ML 164C or ML 295

Spring

ITAL 172

ITAL 272

ITAL 375

The creation of an Italian language minor would strengthen the present offerings of the Department of Modern Languages and fill a hole in the curriculum, as mentioned above. It would provide students with an interest in Italian the opportunity to continue their study of the language. It would enable students who study abroad in Italy to make more explicit connections between their on- and off-campus experiences. It would also allow DePauw to add a vibrant program in Italian at no cost taking full advantage of Francesca Seaman's expertise in Italian language, literature, and culture and her position as a fulltime, tenured faculty member.

Should the minor not be approved, students with an interest in Italian would continue to be discouraged from further study of the language at DePauw, and students who study abroad in Italy would continue to lack institutional support for making connections between their off-campus experiences and their on-campus study. Finally, course offerings in Italian at DePauw would continue to be limited almost exclusively to

“service” courses (in recent years, sometimes three sections of elementary Italian per semester), courses that lead to no minor or major (except for the European Studies minor) and do not foster the deeper interest which our students are showing in Italian language, literature, and culture.

Proposed catalogue description of the minor including requirements and course descriptions:

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, including either five courses taught in Italian, starting at the 200-level, or four courses taught in Italian, starting at the 200-level, and one course taught in English on Italian cinema, literature, and/or culture (ML 164C or ML 295). Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	One-two

See Appendix C for the catalog descriptions of minors in other modern foreign languages at DePauw.

ITAL 171 Elementary Italian I

Introduction to the Italian language with emphasis on development of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing. *No pre-requisite*

ITAL 172: Elementary Italian II

A continuation of ITAL 171. *Pre-requisite: Italian 171.*

ITAL 271: Intermediate Italian I

Second year Italian. First semester. This course emphasizes oral and written expression, listening comprehension and building vocabulary. It also provides an intensive review of grammar. Learning is facilitated by a careful selection of literary texts, such as plays, novels, short stories, celebrated lyrics from opera and contemporary music. A variety of real-life material is also employed, including newspaper and magazine articles, radio and television broadcasts. Students are required to participate and engage in conversation during class. Regular attendance is essential. Daily assignments are required. *Pre-requisite: Italian 171 & 172 or permission of a professor of Italian in the Modern Language Department.*

ITAL 272: Intermediate Italian II

Continuation of ITAL 271.

ITAL 371: Advanced Italian

In this course, students will engage in conversation through film, current events, opera, contemporary music and short stories. Though the course will focus especially on developing the students' oral fluency and writing competence, students will improve their writing, reading, listening-comprehension and oral skills. This course will prepare students for more advanced work in Italian. *Pre-requisite: Italian 272.*

ITAL 375: Topics in Italian Literature and Culture

This course will introduce and examine an Italian literary and/or cultural topic. Taught in Italian. *Pre-requisite: Italian 272 or approval of the instructor. May be repeated for credit with different topics. May count towards European Studies minor.*

ITAL 470: Advanced Readings and Projects

This course is an independent studies course for advanced students of Italian who wish to pursue an independently designed program of research or inquiry in Italian. *Open to advanced students in Italian with permission of Chair. May be repeated for credit with different topics.*

ML164C: The Cinema: Italy

Screening and study of representative masterworks of cinema, the film as art, and a product of culture. No knowledge of the foreign language is required. *Credit toward a major or minor may be given at the discretion of the department.*

ML 295: Topics in Modern Languages

Courses in specific topics, such as culture, literary movements or genres, linguistics or film. *Taught in English. May be repeated for credit with a different topic. May count towards European Studies minor.*

Note: Past course offerings in ML 295 have included "The Grand Tour of Italy. History, Art, and Literary Impressions", "Illusion and Reality. A Journey Through Italian 20th Century Literature," and "Unhappy Loves: Masterpieces of The Italian Tradition."

Appendix B. Catalogue description for other minors in modern foreign languages at DePauw**Requirements for a Minor in Chinese**

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	Five credits in Chinese language courses at the 200-level or above. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Two

Requirements for a Minor in French

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five French courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus. Minor for heritage speakers of French: When students successfully complete three classes at the level of FREN 315 or higher, with a grade of C or better in each, they receive two retroactive credits for FREN 202 and FREN 305 to complete the five-course minor.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Requirements for a Minor in German

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five German courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Requirements for a Minor in Japanese

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, either five courses in Japanese language at the 200-level or above, or four courses in Japanese language at the 200-level or above plus one of the following: ASIA 281, ASIA 282, REL 258 or REL 352. For the ASIA and REL courses, supplementary readings in Japanese are required for Japanese minors. Only one of the courses toward the minor may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Two-three

Requirements for a Minor in Russian

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	Varies
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, starting at the 200-level, including four courses taught in Russian plus one literature course (ML 227 or ML 326) or one culture course (ML 225 or ML 301). Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	One-two

Requirements for a Minor in Spanish

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five Spanish courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus. Minor for heritage speakers of Spanish: When students successfully complete three classes at the level of SPAN 332 or higher, with a grade of C or better in each, they receive two retroactive credits for SPAN 232 and SPAN 330 to complete the five-course minor.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Appendix C. Pink Sheet to clarify and more clearly separate CAPP Motions Related to the Extended Studies (ES) Proposal

**Restructured Motion from CAPP
February 3rd, 2014**

As a result of recent faculty forums, CAPP understands that some faculty members would like to propose amending CAPP's motion regarding the number of Extended Study (formerly Winter Term) experiences students must complete for graduation so that this number is maintained at three, rather than reduced to two.

While CAPP believes its proposal to reduce this requirement from three to two is well-justified, it recognizes that this question must be decided by the whole faculty and welcomes debate on this (and all) issues.

To make it easier for a faculty member to propose an amendment if desired, CAPP has worked with the Chair of the Faculty to reorganize its motion so that it is no longer split between the main agenda and an appendix. This will make it easier for a faculty member to propose an amendment, since language need only be amended in one place.

Note that the wording found in the Appendix of the agenda and the wording found below are identical. The motions found in the body of the agenda have been reorganized to make an amendment easier while keeping the scope of the motions the same.

1) Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty replace the following text (shown in Appendix A and repeated below for simplicity):

EXISTING TEXT:

Winter Term

Every DePauw student must complete three Winter Term projects with a satisfactory grade. (Winter Term projects are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.) Only one of the three required Winter Term projects may be satisfied by participation in a semester off-campus study program or Fellows internship. Students opting to fulfill one of their Winter Term credits in this way will not receive additional credit if they participate in a Winter Term project during January of the same academic year.

One Winter Term project is considered full time, and students may be enrolled in only one project per January session. DePauw Winter Term projects do not receive regular units of academic credit and do not meet distribution requirements for graduation or requirements toward a major. Students are expected to be aware of and follow all appropriate procedures and deadlines, which may be found on the Winter Term web site.

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in a Winter Term project must complete the project by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to an unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Winter Terms may petition to the director of Winter Term to make up a project during the summer. Graduating seniors who receive an unsatisfactory Winter Term grade during the senior year may petition to make up the project during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make---up Winter Term project. Transfer students receive credit for one Winter Term project for every full year of full---time study at another institution.

...with the text below, with the exception of the italicized sentence which will be considered later on our agenda (Motion 2):

PROPOSED TEXT:

Extended Studies

Every DePauw student must complete at least two Extended Studies opportunities with a passing or satisfactory grade. Options for completing the Extended Studies requirement include:

- a Winter Term or May Term credit-bearing course
- an approved non-credit-bearing course, externship, travel, or service learning program
- a semester-long off-campus study opportunity or internship
- an independent study, research project, or creative project

Each of these experiences must be pre-approved to count toward the Extended Studies requirement.

At least one of these opportunities must be completed through participation in a Winter Term or May Term course or opportunity.

Students who receive incomplete (I) grades in an Extended Studies opportunity must complete the course by the end of the following semester or the grade will automatically convert to a grade of failure (F) or unsatisfactory (U). Students who have a deficient number of Extended Studies opportunities may petition to the Committee on Experiential Learning to make up a course in an alternative way. Graduating seniors who receive a failing or unsatisfactory Extended Studies grade during the senior year may petition to make up the course during the final spring semester if appropriate arrangements can be made. Tuition is charged to enroll in a make-up Extended Studies opportunity that is a credit-bearing course.

CAPP anticipates that a faculty member may offer the following amendment.

Anticipated Amendment: That we replace “two” with “three” in the first sentence of the motion.

2) Should CAPP's Motion 1 pass, with or without amendment, CAPP will make the following motion.

Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty include the italicized sentence shown above as part of DePauw's Extended Studies Requirements.

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Agenda
March 3rd, 2014**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom

Meeting called to order at 4:05 without a quorum.

Hi everyone, welcome. Although we do not yet have a quorum, I would like to invite Istvan Csicsery-Ronay and Tom Emery to give remembrances for our departed colleagues of the English Department. As we get started let me make a couple reminders. While I know it seems our community is small enough we should all know each other, we always have new individuals in our community so if you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself. Having the microphones on stands and extra aisles worked so well last month, let's keep with it. If you'd like to ask a question or make a comment today during any report please be sure and come forward. Clay will still need to bring up the volume. Lastly, if you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that it is silenced.

2. Verification of Quorum

Jim Mills has signaled to me that we've reached our quorum of 86 members so let's begin. We can now conduct official business that requires a vote. (4:13PM)

3. Faculty Remembrances

Today we will take a moment to remember a couple of long standing colleagues in English who passed away this winter. Istvan Csicsery-Ronay will share some memories of Keith Opdahl and then Tom Emery, who retired a few years ago, has a tribute to Fred Bergmann. Wes Wilson graciously pulled photographs of each of our colleagues for me to display as the remembrances are read.

Keith Opdahl, Professor Emeritus of English served DePauw full time from 1967 to 1992. Keith passed away on December 31, 2013. A tribute to Keith was written and will be read by Professor Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, English, and may be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

Frederick Bergmann, Professor Emeritus of English served DePauw full time from 1940 to 1982. Fred passed away on December 28, 2013. A tribute to Fred was written and will be read by Professor Emeritus Tom Emery, English, and may be found in Appendix B of this agenda.

4. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of Minutes from the February 2014 Faculty Meeting

B. Approval of the following new courses (recommended by MAO):

ARTH 135 East Asian Art Survey II (1 credit)

BIO 101 Molecules, Cells and Genes (1 credit)

BIO 102 Evolution, Organisms and Ecology (1 credit)

ECON 385 Regression and Simulation for Economics and Management (1 credit)

ENG 397 Irish Literature: Advanced Topics (1 credit)

FILM 420 Independent Study in Film (1 credit)

PSY 281 Cognitive Psychology with lab (1 credit)

C. Approval the following change in course credit and description (recommended by MAO):

HONR – 192 Science Research Fellows Experience II (0.5 credit) to change to HONR – 192 Science

Research Fellows Experience II (variable credit) – Mid-semester, independent research linked to the SRF summer research experience. Offering is project dependent.

D. MAO announces the following change in course title:

ENG 369 – Modern British Literature is changed to ENG 369 Modern British and Irish Literature

E. MAO announces the following course changes:

ENG 393 – Literature and Culture: Advanced Topics and ENG 394 – Literature and History: Advanced Topics are merged into ENG 393 – Literature, Culture, and History: Advanced Topics. ENG 394 will be removed from the catalog.

F. MAO announces a change in course title and description:

ARTH 133 – Asian Art Survey (1 credit) is changed to ARTH 133 – East Asian Art Survey I (1 credit)

Course description for consent agenda items B, C and F can be found in Appendix C.

G. Approve the creation of a minor in Italian (advance notice given by CAPP in February 2014)

A full rationale can be found in Appendix D of this agenda. Additional supplementary information is found in Appendix E.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

In particular I want to note my thank to Vanessa Fox for February’s minutes, we had a productive, healthy robust discussion about extended studies and those free flowing conversations are particularly challenging to capture. Also, thank you to Jeane Pope for stepping this month at the last minute for Vanessa so she can tend to a family emergency.

Approval of Consent Agenda

There were no requests in advance of the meeting or during the meeting to move any items from the consent agenda to the main agenda. There were no objections to approving the consent agenda. The consent agenda was approved.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

A. CAPP gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote in April 2014 to approve the creation of a new interdisciplinary minor in World Literature.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

In introducing this motion for CAPP Nicole Brockmann noted that like the Italian minor just approved via the consent agenda all courses for this minor already exist and requires no new faculty resources.

A full rationale can be found in Appendix F of this agenda.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

While approval of this motion will occur in April, if anyone would like to ask a clarifying question that will help you in thinking about this important issue, please ask it now. There were no questions.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has no written announcements.

There were no questions for CAPP.

6. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

Comments from Bridget Gourley

I know from my conversations with Tiffany Hebb MAO has been busy this past month. Most of their actionable items we addressed on the consent agenda, however we have one item I've Jen Adams, Communication and Theatre to bring forward for MAO. Jen,

A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following changes to the Psychology major.

The content area core requires four courses: Two courses should be chosen from PSY 280, PSY 300 or PSY 301, PSY 330 or PSY 331, PSY 380 or PSY 381, PSY 350

Changed to:

The content area core requires four courses: Two courses should be chosen from PSY 280 or PSY281, PSY 300 or PSY 301, PSY 330 or PSY 331, PSY 380 or PSY 381, PSY 350

This proposal includes the new psych course just approved on the consent agenda.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

This comes to us from a coordinating committee and therefore needs no second. MAO suggested we add this to the consent agenda because the change simply reflects the additional psychology courses approved on the consent agenda. As we work to gain comfort with using a consent agenda, I found it awkward to have something on the consent agenda that depending on approval of a different part of the consent agenda so I made a decision to separate this out.

There were no questions and no discussion about the motion. Motion passed.

Announcements –

MAO has no written announcements other than those that appeared on the consent agenda.

There were no questions for MAO.

7. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

A. COF's report is an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for COF.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its normal work for the year.

8. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC gives notice of our intent to ask the faculty to vote in April 2014 on the following proposed change to the Academic Handbook. Motion will be to revise the "Academic Integrity" section of the *Academic Handbook*, and the equivalent section of the *Student Handbook*.

The suggested changes to the Academic Handbook can be found in Appendix G of this agenda.

Background Information on Proposal

These recommended edits do not change the basic goals or procedures for addressing charges of academic dishonesty. The main substantive changes add:

- Procedures for handling linked cases
- Revised procedures that facilitate the prompt resolution of charges of academic dishonesty
- Details about assembling the committees that hear charges
- Clarification of the circumstances in which a student may withdraw from a course after charges of academic dishonesty have been initiated.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Anticipating flights might be iffy with the weather, Kathryn Millis has asked Dave Berque who meets with SLAAC to bring forward SLAAC’s agenda item.

Comments from Dave Berque:

SLAAC has been discussing several issues related to our academic integrity policy since this fall. Our discussions have been focused on improving the policy to minimize difficulties we have seen with past cases.

The primary points are shown on the agenda and include developing a mechanism to handle linked cases, adding procedures that make it more likely cases will be heard quickly, clarifying that students may not withdraw from a course while an academic integrity process is underway or if they are found responsible for a charge. (The current policy does not address this and some faculty has raised this as a concern.)

Please review the proposed motion in the next month and send comments to Kathryn Millis, chair of SLAAC. You may also send comments to me or to any other member of SLAAC.

There were no clarifying questions.

Written Announcements –

1. SLAAC is meeting with representatives from several areas of campus to discuss past and future work against sexual assault, sexual violence, and related topics.
2. SLAAC has met with representatives of Athletic Board to discuss absences from class related to intercollegiate athletic events.
3. SLAAC is discussing the “Disruptive Students Policy.” The revised policy, which we anticipate presenting to the faculty in April for a vote in May, will include a section on electronic distraction. We welcome hearing from interested faculty members.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

9. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

- A. FGSC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for FGSC.

Written Announcements –

1. Together with division officers a procedure was outlined for obtaining a full slate of candidates for committee vacancies in AY14-15. FGSC refers faculty to the memo about elections from the Chair of the Faculty.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

10. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

A. FDC’s report consists of an offer to answer questions.

Question from a faculty member: I am curious about the status of the university professorships. I’d like to nominate people, but I have heard that they are in hiatus. Can someone tell me about the status?

Response from Terri Bonebright, Dean of the Faculty: The old UP program is suspended and most of the awards are no longer being awarded. One award is endowed and the current term is finishing this year; there will be an announcement soon.

Written Announcements –

FDC continues its work reviewing proposals.

11. Committee on Administration – COA (Scott Spiegelberg)

A. COA will give a report on our progress on post-promotion professional development, and sustainability.

Comments from Scott Spiegelberg

COA has two items of business to report.

First, COA has developed a vision of post-promotion development. We are in the process of conferring with COF on this vision. We plan to share this vision and get feedback from the entire faculty through an online survey and open meetings in the next few weeks. Happy to have comments or questions.

Matthew Oware: Can you share any details about this plan?

Scott Spiegelberg: Yes, we imagine that this will be tied to the sabbatical process and will be the means of developing conversations between faculty members and Academic Affairs. It will not be like the tenure and promotion process.

Second, COA is looking at issues of sustainability, and will be communicating with the Campus Sustainability Committee in these efforts; will be happy to take thoughts or questions.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

12. Library Advisory Committee (LAC) (Geoffrey Klinger)

A. The LAC gives advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty in April 2014 to endorse an open access policy for the Academic Handbook.

In introducing the proposal LAC Chair, Geoff Klinger noted that the LAC has been working on this policy for a couple of years and drew the faculty’s attention to two particular justifications, outlined in Appendix H. First this policy begins to address questions of intellectual property given the current process is unsustainable because of the cost to buy back our own intellectual work. Second, the desire to provide free and open access to our research.

The complete policy with rationale and a FAQ can be found in Appendix H. of this agenda.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Because we are asking to add this as a policy to the handbook, the Library Advisory Committee is giving advance notice this month and we will discuss and vote on the motion in April. Still if anyone would like to ask a clarifying question that will help you in thinking about this important issue, please ask it now.

Comments from Geoffrey Klinger

Although this doesn't need faculty approval (Admin could do this on their own), we felt that it would be a good idea to get faculty endorsement.

There were no questions.

Written Announcements –

LAC has no written announcements

13. Extended Studies Implementation Team Report (Dave Berque)

A. Update on the implementation planning for the new Extended Studies (ES) program.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Given the number of things being worked out to implement our new Extended Studies requirement I suggested that the groups working on the details provide regular updates to the faculty and this seems like a great forum for that given the work is an outgrowth of policies we passed last month. Dave Berque is coordinating an implementation team that includes folks from CAPP, CEL, the Hubbard Center, Financial Aid, Information Services, the Registrar's Office, Student Affairs and faculty governance generally so Dave is going to provide a 50,000 foot status overview. Dave,

Comments from Dave Berque

I want to offer a brief update about our work to Extended Studies program passed by the faculty at our last meeting.

We have formed an Implementation Team consisting of the chairs of the Committee on Experiential Learning (CELL), MAO, CAPP, and the Chair of the faculty as well as representatives from the Hubbard Center, Academic Affairs, the Registrar's office, Financial Aid, Student Life and Information Services.

Meeting weekly to work through issues as they arise. There are a lot of moving pieces, and a lot of groups and offices involved. However, we are working very well together and I appreciate everyone who is contributing to the organizational tasks as well as everyone who has submitted a proposal.

Because so many groups are involved we thought it would be helpful if one person reported to the faculty regularly to keep everyone informed.

First the very exciting news:

We have received approximately 30 proposals for a combination of Winter Term 2015 and May term 2015 off campus courses. There will be a second call for proposals for May 2015 courses so we expect this number to grow.

Of the roughly 30 proposals received to date, 24 are for Winter Term 2015 and the rest are for May Term. 25 of the proposals are for credit-bearing courses and the rest are for co-curricular courses.

Many of the proposals came through department chairs and are for courses in academic departments and programs including:

Classical Studies

Communication and Theatre

French
Biology
Asian Studies
Black Studies
History
English
Film Studies
Geosciences
Sociology/Anthropology

Additional Proposals are for University Studies Courses

The implementation team's focus is on Winter Term 2015 at the moment. Our goal is to have Winter Term 2015 off-campus courses, along with an early May Term 2015 off-campus listing posted online and available to students no later than March 21st, which is also the day when the fall SOC will become available.

Four Faculty Development events are being planned, with the first to be offered on March 13. Please watch for email from Jonathan Nichols- Pethick for details.

Question and comment from a faculty member: I have questions and a criticism to offer. First the criticism: we are now dealing with criteria that were not presented when we first voted, which I think is a problem. I feel like the rug has been jerked out from under me. My questions are: What are the criteria for credit vs. non-credit? What are the criteria for faculty approval for the qualification to teach the course. Why were details not anticipated by CAPP? Why did MAO not work out the details? Why the rush? Why not work out the details for next year?

Response from Dave Berque: Why now? Because the faculty voted to implement this now. There are two different processes to approve courses. From departments pretty easy; MAO is looking at these the same way that they approve of all courses. For UNIV courses, Dave Berque and Ken Kirkpatrick co-chair this department and they have less information. If it was clear what the training was (i.e., graduate degree). If not, we asked the faculty members to provide an explanation what their qualifications are.

Follow up question from faculty member: And my response was satisfactory?

Response from Dave Berque: Yes

Continued response to other questions by Dave Berque: I would like to speak about the process generally and not for a particular class, but using ghost ranch as an example of a course that is taught by non-DePauw teacher, it is unclear how this will work out for students, faculty and staff. Why didn't we anticipate this? Too much to anticipate all the details.

Comment from another faculty member: There seem to be plenty of examples of good courses where the pedagogy is out of the hand of the faculty. Faculty members contextualize the course and grade assignments but don't provide the content (lectures).

Comment from Bridget Gourley: Nicole, did you want to add anything from CAPP?

Nicole Brockmann, Chair of CAPP: All courses for credit should go through MAO and this made sense because this is what MAO does. Experiential courses go through Hubbard Center. It was never CAPP's intention to set up what the rules should be.

Comment from Dave Berque: All courses went through department chairs first. By definition a team of the Dean of Academic Life (me) and the Registrar serve as the department chair for UNIV courses.

Written Announcements –

The ES Implementation Team has no written announcements.

14. Athletic Board (AB) (Pam Propsom)

- A. Athletic Board will be hosting a faculty lunch on Thursday, March 13 from 11:30-12:30 to discuss the integration of athletics and academics on campus. An email announcement and request for RSVP's will follow.

Comments from Pam Propsom:

The NCAC (our athletic conference) is sponsoring campus discussions this year on the integration of academics and athletics. There has already been one discussion involving DePauw administrators, coaches, and faculty members of Athletic Board. Athletic Board will be hosting a luncheon discussion on this topic for faculty on Thursday, March 13 from 11:30-12:30. Lunch will be provided an email invitation will be sent soon requesting faculty RSVPs. We would love to have broad representation and hope that you will consider attending.

There were no questions for the AB.

Written Announcements –

The AB has no written announcements.

Additional Business

15. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

- A. President Casey will provide an update from the February 2014 Board of Trustees meeting.

Comments from Brian Casey:

During February's meeting of the Board of Trustees, we spent considerable time discussing the University's efforts to further strengthen its admission practices – specifically in relation to the needs of our business model and our goals for strengthening the quality of the student experience. I am going to offer you the same presentation I offered to the Board.

Context

To begin, it is important to recognize that we operate in a context. We are, in many ways, quite similar to Denison University and St. Olaf College. We are similarly ranked, have similarly sized endowments, etc. Above us are liberal arts colleges like Carleton, Oberlin and Kenyon. These institutions are widely regarded as leaders among Midwest liberal arts colleges. Below, us, of course, are college like Franklin, Hanover and Albion. These institutions are struggling and are clearly regional in nature.

In the Midwest, we will always compete to some degree with the major public institutions (Indiana, Purdue, Illinois and Miami of Ohio). And some of our strongest students will apply to leading private universities like Vanderbilt, Richmond, Notre Dame and Washington University in St. Louis.

Gross Tuition

If you look at the gross tuition charged by institutions in each of these five categories, you'll see that they

cluster according to type. We are very much like Denison and St. Olaf. Carleton, Kenyon and Oberlin charge a noticeable amount more than we do, while Franklin, Albion and Hanover charge considerably less. These price points provide signals to the market about the relative value of each institution.

If you look at DePauw's gross tuition over time, it has marched steadily upward, as has the tuition at our GLCA and ACM peers. If compared only to the highest achieving institutions within the GLCA and ACM, however, DePauw continues to lag in gross tuition. In other words, though our tuition has increased, DePauw has not made progress against its highest achieving peers.

The Challenges of Our Position

While we have a very significant endowment, it lags on a per student level those at the top of our category. Additionally, DePauw's average net tuition does not allow us to support fully the enterprise that is necessary to provide the type of education and residential experiences we wish for our students. In short, DePauw is trying to provide the experience of a top-50 liberal arts college without the resources necessary to support it.

To put this in perspective, consider that our liberal arts peers in the top 25 of the US News and World Report rankings received (on average) combined endowment and tuition revenue of approximately \$52,000 per student in 2012, while DePauw received just shy of \$28,000. Similarly, the strongest institutions in the GLCA received in excess of \$34,000 in combined revenue per student. As a result, these sets of institutions are operating (on average) with \$24,000 and \$6,900 *more* in revenue per student than is DePauw. Put differently, Williams is investing the annual equivalent of \$57 million *more* in the institution. And DePauw's top-tier GLCA peers are investing the annual equivalent of \$16 million *more* in the institution.

Our challenge is to address these gaps in resources.

DePauw from 2008 to Present

It is important to remember, though, that the progress DePauw has made since 2008 has significantly strengthened our position. With the approval of *DePauw 2020: The Plan for DePauw*, we have doubled-down on the idea of DePauw as a national liberal arts college. With the approval of a ten year financial model we have managed operating costs, sought a stronger revenue position and invested strategically in DePauw, its campus and programs. Additionally, with the approval of the Campus Mater Plan, we are revitalizing the campus to significantly enhance the experience and help attract students.

We've seen a stabilization in the University's finances, specifically through balanced budgets. There have been numerous donor-funded investments in the campus. The Stellar Communities Grant has afforded us an opportunity to invest in Greencastle. The 21st Century Musician Initiative has led to significant new energy in the School of Music. The Hubbard Center is bringing greater intentionality to the manner in which we support, advise and prepare our students for lives of purpose and accomplishment. And, finally, we have invested in our communication efforts to ensure that we present the robust nature of the DePauw experience to prospective students.

We have seen signs that these investments and initiatives are paying off. Applications were up significantly last year, and they are up again this year. The entire current first year class was in the top half of their high school graduating class, and their ACT scores increased from 24-29 (25th/75th percentile) to 25-30. First to second semester retention of first year students was above 97% and the number of students suspended for academic performance is down considerably.

In short, this progress suggests that even amidst the challenges discussed earlier, DePauw is operating from a position of strength. It is for this reason that we believe we now have an opportunity to seriously consider further adjustments in our admission position.

The Current Admission Cycle

With the current admission cycle, we are seeing applications running ahead of last year by approximately 5%. Our goals center on increasing academic quality by further decreasing the admit rate, continuing to raise standards for merit aid, sustaining investments in diversity, and leveraging campus investments to increase demand (and revenue). These goals are achievable, but they may have short-term budgetary implications and it is important that we all understand this.

Admission over the Next Three Years

We believe that, over the course of the coming years, DePauw has an opportunity to carefully strengthen its admission position to better align our sources of revenue with the quality of the student experience we provide on our campus. Accomplishing this is not without risk, but we believe it is both achievable and necessary.

We will focus on four primary goals. First, we will continue to raise standards for merit aid, lining DePauw up with our peer institutions within the Midwest. Second, we will seek significant new gifts to increase endowment dedicated to need-based financial aid, through the *DePauw Trust*. Third, we anticipate tuition increases to, again, stay consistent with peer institutions. Finally, through anticipated increases in the number of applications we receive, we will seek to lower the admission rate to below 50%.

These are conversations we are having with the Board of Trustees, conversations that will continue when the Board meets in May. I thought it was important, however, for the faculty to understand the steps we are considering.

Question from a faculty member: How many of those colleges have the Greek life that we do? How does this affect our ability to get students?

Response from Brian Casey: Greek does not affect the students who don't come as much as you think; it's Greencastle

Question from another faculty member: Does Human Capital consider the Travis Effect when they make their estimate?

Response from Brian Casey: Human Capital uses statistical methods to generate their demand curves based on their understanding of the market. I have provide the "Travis Effect" as an example of why we think we can do better than what they predict.

Question from a faculty member: Are we going to get a different personality? That is to say, colleges have things that they are known for. Oberlin: hyper liberal, and with most kids from the East Coast. Kenyon: intellectual. Grinnell: liberal.

Response from Brian Casey: Human Capital is surprised by the width of our applicants. We will admit more of those kids who are in our band. Kids who do want to come here, but don't (can't afford it). I'm not interested in coming Kenyon; I'm interested in becoming a really good DePauw. We aren't getting enough of the really good kids. It's not an institutional shift, it's a financial one

Question from a different faculty member: How many of the schools that you showed in your slides use precipice admissions?

Response from Brian Casey: Denison just shifted. We are going to face some noise from IU (etc) that have

rolling admissions; in the Midwest, students will apply to public universities.

Question from Bridget Gourley: Can we post the slides that you have shown to Moodle?

Response from Brian Casey: Yes, but not to the public at large.

16. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

Comments from Larry Stimpert:

At faculty institute there were four themes that could guide us going forward: telling our story; excellence in all we do; every student succeeds; exploit our residential character (no liberal arts has figured out how to do this). To advance these points, I have been working with the Academic Affairs staff and we have worked out an agenda that guides our day to day work as well as larger initiatives. Please contact me if you have questions. (The VPAA then showed the grid that is attached to these minutes after appendix H).

There are six major categories for our work: Department and Programs, Curriculum, Faculty Development and Standards, Centers and Institutes, Governance, and other. Within each category there are a list of accomplished or on going topics of work. The color coding is as follows: Yellow – on our way; Green – fully launched; White – barely launched; still work to do.

Looking ahead, I have several questions to put before this faculty. How do we get faculty involvement in setting a common agenda? How do we get your input in the planning process? The initial agenda seemed obvious, but future items might be more controversial. What is most effective use of faculty meeting? What did we chew on as a body? WT was a good model – good discussion around something concrete at this forum. But this isn't the best place to start from scratch. What is the best way for us to function as a body?

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

17. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

18. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

19. Announcements

A. DePauw University website (Christopher Wells)

Comments from Bridget Gourley. In response to some questions raised with FGSC, we have asked Christopher Wells to share with us the vision DePauw has for the website and how we can feature various scholarly and creative endeavors on our website.

Comments from Christopher Wells

I hate to stand before the faculty and not talk about sustainability, so I'll make the following announcement while the web page comes up: the Campus Sustainability Committee will host an open forum in Julian auditorium at 4PM Wednesday March 12 to inform folks about the RFP process to select a firm to help us produce a comprehensive sustainability plan and a roadmap to carbon neutrality by 2040, and to get their input on criteria for the final selection.

(Referring to the DePauw Website, which was projected for the benefit of the faculty)

My intention in responding to the request for information on how scholarship gets featured on the homepage

is to:

1) show the homepage, and define the two spaces it provides for this kind of material (news and features, with most coverage of scholarly/research/artistic endeavors falling into the features category)

2) show how scholarship can also be featured on departmental pages

3) talk about the staff resources in the (administrative) Communications department available to help both departments and individual faculty with getting their scholarship, research, and/or artistic activity up on the web (Chris Wolfe chriswolfe@depauw.edu is the primary contact for this kind of support, though Loyal Vandenburg is also available to assist).

Comment from a faculty member: There is a new module that reorders pictures each time the page is loaded.

Response from Christopher Wells: Thank you for pointing that out. Our team can create other modules to do the kind of thing that you want on your web page.

B. Faculty and Staff Campaign (Michele Villinski and Erik Wielenberg)

Comments from Michele Vilinski and Erik Wielenberg: The faculty and staff campaign will begin later this month and you should keep your eye on campus mail for this year's brochure and pledge envelope. You can make an unrestricted gift to the Annual Fund or designate a program or department for your gift, including Athletics, School of Music, Environmental (or other) Fellows program(s), or those dismal econometrician in the Economics and Management Department! You can pay by cash, check, or credit card. And as in past years, the goal is to increase our percent participation; your gift need not be large. We are a visual representation of our goal: Michele's height represents last year's participation (32%) while Eric's height represent this year's goal Eric (40%, which would require 80 more people).

There were no questions about the Faculty and Staff Campaign.

C. Committee Elections for AY2014-15 (Bridget Gourley)

All of you should have received a memo from me about committee elections for AY2014-15. I'm hoping you've been in conversation with your colleagues and have meetings planned with your division. The FGSC and Division chairs met collectively in early February to strategize approaches to filling the committee roster. Collectively we decided to try approaching filling our core committees that meet most regularly first and then in the second half of the semester once everyone knew what major committee responsibilities they had we could fill out the remaining roster.

We thought it would be helpful for divisions to meet to come up with slates for both divisional vacancies as well as at-large positions because often we have two things happen that are particularly inefficient. A division will get 6 nominees for the same position and no nominees for other positions. We hope by being in the same room together conversations can ensue to better balance a slate so divisions and at-large positions are contested but we aren't necessarily splitting the approximately 60 votes in a division (assuming everyone eligible votes) 5 ways.

Also, this way experienced colleagues can share with others the type of work different committees do so folks can choose service that is of interest to them.

As you consider what to volunteer to do please consider the following:

There are 112 elected committee positions (assuming I didn't miss one in counting). That does NOT included

appointed committees within the governance structure, for example the Diversity and Equity Committee or the Resource Allocation Subcommittee. Also, it doesn't include committees outside the governance structure, such as departmental committees or interdisciplinary program committees.

Given there are approximately 240 voting faculty eligible to serve and in any given year approximately 40 individuals are on leave in any given year that implies that we have about 200 of us to fill 120 positions so in any given year more than half of us should be serving on a committee. Another way to think about it is on a long-term average, every other year one should be doing elected committee service if we are sharing the load. Certainly it is more likely, that with three-year terms of service one is more likely to have three years on a committee followed by three years off.

Another way to look at the numbers is there are approximately 48 positions that should be vacant each year due to the standard rotation of terms. Add to that an additional, on average 13-15 positions that need to be filled due to leaves that fall within someone's term and we are filling over 60 positions every year.

FGSC, the Division officers and I, hope you'll look at the list of vacancies for the coming year and nominate yourself as well as encourage a colleague to serve. With so many different committees focused on different types of work there is something for everyone. Unless the faculty wants to cede their decision making to the authority to the administration in it important that we engage in the governance process.

Please note that Division Chairs need to be forwarding slates of candidates for core committees this Friday.

There were no questions about the election process.

Written Announcements –

The schedule for this year's election cycle:

February 19	Announcement of positions.
Mar 7	Division officers report to Chair of the Faculty nominations for divisional representatives to CORE committees (by 7 pm)
Mar 10-12	Voting booth open for CORE committee divisional positions
Mar 13	Announcement of results for divisional positions and updates on constraints for at-large positions for CORE committees
Mar 31	Division officers report to Chair of the Faculty divisional nominations for CORE committee at-large positions (by 7 pm)
April 2-4	Voting booth open to elect candidates for CORE committee at-large positions
April 7	Announcement of results for CORE committee at-large positions
April 14	Division officers report to Chair of the Faculty nominations for divisional representatives to remaining divisional vacancies (by 7 pm)
April 15-17	Voting booth open for divisional positions
April 18	Announcement of results for divisional positions and updates on constraints for remaining at-large positions
April 28	Division officers report to Chair of the Faculty divisional nominations for remaining at-large positions (by 7 pm)
April 29-May 1	Voting booth open to elect candidates for remaining at-large positions.
May 2	Announcement of final election results for at-large nominations.

Please to talk with your colleagues about the vacancies and take time to meet with your division so that all divisions have strong slates for both divisional and at-large positions. Remember, if you nominate a colleague you must first verify their willingness and eligibility to serve.

20. Adjournment

If there are no other announcements let's consider ourselves adjourned. I look forward to seeing you at this venue in

April. I think we will have much to discuss. As a reminder the deadline for the April faculty meeting agenda will be the first day back from Spring Break.

Appendices

Appendix A: In Memory of Keith Opdahl (1934-2013) **Written by Istvan Csicsery-Ronay**

Keith Opdahl taught fulltime in the English department at DePauw from 1967 until 1992. He drove me to campus for my on-campus interview, and cheerfully coaxed me through the manic talking-jag that was my class presentation. He was, in many ways, a mentor to me in my first years here. He was passionate about teaching, and he made a difference in many students' lives. He taught careful writing, used imaginative methods in the classroom, and led discussions masterfully. He was equally passionate about literary scholarship. He wrote one of the first academic studies of Saul Bellow – his hero among contemporary writers – and spent many years working out a sophisticated theory of affective reading. He was curious and informed about the recent schools of theory that my cohort was bringing to the university; like many of his generation, he disagreed with their directions, but he never denigrated or dismissed them. In 2002 he published his ideas in the book *Emotion as Meaning: The Literary Case for How We Imagine*, a book that displayed his gift as sophisticated literary reader. I will confess that at the time, in my youthful pride I considered his ideas old-fashioned. Keith may have felt satisfaction in knowing that reading for emotion eventually became a strong current in literary theory. Keith was a fine talker, always curious to know what his conversation partners believed; and we always knew what he believed -- he was an ardent left-liberal, with a passion for social justice. He had an omnivorous intellect – he loved nature and art equally, and knew a lot about both. He could be contentious and political; there are few among us of whom that can't be said. I will remember him as generous and bursting with vitality. And I will miss him.

Appendix B: In Memory of Fred Bergmann (1934-2013)

Written by Tom Emery

(with thanks to Emeritus English Professors Cynthia Cornell and Walker Gilmer)

Fredrick L. Bergmann, Emeritus Professor of English, died December 28, 2013 in Peoria, Arizona, near Phoenix . He was 97. He had taught at DePauw for 44 years and was head of the English Department for 21. He lived nearly 30 years after Greencastle in the warm Arizona climate. Born in 1916, Fred earned the AB from Washburn College in Kansas, the MA from Washington State University, and the PhD from George Washington University.

He was a very hard worker. He published some 12 books, including *The Plays of David Garrick* and several books on writing craft, including a collaboration with his mentor, Raymond W. Pence, who led the English Department and its writing program for many years since arriving in 1917. Like Pence, Bergmann had to balance the offerings in the dual-major department of literature and composition (now writing) and provide staffing for Freshman English. During his term the staff was heavily weighted towards literature specialists but Bergmann was the first to hire MFA degree holders as advanced writing teachers.

As Head of the English Department, he created a varied English faculty that had a reputation as hard working and dedicated. It included eventually Gilmer, Sedlack, Cavanaugh, Nelson, Williams, Opdahl, Emery and Cornell, who stayed through retirement. He did not like committees and sometimes hired almost single-handedly. He always announced colleagues' teaching schedules by memo, often saying, "this was the best I could do." He arrived at DePauw just before World War II and provided an important bridge between generations before and after the War.

Fred was among the last of the "Heads" of departments, who were appointed for indeterminate terms. He left as "Head" after President Richard Rosser began a system of department chairs who would serve for specific terms and be formally evaluated by their colleagues. During discussions of departmental changes at that time, Fred pinned a cartoon on his door of an English king holding a scepter and saying in a cartoon bubble, "More divine rights."

He was known as an excellent teacher and his Major English Writers course was legendary, drawing nearly 100 students per semester when most literature courses were capped at 30 or so. He sometimes dressed in period garb to deliver lectures. His ordinary dress was a suit and tie, sometimes an ascot, often a Tyrolean hat with feather. Sometimes he carried a walking stick. He drove a Mercedes-Benz.

He often communicated by memo on an IBM Selectric typewriter, which at the time cost around \$1,000. He was probably the best letter writer I have ever known.

In the late 50s, Fred strongly supported creating DePauw's study programs in Freiburg, Budapest and Athens (a photo on the Depauw web site shows Fred with his daughter, Bunny, at the Berlin Wall). He served as resident adviser to the program in Athens after his retirement.

He served as adviser to *The DePauw* for many years and was a strong champion of the paper's editorial independence. He was an important link to editors going back to the 1920s when *The DePauw* was a daily paper, including Eugene Pulliam of Indianapolis Newspapers and Barney Kilgore, architect of the modern Wall Street Journal. Eventually, *The DePauw* used its profits to build its own building (that building, just north of Roy O. West Library, is now called The Honor Scholar Building).

Jean, his wife, died in 2007. He is survived by his children, John and Bunny, both DePauw graduates, in Arizona, five granddaughters, two great granddaughters, and three great grandsons. Bunny said he was active in scholarly work until just days before he died.

Appendix C: Course Descriptions for MAO Consent Agenda Items

Related to Consent Agenda Item B – New courses

ARTH 135 East Asian Art Survey II (1 credit) - The second half of a 2-semester survey of East Asian Art (from the 14th century to the present) analyzing the major developments in the art and architecture of China, Japan, and Korea over a range of media. We will study some of the various methodologies that can be applied to East Asian Art as well as key themes in the chronological and historical development of visual cultures against the background of political, social, and cultural contexts. Cross-listed with Asian Studies.

BIO 101 Molecules, Cells and Genes (1 credit) - Includes laboratory. An introduction to genetics, cell biology and molecular biology. Students will examine topics in biological chemistry, cellular structure and function, metabolism and energy flow in cellular systems, Mendelian genetics and the cell cycle.

BIO 102 Evolution, Organisms and Ecology (1 credit) - Includes laboratory. An introduction to the principles and practice of evolutionary biology, population genetics, and ecology. Students will examine topics in natural selection, the modern synthesis, speciation, phylogeny, primary productivity and ecological efficiency.

ECON 385 Regression and Simulation for Economics and Management (1 credit) - Regression analysis is applied to a variety of economics and management examples and data. Extensive use of Monte Carlo simulation enables deep understanding of chance processes and sampling variability. Advanced Excel applications (such as add-ins and user-defined functions) develop skills useful in other courses and the workplace. Prerequisite: Elementary statistics (such as ECON 350, BIO 275, MATH 141, MATH 247 or PSY 214) or consent of the instructor.

ENG 397 Irish Literature: Advanced Topics (1 credit) – An intensive exploration of Irish culture and authors from a literary perspective. Topics might include medieval Irish literature, James Joyce, modern Irish drama, Irish mythology, the Gaelic revival, Irish poets, the troubles and postcolonialism, and Irish film.

FILM 420 Independent Study in Film (1 credit) - Independent project under tutorial supervision designed for juniors and seniors wishing to work in depth on a particular aspect of film study. Prerequisites: junior or senior classification and permission of instructor and program director. Prior to registration, the student must present to the director a written statement of the project countersigned by the instructor who will serve as tutor.

PSY 281 Cognitive Psychology with lab (1 credit) - This course examines the psychological structures and processes involved in the acquisition, retention and use of knowledge. Topics covered include pattern recognition, attention, memory, language, problem solving and decision-making. Lab includes designing experiments and collecting data from human participants to help understand cognitive processes in these topic areas. Prerequisite: PSY 100. Not open to students with credit in PSY 280.

Related to Consent Agenda Item C – Change in course credit and description

HONR 192 Science Research Fellows Experience II (variable credit) – Mid-semester, independent research linked to the SRF summer research experience. Offering is project dependent.

Related to Consent Agenda Item F – Change in course title and description

ARTH 133 – East Asian Art Survey I (1 credit) - The first half of a 2-semester survey of East Asian Art (from 1500 B.C.E. to the 14th century) analyzing the major developments in the art and architecture of China, Japan, and Korea over a range of media. We will study some of the various methodologies that can be applied to East Asian Art as well as key themes in the chronological and historical development of visual cultures against the background of political, social, and cultural contexts. Cross-listed with Asian Studies.

Appendix D. Rationale for proposed minor in Italian

(condensed from documents provided by the Department of Modern Languages)

In spring 2013, the Department of Modern Languages discussed the creation of a minor in Italian that would be in line with other minors in the department (particularly, minors in those languages that do not have a major at DePauw: Chinese, Japanese, and Russian) and sustainable in terms of current staffing (i.e., one fulltime, now tenured faculty member in Italian).

In September 2013, Francesca Seaman and the chair of the Department of Modern Languages (Carrie Klaus) drafted a proposal for a minor in Italian that they shared with faculty in the Department at meetings in October and November. This proposal is the result of revisions after those meetings and has been reviewed and approved by all continuing, fulltime faculty members in the Department. (NB: CAPP approved this minor in December 2013.)

No new faculty will be needed in order to offer regularly all courses necessary for a student (even a student entering DePauw with no previous knowledge or prior study of Italian) to complete a five-course minor in Italian, where the first course to count toward the minor is Italian 271, in four years or less. A sequence of study for a student who begins Italian at DePauw might be as follows (note that, upon completion of ITAL 272, a student could take the remaining courses in any order).

First year: ITAL 171 (fall) – ITAL 172 (spring)

Second year: ITAL 271 (fall) – ITAL 272 (spring)

Third year: ITAL 371/ML 164C/ML 295 (fall) – ITAL 375 (spring)

Fourth year: ITAL 371/ML 164C/ML 295 (fall) – ITAL 375 (spring)

All courses listed are already regularly offered at DePauw. If the minor in Italian is approved, the Department of Modern Languages would commit to the following course offerings in Italian each semester.

Fall:

ITAL 171

ITAL 271

ITAL 371 or ML 164C or ML 295

Spring

ITAL 172

ITAL 272

ITAL 375

The creation of an Italian language minor would strengthen the present offerings of the Department of Modern Languages and fill a hole in the curriculum, as mentioned above. It would provide students with an interest in Italian the opportunity to continue their study of the language. It would enable students who study abroad in Italy to make more explicit connections between their on- and off-campus experiences. It would also allow DePauw to add a vibrant program in Italian at no cost taking full advantage of Francesca Seaman's expertise in Italian language, literature, and culture and her position as a fulltime, tenured faculty member.

Should the minor not be approved, students with an interest in Italian would continue to be discouraged from further study of the language at DePauw, and students who study abroad in Italy would continue to lack institutional support for making connections between their off-campus experiences and their on-campus study. Finally, course offerings in Italian at DePauw would continue to be limited almost exclusively to

“service” courses (in recent years, sometimes three sections of elementary Italian per semester), courses that lead to no minor or major (except for the European Studies minor) and do not foster the deeper interest which our students are showing in Italian language, literature, and culture.

Proposed catalogue description of the minor including requirements and course descriptions:

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, including either five courses taught in Italian, starting at the 200-level, or four courses taught in Italian, starting at the 200-level, and one course taught in English on Italian cinema, literature, and/or culture (ML 164C or ML 295). Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	One-two

See Appendix C for the catalog descriptions of minors in other modern foreign languages at DePauw.

ITAL 171 Elementary Italian I

Introduction to the Italian language with emphasis on development of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing. *No pre-requisite*

ITAL 172: Elementary Italian II

A continuation of ITAL 171. *Pre-requisite: Italian 171.*

ITAL 271: Intermediate Italian I

Second year Italian. First semester. This course emphasizes oral and written expression, listening comprehension and building vocabulary. It also provides an intensive review of grammar. Learning is facilitated by a careful selection of literary texts, such as plays, novels, short stories, celebrated lyrics from opera and contemporary music. A variety of real-life material is also employed, including newspaper and magazine articles, radio and television broadcasts. Students are required to participate and engage in conversation during class. Regular attendance is essential. Daily assignments are required. *Pre-requisite: Italian 171 & 172 or permission of a professor of Italian in the Modern Language Department.*

ITAL 272: Intermediate Italian II

Continuation of ITAL 271.

ITAL 371: Advanced Italian

In this course, students will engage in conversation through film, current events, opera, contemporary music and short stories. Though the course will focus especially on developing the students' oral fluency and writing competence, students will improve their writing, reading, listening-comprehension and oral skills. This course will prepare students for more advanced work in Italian. *Pre-requisite: Italian 272.*

ITAL 375: Topics in Italian Literature and Culture

This course will introduce and examine an Italian literary and/or cultural topic. Taught in Italian. *Pre-requisite: Italian 272 or approval of the instructor. May be repeated for credit with different topics. May count towards European Studies minor.*

ITAL 470: Advanced Readings and Projects

This course is an independent studies course for advanced students of Italian who wish to pursue an independently designed program of research or inquiry in Italian. *Open to advanced students in Italian with permission of Chair. May be repeated for credit with different topics.*

ML164C: The Cinema: Italy

Screening and study of representative masterworks of cinema, the film as art, and a product of culture. No knowledge of the foreign language is required. *Credit toward a major or minor may be given at the discretion of the department.*

ML 295: Topics in Modern Languages

Courses in specific topics, such as culture, literary movements or genres, linguistics or film. *Taught in English. May be repeated for credit with a different topic. May count towards European Studies minor.*

Note: Past course offerings in ML 295 have included "The Grand Tour of Italy. History, Art, and Literary Impressions", "Illusion and Reality. A Journey Through Italian 20th Century Literature," and "Unhappy Loves: Masterpieces of The Italian Tradition."

Appendix E. Catalogue description for other minors in modern foreign languages at DePauw

Requirements for a Minor in Chinese

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	Five credits in Chinese language courses at the 200-level or above. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Two

Requirements for a Minor in French

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five French courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus. Minor for heritage speakers of French: When students successfully complete three classes at the level of FREN 315 or higher, with a grade of C or better in each, they receive two retroactive credits for FREN 202 and FREN 305 to complete the five-course minor.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Requirements for a Minor in German

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five German courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Requirements for a Minor in Japanese

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, either five courses in Japanese language at the 200-level or above, or four courses in Japanese language at the 200-level or above plus one of the following: ASIA 281, ASIA 282, REL 258 or REL 352. For the ASIA and REL courses, supplementary readings in Japanese are required for Japanese minors. Only one of the courses toward the minor may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Two-three

Requirements for a Minor in Russian

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	Varies
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five courses, starting at the 200-level, including four courses taught in Russian plus one literature course (ML 227 or ML 326) or one culture course (ML 225 or ML 301). Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	One-two

Requirements for a Minor in Spanish

Total courses required	Five
Core courses	None
Other required courses	The minor requires a minimum of five Spanish courses, starting at the 200-level. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus. Minor for heritage speakers of Spanish: When students successfully complete three classes at the level of SPAN 332 or higher, with a grade of C or better in each, they receive two retroactive credits for SPAN 232 and SPAN 330 to complete the five-course minor.
Number 300 and 400 level courses	Three

Appendix F. Rationale for Proposed Minor in World Literature

(condensed from documents provided by the departments of English and Modern Languages)

The English and Modern Languages Departments, with the endorsement of the Classical Studies Department, propose an interdisciplinary minor in world literature, drawing from courses in both departments and other affiliated departments. The new minor does not require any new courses or changes in staffing, and we do not expect any significant changes in enrollment patterns. It simply offers students a new avenue for studying literature at DePauw, one that combines the resources and expertise of both departments and affords a wider perspective on literature that neither department can provide on its own. In practical terms, the proposed minor represents a more intentional configuration of courses that we already offer, a more coherent context for planning and teaching these courses, and new opportunities for faculty members in both departments to collaborate.

In some areas, the university curriculum has been a step behind the administrative thrust to internationalize DePauw's student body. Currently, DePauw hosts 260 international and foreign exchange students representing 41 countries. The Department of English has only recently adapted its writing curriculum to accommodate the many students who come to campus speaking and writing in languages other than English. In literature, we have made no comparable adaptation. A minor in World Literature is not designed specifically to meet the needs of students whose background is in a language other than English, but it acknowledges that domestic and international students have a shared interest in studying literature from a global perspective.

Naturally, English as a discipline has focused on British, American, and other anglophone literatures, and it will continue to do so. At the same time, English has always recognized close allegiances to comparative literature and the study of literatures in languages other than English. These disciplines are in continual dialogue with each other through their collective membership in the Modern Language Association. The new minor represents a configuration of courses designed to leverage these allegiances within the university curriculum, combining the resources of the English, Modern Languages, and other departments to open a new area of study.

The Department of Modern Languages is an enthusiastic partner with the Department of English in this endeavor. While remaining committed to teaching literatures and cultures in our nine target languages spanning the globe, we also offer a substantial number of classes devoted to literature in translation. With an ever-growing focus on translinguistic and transcultural topics, we offer examinations of literature that are deeply embedded in and across the specific languages and cultures in which we have expertise.

Opening and developing this area of study positions DePauw with the best undergraduate literature programs in the country. Of the 27 institutions in the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), only 6 offer programs in comparative or world literature: Beloit, Coe, Colorado, Kenyon, Oberlin, and Wooster. Many of the highest ranked liberal arts colleges in the country, however, have such programs, including Barnard, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Hamilton, Haverford, Hobart William Smith, Middlebury, Smith, Swarthmore, Wellesley, Willamette, and Williams. From this perspective, a program in comparative or world literature represents a benchmark of an elite liberal arts institution.

The new minor will require the creation of a World Literature Steering Committee, with two members from English, two from Modern Languages, and one at-large member, each serving three-year terms. The committee will function primarily to advise students in the minor, approve courses for credit in the minor, and monitor course offerings and enrollment. As the minor becomes more popular, advising responsibilities could be distributed to members of the English and Modern Languages Departments. Members of the Steering Committee, including the Chair of the committee, will be designated upon the recommendation of the Departments of English and Modern Languages, in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Proposed catalogue description of the minor including requirements and course descriptions:

The World Literature minor offers students the opportunity to study literature from an interdisciplinary, global perspective, focusing on literature in translation and literature in languages other than English. Core courses introduce students to literary genres and important works in world literature. Elective courses may include literature courses taught in English as well as literature courses taught in another language. The minor is especially compatible with a major in Classical Studies, Modern Languages, and study abroad. Students should consult with their minor advisor when choosing courses.

TOTAL COURSES REQUIRED: Five, with at least one in Modern Languages or another affiliated department

CORE COURSES: ENG 151 and ENG 250. FREN 327, GER 307, or SPAN 335 may be substituted for ENG 151.

OTHER REQUIRED COURSES: ENG 197 or ML 197 may be counted toward the minor when the topic is world literature.

NUMBER 300 AND 400 LEVEL COURSES: two in English, Modern Languages, or an affiliated department

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Literature courses taught in languages other than English may be counted toward the minor. Literature courses in affiliated departments may be counted toward the minor with the approval of the Steering Committee. One study-abroad course may be counted toward the minor.

Core courses

ENG 151: Literature and Interpretation

ENG 250: World Literature

FREN 327: Introduction to Literature in French

GER 307: Introduction to German Literature

SPAN 335: Introduction to Hispanic Literature

Courses in literature taught in English

ASIA 281: Traditional Japanese Literature

ASIA 282: Modern Japanese Novels

CLST 100: Greek and Roman Mythology

ENG 197: First-Year Seminar (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 255: Topics in Literary Studies (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 261: Modern Continental Literature

ENG 390: Women and Literature: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 391: Authors: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 392: Genres: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 396: World Literature: Adv. Topics

ML 194: Arabic Literature in Translation

ML 227: Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature

ML 260: Topics in French Literature

ML 264: Topics in Hispanic Literature

ML 326: Twentieth-Century Russian Literature

Note: Note: In ML 227 and ML 326 (above) and ML 395 (below), when the topic is Russian literature, students pursuing a minor in Russian or Russian studies do readings in the original Russian.

Courses in literature taught in another language

LAT 224: Introduction to Latin Poetry

LAT 341: Drama

SPAN 442: Literature of Spain
SPAN 444: Spanish American Literature

Topics courses taught in English (when the topic is literature)

ASIA 197: First-Year Seminar in Asian Studies
ASIA 290: Topics in East Asian Studies
ASIA 390: Topics in East Asian Studies
ML 197: First-Year Seminar in Modern Languages
ML 295: Topics in Modern Languages
ML 395: Advanced Topics in Modern Languages

Topics courses taught in another language (when the topic is literature)

CHIN 269: Topics in Chinese
FREN 401: Literatures and Cultures of the French-Speaking World
GER 411: Twentieth Century German Literature and Culture
GER 412: Topics
GRK 205: Readings in Greek Prose and Poetry
GRK 452: Readings in Greek
ITAL 375: Topics in Italian Literature and Culture
LAT 223: Introduction to Latin Prose
LAT 332: Readings in Latin
RUS 324: Topics
SPAN 390: Topics in Spanish

Appendix G. Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy found in the Academic Handbook

Text to be inserted is shown underlined and text to be deleted struck through.

Academic Integrity

1. Introduction

Academic integrity refers to the ethical standards and policies that govern how people work and interact in the academic enterprise at a college or university. These standards and policies attempt to do more than define and condemn what is wrong or unethical; they also attempt to provide a foundation for the mutual trust and individual responsibility necessary in a healthy academic community.

Both faculty members and students have the responsibility of upholding the principles of academic integrity. Faculty and staff members should create an environment in which honesty is encouraged, dishonesty discouraged and integrity is openly discussed. Faculty members should follow the principles of academic integrity in their own work and conduct. Students are obligated not only to follow these principles, but also to take an active role in encouraging other students to respect them. If students suspect a violation of academic integrity, they should make their suspicions known to a faculty member or staff member in academic affairs. Students reporting dishonesty must be prepared to give evidence in a hearing before the University Review Committee (URC).

Many faculty members ask students to work collaboratively with others on written projects, oral presentations, revisions, labs, or other course work. The guidelines for collaborative work differ substantially from course to course, but in most cases part or all of a collaborative project must be completed independently. Faculty members should make clear, in writing, their expectations for collaborative work. Students should make sure they understand what is expected of them; they are responsible for knowing when collaboration is permitted, and when not. Handing in a paper, lab report, or take home exam written entirely by a member of one's collaborative group, except when given explicit permission to do so by the instructor of the course, is an act of academic dishonesty.

Almost all the types of academic dishonesty described below have to do with working with others or using the work of others. This is not to suggest that working with others or using their work is wrong. Indeed, the heart of the academic enterprise, learning itself, is based on using the ideas of others to stimulate and develop your own. In this sense, all academic work is collaboration, and therefore academic integrity focuses on those acts that demean or invalidate fruitful collaboration.

2. Types of Academic Dishonesty

Cheating. Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials in any academic exercise or having someone else do work for you. Examples of cheating include looking at another student's paper during a test, bringing an answer sheet to a test, obtaining a copy of a test prior to the test date or submitting homework borrowed from another student.

Fabrication. Inventing or falsifying information. Examples of fabrication include inventing data for an experiment you did not do or did not do correctly or making reference to sources you did not use in a research paper.

Facilitating academic dishonesty. Helping someone else to commit an act of academic dishonesty. This includes giving someone a paper or homework to copy from or allowing someone to cheat from your test paper.

Plagiarism. Using the words or ideas of another writer without attribution, so that they seem as if they are your own. Plagiarism ranges from copying someone else's work word for word, to rewriting someone else's

work with only minor word changes (mosaic plagiarism), to summarizing work without acknowledging the source. (See the Writing Center Guide to Avoiding Plagiarism for further information on plagiarism.)

Multiple submission. Submitting work you have done in previous classes as if it were new and original work. Although professors may occasionally be willing to let you use previous work as the basis of new work, they expect you to do new work for each class. Students seeking to submit a piece of work to more than one class must have the written permission of both instructors.

Abuse of academic materials. Harming, appropriating or disabling academic resources so that others cannot use them. This includes cutting tables and illustrations out of books to use in a paper, stealing books or articles and deleting or damaging computer files intended for others' use.

Deception and misrepresentation. Lying about or misrepresenting your work, academic records or credentials. Examples of deception and misrepresentation include forging signatures, forging letters of recommendation and falsifying credentials in an application. Of particular concern, given the current popularity of collaborative projects, is taking credit for group work to which you did not contribute significantly or meet your obligations. In a collaborative project, all members of the group are expected to do their share. Group members may work together on each phase of the project or they may divide the tasks--one person might do background research; another might take charge of the lab experiments; another might be responsible for drafting the report. Even in a modular project, however, each member of the group is responsible for being familiar and involved with the entire project. Be sure to get clear instructions on your individual and collective responsibilities from each faculty member for each course.

Electronic dishonesty. Using network access inappropriately, in a way that affects a class or other students' academic work. Examples of electronic dishonesty include using someone else's authorized computer account to send and receive messages, breaking into someone else's files, gaining access to restricted files, disabling others' access to network systems or files, knowingly spreading a computer virus or obtaining a computer account under false pretenses.

Carelessness. When does carelessness become dishonesty? Students sometimes make minor mistakes in completing academic assignments. Mistyping one of many endnotes in a long paper, for example, may in most cases be considered a careless mistake, rather than an act of deliberate dishonesty.

When students make multiple mistakes in acknowledging sources, however, these mistakes cannot be considered simply careless. Students who copy long passages from a book or a Web source, for example, make a deliberate choice to do so. Such students have taken a short cut; instead of explaining the source of their ideas, they have simply stolen ideas from others. In such cases, carelessness is a form of dishonesty.

Students are responsible for knowing the academic integrity policy and may not use ignorance of the policy as an excuse for dishonesty.

Other types of academic dishonesty. The list above is a partial one. Instructors may explain in their syllabi other types of academic dishonesty relevant to the work in particular disciplines or particular courses.

3. Overview of the Process

All cases of academic dishonesty must be reported by faculty members and settled through the process outlined below. Faculty members may not impose a grade penalty for academic dishonesty except through the process outlined below.

The process is designed 1) to provide prompt resolution of cases, 2) to help the student understand both the

charge and penalty, and 3) to allow the student to discuss what happened and/or contest the charge or penalty being made. At all stages of the process, the focus should be on education, and open, frank discussion should be encouraged. Students frequently commit acts of dishonesty when they are under pressure of one sort or another; or they may persuade themselves that borrowing someone else's words and ideas is not a serious offense. This settlement process gives faculty members and students a chance to discuss why academic integrity is so important to the university community.

In the process of investigating the charge, the instructor may discuss his or her suspicions with the student. In cases of cheating on exams, it may be appropriate to confront the student during the exam or immediately after; however, even in cases when the student admits to the violation verbally, a formal conference to review and sign the written settlement form should be arranged. In confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty, instructors may choose to have a colleague present to act as an observer. That colleague need not be a member of the same department, but should be someone knowledgeable about the academic integrity policy.

4. The Settlement Process

When an instructor becomes aware of a possible case of academic dishonesty, he or she should move quickly (usually within three days) to investigate the violation and to contact the student. If suspected violations occur at the end of the semester, the instructor ~~may~~ **should** assign a grade of Incomplete and ~~arrange to confer with the student~~ **begin the settlement process as quickly as possible, but no later than** at the start of the following semester. ***Even when suspected violations occur after grades have been submitted, Reports must be made the settlement process must be started*** before the end of the semester following the **suspected** violation. The formal process of initiating a charge and settlement involves the following steps, with occasional minor variations depending on the nature and timing of the case:

- I. The instructor arranges to confer with the student to discuss the integrity violation and the evidence supporting it. During or shortly after the instructor's conversation with the student, the instructor presents the student with a written statement of the charge and the proposed penalty (see the Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form

The student has the opportunity to respond to the charge. After listening to the student, the instructor may decide to revise the charge or penalty, or drop the charge all together. If, for any reason, the faculty member believes that the violation deserves a penalty more severe than failure in the course, he or she may immediately refer the case to the University Review Committee (URC).

- II. The student has three business days to respond to the charge, either by assenting to the charge and penalty by signing the settlement form, or by requesting a hearing before the URC. At that hearing, the student may either dispute the charge or the severity of the penalty. While considering how to respond to a charge, students are encouraged to seek advice from someone knowledgeable in matters of academic integrity, such as a faculty advisor, an academic dean, or another trusted advisor. If a student charged with a violation does not respond in the specified time, the matter is immediately turned over to the URC for a hearing.
- III. Once the settlement form has been signed, it is forwarded to the academic affairs office to be kept for five years. If this proves to be a second violation of the academic integrity policy, an academic dean will convene a disciplinary hearing of the URC.

Note: Once an academic integrity charge has been initiated against a student, he or she may not withdraw from the course in question ***unless the charge is dropped by the faculty member or the student is found to be not responsible through a hearing or an appeal.*** A hold is placed on the student's transcript until the charge

has been settled.

Penalties for Academic Dishonesty

Students who have violated the academic integrity policy are penalized more severely than students who have simply not turned in an assignment. While the degree of penalty varies according to the judgment of the instructor, a first offense is usually penalized in three ways:

- I. the settlement form itself, which when signed is filed in the academic affairs office;
- II. a grade of zero on the relevant assignment; and
- III. a lowered final course grade.

Occasionally, even for a first offense, the penalty is failure in the course. If a more severe penalty is called for, the instructor may request a hearing of the University Review Committee (URC).

Academic dishonesty outside of a particular class (forged signatures and fabricated résumés, for example) also leads to penalties. Students will be asked to sign the academic dishonesty settlement form. Either the accused student or the faculty/staff member making the charge may request a hearing before the URC.

A second violation of the academic integrity policy leads automatically to a disciplinary hearing before the URC, and may result in suspension or dismissal.

Student Records

First Offenses. Signed settlement forms for first offenses are filed in the academic affairs office for five years. The name of the student is kept confidential. The settlement form does not become part of the student's permanent record, except if the student is found responsible for a second violation of the academic integrity policy.

Second Offenses. In cases where a student is found to be responsible for a second violation of the academic integrity policy, a ~~note about the violation~~ **copy of the URC decision** will be placed in the student's permanent record (kept in the Office of Student Life) and will be reported if the student releases the record to employers or other schools. **A second offense is defined to be one that takes place in whole or in part after a student has been presented with a settlement form for a prior case, unless the student is found not responsible for the prior case.**

The Academic Integrity Hearing

If a hearing before the University Review Committee is necessary, either because the charge or penalty is disputed or because this is a second offense, it will be convened by an Academic Dean **as quickly as possible, but usually no later than three weeks after the Dean has received the signed or unsigned settlement form.** ~~at a time when all participants can attend.~~ Committee members will be provided with a detailed outline of the hearing process.

The URC consists of a **teaching faculty member who is a** current or former member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two **additional** teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by the convenor from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. **SLAAC will identify this pool in February of each year with the pool to begin service on March 1st. SLAAC may add members to the pool as needed. In the event an insufficient number of members of the pool are available when a URC needs to be convened, the convenor may ask other faculty members or students to serve on the URC. In such cases the convenor will share the names of the URC with the Chair of SLAAC. Each URC board member will receive training prior to serving on his or her first URC.** The convenor observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

The membership of this committee is made known to parties involved prior to a hearing. Student, faculty members and administrative alternates are also designated for the committee. Either party can ask the committee's chair that a committee member not serve on the hearing panel because of bias or conflict of

interest. The chair shall decide if there are sufficient grounds to honor this request. If a committee member is unable to attend the hearing, or if a member is excluded because of potential bias or conflict of interest, an alternate will be asked to serve. **Committee members are required to attend the hearing in person.**

Nature of the hearing. There are two types of academic hearings: one to decide a disputed charge or penalty, the other to consider disciplinary matters following a second offense. A hearing of the University Review Committee is intended to be an orderly, fair inquiry into the facts bearing on the case **and only material related to the written charges may be considered during the hearing.** ‡ **The hearing** is not intended to be a trial concerned with technical formalities.

The party bringing the charge and the accused student will usually attend the hearing in person. If there is no reasonable alternative that permits a timely hearing, either or both parties may participate remotely or may provide only a written statement with the permission of the convener. If one or both parties fails to participate in a previously scheduled hearing, If the accused student fails to appear after proper notice of the hearing, the hearing will go forward and the committee will reach its conclusion on responsibility and the appropriate penalty on the basis of evidence presented at the hearing.

Related Cases. At the discretion of the convener, related cases may be heard sequentially by the same hearing board. When structured in this way, the parties involved in the first case will be heard, followed by the parties involved in the second case and so on. The hearing board will then deliberate before deciding if they wish to call the parties for one or more cases back in sequence for additional questions. This process may be repeated as necessary before the hearing board starts its final deliberations. At the discretion of the convener, a hearing for related cases may span multiple days.

Confidentiality. Hearing proceedings are confidential. Committee members, students, faculty members, recorders, advisors, and witnesses are enjoined from mentioning names of those involved or details that might reveal the identity of the student or faculty member, and from discussing presentations or committee deliberations.

Presentation; burden of proof; rights. When a hearing is convened to hear a disputed charge or penalty, the faculty member referring the case presents the evidence of the offense to the panel. The student may present counter-evidence if he or she wishes. Either party may have a faculty member, staff member, or student advisor and each has the right to call and question witnesses. The burden of proof is on the faculty member, who must establish the responsibility of the student by a preponderance of the evidence. (In matters of academic integrity, the evidence does not have to constitute overwhelming, irrefutable proof of responsibility, but only has to convince the panel that the violation took place.) Faculty members may refer cases based on the testimony of other students; in doing so, however, the faculty member should make sure either that the students who provided the testimony are willing to appear as witnesses at the hearing or that there is corroborating evidence that substantiates the charge. Other procedures for due process shall be followed, and records (including a tape recording of the hearing) shall be kept. Tapes will be erased after the appeal period has elapsed. Written records will be destroyed after five years.

URC penalties. The URC imposes penalties for dishonesty according to the nature of the violation. URC penalties may include a letter of warning, grade penalties, failure in the class, suspension, or dismissal. If the URC finds that there has been no violation, or if the URC does not find a preponderance of evidence that a violation has taken place, the student will be exonerated.

Second Offense. When a hearing is convened to consider disciplinary penalties related to a second offense, the chair reviews the offenses, as put forth in the settlement forms or in previous hearing reports, and asks the student if there are any comments he or she would like to make in regard to these offenses. Since these cases have already been decided, either through settlement or previous hearing, there is no need to reconsider

them. In most cases, it is unnecessary to call witnesses, unless the committee or the student feels the reports are unclear in some respect that a witness can clarify. The sole consideration of the committee at a second offense hearing is whether further disciplinary sanctions (usually suspension or dismissal) should be applied.

Appeals

Either the instructor or the student may appeal the decision of the URC to the vice president for academic affairs. Appeals must be made in writing to the vice president for academic affairs within three business days of receiving the written notification of the decision. Appeals will be considered only if they are based on one or more of the following criteria:

- I. new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing ***and which is provided as part of the written appeal***; or
- II. procedural error that can be shown to have affected the outcome of the hearing; or
- III. appropriateness of sanction only in cases of suspension or dismissal.

The vice president for academic affairs will decide whether or not there is a basis for appeal, and, if so, upon consideration of the appeal, may revise the URC decision or the penalty. The decision of the vice president for academic affairs is final ***and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convenor of the URC and to the chair of the URC.***

(Approved by the DePauw University Faculty, November 4, 2002. University Review Committee (URC) Hearing Procedures are available in the Office of Academic Life. Hearing Procedures are updated and revised periodically by the Academic Affairs administration in consultation with the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee.)

Appendix H. Rationale, Proposed Open Access Policy to added to the Academic Handbook, and FAQ

Open Access Policy: Rationale:

Whereas the open access movement is about two things: the furtherance of knowledge and recapturing our own intellectual property.

And whereas the vendor model restricts the sharing of knowledge, and puts the knowledge we create in the control of profit-motived third parties.

And whereas, adopting an open access policy allows us to retain the rights to our own work, easily access the work of others, and creates a broader more inclusive base of knowledge from which to learn and conduct our research.

And whereas the proposed open access policy is meant to encourage you to make your scholarship open access, but it in no way prevents you from publishing in current journals.

And whereas schools such as Bryn Mawr, Oberlin, Hope, Trinity, Wellesley, the University of California system, and many other institutions have adopted similar policies.

Be it resolved, that the faculty endorse the following Resolution regarding the implementation of the following Open Access Policy at DePauw.

Open Access Policy: Resolution:

The faculty of DePauw University is committed to disseminating the results of its published research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the faculty adopts the following open-access policy:

Each faculty member will, henceforth, retain – where feasible and appropriate – copyright privileges with respect to his or her scholarly articles. Whenever possible, faculty authors will negotiate open-access agreements with scholarly publishers. Whenever and wherever faculty authors negotiate open access agreements with a publisher, said authors will henceforth grant to DePauw University special permission to make available his or her scholarly articles in the university’s institutional repository. (For the purposes of this Open Access policy, scholarly articles are understood to be articles published in peer-reviewed journals).

Each faculty member grants to DePauw University a non-exclusive worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the author is a member of the faculty. As the copyright holder of the article, the faculty author maintains the exclusive and irrevocable right to withhold from DePauw University the granted worldwide license for any given article provided that the faculty author submit the appropriate waiver to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) or the VPAA’s designate.

The policy does *not* apply to: any articles completed before the adoption of this policy; any articles for which the faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy; or any articles for which the author requests a waiver. The VPAA or the VPAA’s designate will waive application of the policy for a particular article or delay access to said article for a specified period of time upon express direction by the author.

To facilitate access to his or her scholarly articles, authors will provide one electronic copy of the final peer-reviewed version of each article for which no waiver has been obtained, along with the appropriate

bibliographic data. This electronic copy will, whenever practical, be delivered no later than the date of publication for the article to the appropriate representative of the VPAA's Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by Library Advisory Committee (LAC) in consultation with the VPAA's Office.

The VPAA's Office may make the article available to the public in an open-access institutional repository for as long as the faculty author and copyright holder grants such access. The current policy is in no way intended to hinder faculty efforts to publish their work in the best peer-reviewed scholarly journals but is, rather, an attempt to make articles more widely available, when and where possible. The faculty-led LAC will maintain responsibility for protecting faculty interests and overseeing the operation of the repository as well as interpreting this Open Access policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty from time to time.

Open Access Policy: Frequently Asked Questions:

Why are we doing this?

- Because it serves the educational goal of the furtherance of knowledge. By making research freely available to the public, you maximize the possibility that others will benefit from your research. This makes the research more valuable.
- It counters some of the avariciousness of commercial publishing companies.

Why make this an "opt-out" policy? Why not just allow faculty to "opt-in" or individually retain a license for open-access distribution?

- An opt-out policy encourages open access more than an opt-in policy does. So just as an opt-out organ donation policy results in more organ donations so too, an opt-out open access policy will result more open access articles being published.

What are the advantages for faculty authors?

- You retain more of your own intellectual property and more widespread dissemination of your scholarly work.

Does the policy apply to articles I wrote before the policy was adopted?

- No. However, if any articles published before the policy was adopted can be legally submitted to the institutional repository, faculty members are encouraged to do so.

Does the policy apply to co-authored papers?

- Yes.

What if the journal publisher refuses to publish my article because of this prior license?

- The faculty member may always opt-out of the policy to get the article published.

Will this policy harm current publishers?

- The publishing industry is in flux. Large conglomerates rake in huge profits while small academic publishers struggle. The larger goal of furthering knowledge and research has taken a back seat. The contents of scholarly publishing are the fruit of our labors, and we continually pay unsustainably higher costs to buy it back. New models need to emerge. This is just the first step.

How will this license affect the peer-review of my article and the promotion and tenure process?

- Open access is a separate issue from peer-review and promotion and tenure. There are plenty of scholarly, peer-reviewed, open-access journals, and you can still publish in other journals with the opt-out policy.

What will DePauw do with the articles?

- The goal is to make them accessible to the world.

Will DePauw ever sell articles for profit or allow others to do so?

- No. The author will retain full copyright privileges. This is part of the beauty of open access. The author actually owns the rights to their article as long as it is under copyright.

Is the university taking the rights to my article?

- No. You retain the rights to your article. You simply grant us the non-exclusive right to “publish” it. In the current model of publishing, most authors do not retain the rights to their own work.

Who owns the copyright in articles I write?

- You do.

What does it mean to say that this is a “non-exclusive license?”

- It means you still retain the right to get your article published elsewhere. For example, you would not have to get permission from your publisher to get your article published in an anthology.

Can others distribute my work, for instance, placing it in a course pack?

- If your work is in an open access journal there is no need for others to create a course pack, the article is already available to the public. However, you retain copyright meaning that others cannot profit from your work without your permission.

What if I leave DePauw, or pass away?

- As copyright holder, you retain the right to withdraw your work from the repository. In the event of your passing, your heirs would also retain the full rights and privileges of current copyright law provided that such copyright is passed to them through an appropriate legal instrument (e.g. a will).

Where should I turn if I have questions, or would like more information?

- You can contact any member of the Library Advisory Committee: Terri Bonebright (Dean of Faculty; VPAA designate), Jason Fuller, David Gellman, Brian Howard, Geoff Klinger (Chair), Rick Provine (Director of Libraries), Bruce Sanders.
- For more about open access, visit <http://libguides.depauw.edu/content.php?pid=422707>.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AGENDA FOR 2013-2014

<i>Departments and Programs</i>	<i>Curriculum</i>	<i>Faculty Development and Standards</i>	<i>HCSE, H&Fs, Centers and Institutes</i>	<i>Governance</i>	<i>Other</i>
Develop department and program plans	Enhance Winter Term	Review evaluation, tenure and promotion processes, and merit pay	Launch the Hubbard Center for Student Engagement	Review structure of faculty committees; rethink use of faculty time	Enhance advising efforts
Launch faculty searches	Augment our undergraduate research opportunities; offer more senior capstone experiences	Expand sabbatical opportunities (in a cost-neutral way)	Strengthen our centers, institutes, fellows programs, and the Honor Scholars Program		Course selection and registration process; time banks
Re-start department and program reviews	Evaluate teaching load options		Launch Prindle Institute, Pulliam Center searches		Develop the academic component of the campaign
					Plan for library renovation and associated fundraising
					Win more grant funding; augment our grant writing capability

DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes

April 7th, 2014

(Part A – Items not requiring a Quorum)

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley, Chair of Faculty)

Welcome everyone. As we get started let me make a couple reminders. While I know it seems our community is small enough we should all know each other, we always have new individuals in our community so if you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself. Again, we have the microphones on stands and extra aisles. If you'd like to ask a question or make a comment today during any report please be sure and come forward. Clay will still need to bring up the volume. Lastly, if you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that it is silenced.

2. Verification of Quorum

At 4:07 p.m., there wasn't a quorum yet. We started with items on the agenda that don't require an active quorum.

3. Consent Agenda

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

B. CAPP continues to work on cleaning up bits and pieces of catalog language to reflect changes that are coming about as a result of the creation of the Extended Studies program. Most of these changes are minor and cosmetic, but CAPP will be asking for some help from department and program chairs in looking at the wording of the descriptions of the requirements of their major and minor courses of study and making changes where necessary.

Comment from Nicole Brockmann

We will probably replace "course" with "course credit" in the catalog language with approval from department chairs.

Question from a faculty member

Can we call it summer term instead of May term? Why are we naming one time period after a season and the other time period after a month?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

There is some long-standing nostalgic love for "winter term" as a label. "Summer term" may come to mean something different in the future. I agree that it is awkward.

Question from another faculty member

Off-campus courses are traditionally counted as 0.75 credits. How will the change from "course" to "course credit" affect students completing a major if the major is based on credits and not courses?

Response from Nicole Brockmann

We don't know how this will work.

Question from another faculty member

Also, why are off-campus courses traditionally counted as 0.75 credits?

Response from Ken Kirkpatrick, Registrar

One of our courses is equal to four semester hours. Off-campus courses transfer in as three semester hours, so we convert it to 0.75 of a credit.

- C. By now departments have hopefully received notification from the office of Academic Affairs with initial guidelines for this year's RAS process. The deadline for submission of RAS proposals is Wednesday, May 9th. RAS deliberations are tentatively scheduled for May 21, 22, 23, and 27 (Tuesday). (Dates were corrected relative to what was reported in the agenda.) CAPP will soon be putting out a call for faculty members who are willing to serve on this year's RAS. CAPP is also looking at ways to improve the process and is actively soliciting feedback from faculty; please send your thoughts to Nicole Brockmann at nicolebrockmann@depauw.edu.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann

We will need to staff the Resource Allocation Subcommittee. Please consider volunteering to serve on this subcommittee. Regarding RAS proposals, I encourage you to remember that RAS is a subcommittee of CAPP. CAPP and MAO address separate issues. CAPP addresses larger curricular issues and MAO addresses operational issues. RAS proposals are more likely to be successful when they address larger curricular issues, not operational issues. Consider how your request fits within the long-term mission of the university. It is important to pitch the proposal to a CAPP mindset, not a MAO mindset.

I would like to see some improvements in the RAS process. The membership of RAS changes every year. This creates subjectivities and inconsistencies. As chair of CAPP, I believe that everyone should have knowledge about what kinds of things are valued in proposals. Therefore, I am throwing open my email in-box. If you have ever had a comment, question, complaint, or praise about RAS, please let me know. As RAS moves forward, let's develop some institutional consistency.

There were no questions for CAPP.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has no written announcements.

5. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

6. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

7. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

8. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

9. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

10. Committee on Administration – COA (Scott Spiegelberg)

A. Update on post-promotion development.

The online survey on post-promotion development is now available, through April 9.

Open meetings on post-promotion development will be held in mid April.

Comments from Scott Spiegelberg

You all should have received an email from Bill Tobin with a link to a Survey Monkey on post-promotion development, <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/WXMJG5R> This survey is available through Wednesday, April 9th. COA will be holding open meetings in the next few weeks. Look for email notifications about the upcoming meetings.

Question from a faculty member

Do you need IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval to do this survey? When my students do a survey, IRB approval is required.

Kevin Moore, IRB member

Institutional research is exempt from IRB policy.

There were no other questions for COA.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

11. Library Advisory Committee (LAC) (Geoffrey Klinger)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

12. Extended Studies Implementation Team Report (Dave Berque)

Comments from Dave Berque

The Extended Studies Implementation team is continuing to meet weekly to coordinate the roll-out of the new Extended Studies Program in as smooth of a way as possible. At the March faculty meeting I reported on the proposals we had received for off-campus Winter Term 2015 and May Term 2015 courses.

Our focus since the March meeting has been two-fold. First, we have been giving attention to faculty development events and you can see the details of these in the written announcements. Second, we have been preparing to help students learn about, and apply for, off-campus Extended Studies courses.

This includes making Extended Studies course listings available on the regular Schedule of Classes to help signal that these courses are just as “real” as semester courses, and also preparing for an open house that will take place this Wednesday to help students learn about off-campus Extended Studies courses taking place in both Winter Term and May Term next year. The open house will be followed by the start of the Extended Studies off-campus course registration process later this week.

Details about the open house and registration timeline can be found in the written announcement section of the agenda. Please continue to help us by encouraging your students to explore these opportunities.

The committee is now shifting its attention to on-campus Extended Studies courses. Proposals for these are due today, April 7, and MAO and CEL will begin reviewing them shortly. We already know of several exciting proposals that are in the works.

Question from a faculty member

When do students apply for off-campus courses?

Response from Dave Berque

April 10th through April 24th

Written Announcements

1. We currently have more than twenty Winter Term 2015 Off-Campus Courses scheduled, as well as four May Term 2015 Off-Campus courses scheduled.
2. Proposals for On-Campus Winter Term Extended Studies courses are due today, April 7th. See e-mail from Anne Harris dated March 10th for details.
3. Please encourage students to attend the Off-Campus Courses Extended Studies Fair, Wednesday April 9th 11am – 1pm in the Union Building Ballroom.
4. Students may apply for Off-Campus Extended Studies courses from April 10th through April 24th. Encourage students to apply early.
5. Two faculty development meetings have been completed. The next meeting will take place on Thursday, April 24th from 11:30-12:30 in UB 231/232, lunch provided.

13. Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC) (Caroline Jetton)

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Caroline Jetton prepared an update for us regarding DEC’s work related to on-going conversations on campus. I draw your attention to it in the agenda. I know this is emotional work and therefore difficult work, so I want to acknowledge everyone in our community that has been participating openly and quietly in this important conversation. I look forward to the work moving forward.

- A. DEC’s report is an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for DEC.

Written Announcements –

Since the last University faculty meeting, committee members have attended an array of campus events pertinent to the topic of diversity: the student forum, “Be the Change You Wish to See,” sponsored by Zeta Phi Beta Sorority on March 6, The Movement’s meeting on March 14, the Student Government’s Student Moderated Panel and Open Forum on March 16, and the Student Life Lunch Forum on March 17.

On March 11, the entire committee was formally apprised by Cindy Babington and Dave Berque of two recent classroom incidents.

We hosted an Open Meeting on March 18 and attendance was robust. While difficult to hear and process all that was shared, it was an essential conversation for our campus community. Once the committee has had the opportunity to review the notes from the Open Meeting, they will be posted online. Anyone who was not able to attend the meeting or who did not feel comfortable sharing, may share information with the chair, Caroline Jetton, and she will bring it to the attention of the full DEC membership.

On March 20, we met with Terri Bonebright to discuss DePauw's current search practices and ongoing efforts to recruit faculty members from underrepresented groups. We will meet with her again later in the semester to follow-up on our meeting with her.

Our first opportunity to meet and discuss what we heard at the various fora or in individual conversations was April 1. Terri Bonebright and President Casey attended the meeting. Our discussion is ongoing. We will be making recommendations, coordinating with other campus stakeholders, and asking other committees, offices, and programs to review and consider possible solutions. Once a plan has been developed, we will issue a statement outlining the plan for moving forward. Our target date for issuing a statement is on or before April 15.

Additional Business

14. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

I would like to discuss with the faculty the possibility of an “M” designation in the curriculum for multicultural courses.

There have been various calls for DePauw to consider adding a Diversity or Multicultural Requirement in our curriculum, modeled on the S, W, or Q requirement. I would like to work through the faculty governance process to consider such a possibility and, through the Office of Academic Affairs, bring this to CAPP. We would need to carefully consider exactly what we would mean by having an M requirement, what would be covered, and how it would be managed and administered.

In the meantime, I met with the Diversity and Equity Committee and some faculty members last week about this possibility and discussed with them whether we could take some steps, in the short term, to highlight the number of currently-offered courses at DePauw that provide perspectives on race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, religious diversity, socioeconomic diversity, and international or global viewpoints.

I am going to ask the Office for Academic Affairs to create a way for faculty to “waive” or select into such a designation system in which, should the faculty member believe that one or multiple of their courses offer perspectives on diversity that we could highlight such courses to students and to advisors. This could be in the form of an electronic designation or a booklet (available to students and faculty) that offers more detailed descriptions of courses. I believe this might be a positive approach, and more manageable, than asking CAPP or MAO to engage in the designating of courses before we have any defined terms as to what would be an M course in an M requirement system.

If DePauw were to move to an M requirement, we would likely need to see what patterns students currently exhibit within the courses currently offered. This designation system would offer us one way to see current course patterns and see if some form of designation changes student course selection choices.

Comments from Nicole Brockmann, chair of CAPP

Alicia Suarez approached me on behalf of CAPP with this idea. I responded with an email regarding how we can proceed in terms of pedagogy.

Response from President Casey

I think the conservations will be complicated. But as we were meeting with DEC, it became clear that we already have these courses. We can easily recognize and designate these courses officially as “M” courses.

Question from a faculty member

Even in this preliminary phase, by multicultural, do we mean within the United States or will we include multinational or international perspectives as well? I think we have non-United States courses that address multicultural issues. Part of the M designation could be within the United States and another part could be internationally. I would like to know if my courses would count or not.

Response from President Casey

I think both. I turn to Anne Harris, Director of the Women’s Studies Program. Let’s get all the courses out there and then decide. Perhaps we can bifurcate the courses in terms of national vs. international. I think that you can decide whether your courses would count or not. There is a lot of work on this campus that we should highlight, especially in terms of incoming students. If we care about this topic, let’s let people know.

Comments from Anne Harris, Director of the Women’s Studies Program

I believe that we should take advantage of any occasion where we have the opportunity to talk to each other about our courses. What has emerged this spring is not that this is a competency but a skill and awareness and that we are engaged in this area. We can celebrate this as a skill. In Women’s Studies, there are two courses that would fit: Women of Color in the U.S. (WS 260) and Transnational Feminism (WS 262).

Comment from President Casey

President Casey noted that student government had also been discussing the issue and asked Olivia Flores, Student Body Vice President to update the faculty on the status of discussions within Student Government.

Comments from Olivia Flores, Student Body Vice President

We have been discussing this issue in multiple chambers of DePauw Student Government. There was a resolution on the floor to revisit a white paper passed in 2012 on multiculturalism. There is an interesting discussion among students right now. Many students are adamant that this is a skill that they should acquire before we graduate. Other students come back with an argument saying, “Where will this end?” “Should there be a sustainability competency?” “Or other competencies?” We will revisit the white paper. We will see if it passes, then we will pass it on to the administration.

Comment from President Casey

I will work with the Office of Academic Affairs to see where we should go from here.

There were no other questions for President Casey.

15. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

I attended several of the open forums on campus during the last month. Many of you were there also and are aware of this. There was a consistent theme – classroom environment. Everyone in the Office of Academic Affairs is aware of this. We need to do some specific activities and programming regarding sexual assault and harassment. We were thinking about rolling this in during the fall, but it’s not too soon to start.

I would like to underscore a couple of things. We know that good things are happening in our classrooms. We rank in the top 50 in terms of the number of graduates that go on to earn advanced degrees.

We conduct surveys of our alumni five years after graduation. This is an interesting time to survey alumni because this is when they are starting to establish their careers. The survey asks questions about their coursework and how DePauw prepared them for their careers. Bill Tobin is working on the survey. The survey shows a positive picture of our work. Alumni consistently respond by saying that they develop close personal relationships with faculty members, and that these relationships have a strong impact on their personal growth. Alumni also respond by saying they are satisfied with the opportunities to interact with faculty members and that faculty members posed challenging ideas in class.

There are some concerns that come out of the alumni surveys. Less than 50 percent of the alumni agreed these outcomes: that they form relationships with students different from themselves, and that they have serious discussions with faculty, staff, or students whose political or religious viewpoints are different from their own.

The picture is overall positive, but we can never be complacent with the quality of our program. We have to be mindful that we reach every single student. We do outstanding things for our students who are involved in a lot of activities and who are self-motivated to take advantage of what we have to offer. We also do a lot for students with learning disabilities and students for whom English is a second language. But what about the students in the middle? We can always do better.

Methodist Exemplary Teaching Award

I close my comments today by announcing the recipients of this year's Methodist Exemplary Teaching Award sponsored by the United Methodist Church with funds supplemented by a generous gift from George and Virginia Crane specifically for this purpose. The award is given to one or more faculty members who "exemplify excellence in teaching; civility and concern for students and colleagues; commitment to value-centered education; and service to students, the institution and the community."

First I want to thank those of you who sent in nominations for this award. It is heartwarming to see the many wonderful things our colleagues are doing to support teaching and our students across the many departments, programs and disciplines at our university. From these nominations, it is clear that there are a large number of faculty members who are deserving of recognition for their work with students, which makes the decision for this award a difficult one. This year we are recognizing two colleagues. I would like to say a few words about each of these colleagues using information from the nominating letters and from student comments.

This faculty member understands that college is a struggle for some students, and he is very good at inspiring confidence in those students to help them do their best work. One student wrote "This professor has always told me that as long as I am doing my best, and working hard, that is all I can ever ask of myself and all a professor can ask of their student... [he] always reminds me that my contributions are important and never to sell myself short". Another student recounts the time that this professor met with him on a Saturday morning last semester to help him with his senior seminar presentation—even though he was not the professor for that class! His colleagues hear these kinds of things from students all the time.

This faculty member also has a long service record at DPU. In the ten years he has served on COF, FDC, the SRF steering committee, several DPCs and search committees, and is currently finishing a three-year term as chair of the department. His service to the department, division, university, and community extends well beyond the structured university service activities I just mentioned. He has judged high school science fairs, has given public talks at the library, and serves on panel discussions. He arranges regular lunches for our majors to meet each other, advises the department student club (and helps to arrange field trips and other activities for that

body), annually runs very popular co-curricular field trips for students during the regular semester or fall break, and team-teaches Winter Term excursions with other members of the department almost every year. He manages sample collections, services lab equipment, mentors work-study students, and conducts research with students nearly every summer.

Finally, if one trait defines this faculty member's personality more than any other, it's humility. He flies under the radar, and he doesn't openly advertise all the extra workload he carries for our students.

Please join me in congratulating Jim Mills for his exemplary teaching award.

The second winner for this year has been described by her colleagues as a talented and multi-faceted teacher. She has effectively taught a wide variety of courses and is a caring, innovative, and effective teacher. She is particularly noteworthy for her classroom management of student discussion, challenging assignments, concern for students, and creative pedagogy. Many students comment on how available she is and how much she encourages their efforts. She uses effectively uses multiple methods, creativity, and enthusiasm to bring classroom material to life and often convinces students who weren't too enthusiastic at the beginning of the course to surprise themselves and enjoy the course and do well in it. She has succeeded in keeping her standards strong, while still maintaining excellent relationships with students. With the recent increase in international student, she has taken a particular interest in them and works hard to help them with their ability to speak English.

Her colleagues comment on how involved she is with the department and they are impressed with her collegiality and her willingness to do more than is expected to contribute to departmental functioning. She is always one of the first to volunteer for assignments and also initiates ideas. For example, upon her arrival at DePauw, she started the DePauw chapter of our honor society, Lamda Pi Eta. She not only founded it, she has continued to sponsor it ever since. She has established relationships with a variety of faculty and disciplines and interacts and represents the department well across campus.

Her work with as Director of the Speaking and Listening program has been exceptional, and she has been tireless in working with both students and faculty to improve classroom discussions. She has been especially effective at coordinating with Writing Across the Curriculum and Quantitative Reasoning Across the Curriculum coordinators and reaching out to a variety of faculty in quite diverse disciplines. In addition, this year, she has taken on a new initiative to teach a course for subject based tutors, to help them be more effective.

Her colleagues praise her for "walking the walk", not just talking about value-centered education. While she never seeks the limelight, she is one of our under-recognized treasures and deserves our notice and gratitude.

Please join me in congratulating Susan Wilson for her Exemplary Teaching Award.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

16. Old Business

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

17. New Business

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

18. Announcements

A. Prindle Center for Ethics Reading Groups (Jeane Pope)

Prindle reading groups will continue next year. We hope to have between 3-5 reading groups each semester. Ideas for readings and expressions of interest to lead groups for fall semester should be forwarded to Jeane Pope by May 15 for maximum consideration.

Comments from Jeane Pope

Hi. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Jeane Pope and I teach in the Department of Geosciences and I am also the Faculty Sustainability Coordinator. However, I'm here before you today to tell you that starting in the fall, I will be taking on a new role as the Coordinator for the Prindle reading groups.

Each semester, The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics sponsors between 3 and 5 reading groups on various topics related to ethics. The reading groups are composed of 15 to 20 faculty, staff and students who meet several times throughout the semester to delve into important questions from the readings. For example, in the fall, Mike Roberts in the Department of Psychology will be leading a discussion of *Thinking, Fast and Slow* by Daniel Kahneman. The books and refreshments for the meetings will be provided by The Prindle Institute. All faculty members are welcome to submit a proposal for either the fall 2014 or spring 2015 semester. If you are interested in creating a reading group, please contact me, Jeane Pope (jpope@depauw.edu) by May 15. I am happy to take questions. Thank you!

There were no questions for Jeane Pope.

B. Committee Elections for AY2014-15 (Bridget Gourley)

This section was skipped because there wasn't a quorum.

19. Adjournment

The meeting was called to an end at 4:54 p.m. because the quorum still had not yet been met.

DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 14th, 2014
(Part B – Actionable Items Requiring a Quorum ONLY)

1. Call to Order – 11:30 a.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley, Chair of Faculty)

Welcome everyone. Thank you for coming out for this second attempt to get a quorum. I know you are busy and I know I created conflicts for some of you in choosing this time. Unfortunately there was no perfect time given the wealth of activity on our campus.

As we get started let me make a couple reminders. First a new one, I want to remind you if we can all minimize our use of acronyms, it would be really helpful to our newer members of the community. I had a request just last week, noting it is hard to follow the discussion if you are still figuring out the lingo.

While I know it seems our community is small enough we should all know each other, we always have new individuals in our community so if you speak during the meeting please introduce yourself.

Again, we have the microphones on stands and extra aisles. If you'd like to ask a question or make a comment today during any report please be sure and come forward. Clay will still need to bring up the volume.

Lastly, if you don't like to be startled when your cell phone rings aloud, please check that it is silenced.

2. Verification of Quorum

The quorum of 86 members was reached at 11:38 a.m.

3. Consent Agenda (Bridget Gourley)

There were no requests in advance of the meeting to move items from the consent agenda to the main agenda. No one requested to move an item from the consent agenda to the main agenda during the meeting. There were no objections to approving the consent agenda. The consent agenda was approved.

A. Approve of Minutes from the March 2014 Faculty Meeting

B. Approve the creation of an interdisciplinary minor in World Literature (advance notice given by CAPP in March 2014)

A rationale can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

C. Approve of the following new courses (recommended by MAO):

HONR 193 – Science Research Fellows: Understanding Science (0.5 credit)

HONR 194 – Science Research Fellows: Research Methods (0.5 credit)

D. MAO announces changes in course number and description:

HONR 191 Science Research Fellows Experience I to change to HONR 291 Science Research Fellows Experience I

MUS 219 Composition to change to MUS 320 Composition

E. MAO announces the following change in course number:

HONR 192 Science Research Fellows Experience II (variable credit) to change to HONR 292 Science Research Fellows Experience II

F. MAO announces approval of the following new experimental 0.5 credit extended studies off-campus courses:

Winter Term courses:

ASIA 183 - Japanese Culture, Technology and Design

BIO 183 – The Galapagos
CLST 183 – Italy and the Architecture of Sport: Ancient Games and Modern Soccer
ENG 183 – Italian Film and Filmmaking
FREN 183 – French Language Immersion in French Polynesia
GEOS 183 – Assembling California: Geologic Field Studies in the Mojave Desert
HIST 183 – China and Hong Kong: Tradition and Change
HIST 183 – French Revolution
SOC 183 – Gender, Sexuality and Reproduction in Mexico
UNIV 183 – Geography and Bliss
UNIV 183 – New Yorking
UNIV 183 – Thailand and Vietnam: Culture, Technology and Economic Development
UNIV 183 – Social Justice and Spanish Immersion in Mexico
UNIV 183 – Exploring Moroccan Culture Through Its Music and Dance Traditions
UNIV 183 – O’Keefe Country: Ghost Ranch
UNIV 183 – Service Engagement in El Salvador

May courses:

ML 183 – History, Art History, and Language of Northeastern Italy
UNIV 183 – Habitat III: Mexico City and the Perfect Storm
UNIV 183 – South Africa After Mandela
UNIV 183 – Wilderness Writing: Backing Isle Royale

Course description for consent agenda items C, D and E can be found in Appendix C.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

- A. CAPP gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote in May 2014 to approve the creation of a new minor in Astronomy.

A rationale for this motion can be found in Appendix B of this agenda. The motion will be voted on during the May faculty meeting. There were no clarifying questions about the motion.

There were no questions for CAPP.

Written Announcements –

CAPP has no written announcements.

5. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Tiffany Hebb)

- A. MAO gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote in May 2014 to approve the changes to the Class Attendance and Absences portion of the Academic Handbook found in Appendix D of this agenda. Text to be inserted is underlined at the bottom of the policy, where it would be added.

Comments from a faculty member

I don’t think this motion will prohibit these problems. The language in the Academic Handbook will still be watered down and won’t improve the situation.

Response from Tiffany Hebb

We tried to be more specific, but we ran into roadblocks. I agree, the proposed changes are more watered down than some might like. This does at least establish expectations and outline how disputes can be resolved, through the Dean of Students.

Announcements –

MAO has no written announcements other than those that appeared on the consent agenda.

6. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

- A. COF gives advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty to make changes to the personnel policies section of the Academic Handbook regarding the review process for librarians. The exact changes are found in Appendix E of this agenda. Deletions are ~~struck through~~ and additions are in **bold**.

Comments from Matthew Balensuela

Thank you for filling out the Google survey regarding moving review files to an on-line format. We may get this implemented partially during the next academic year.

Regarding the motion, the key change is removal of the phrase “every 5 years after.” If the motion does not pass, librarians would have to prepare large review files and DPCs would have to review these files every five years. If the motion does pass, the amount of work would be reduced. The librarians have wanted to make this change for several years. Librarians will continue to have annual reviews by the Dean of Libraries and COF will continue to review the teaching of librarians with the rank of professor.

COF also discussed the review of faculty members with continuing term appointments. We decided to move forward with this change for the librarians, then we will confer with faculty members on continuing term appointments to discuss the relevant issues.

There were no questions for COF.

Written Announcements –

COF continues its normal work for the year.

7. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

- A. Motion (to be voted on) to revise the “[Academic Integrity](#)” section of the *Academic Handbook*, and the equivalent section of the [Student Handbook](#). Advanced notice was given in the March 2014 Faculty Meeting Agenda.

The suggested changes to the *Academic Handbook* can be found in Appendix F of this agenda. Text to be inserted is shown underlined and bold, and text to be deleted struck through.

Background Information on Proposal

These recommended edits do not change the basic goals or procedures for addressing charges of academic dishonesty. The main substantive changes add:

- Procedures for handling linked cases
- Revised procedures that facilitate the prompt resolution of charges of academic dishonesty
- Details about assembling the committees that hear charges

- Clarification of the circumstances in which a student may withdraw from a course after charges of academic dishonesty have been initiated.

Comments from Kathryn Millis

The motion is regarding academic integrity. The motion addresses procedural matters, scheduling, and setting up committees.

This motion came from a standing committee and did not need a second. Advance notice was given in March. There were no questions about the motion. No one spoke in favor of or against the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

Written Announcements –

1. Members of SLAAC have met with concerned students and attended recent open meeting sponsored by DEC.
2. SLAAC continues discussion of how to address electronic distractions. Recent campus events complicated our plan to add them to the [Disruptive Student Policy](#). We are also discussing classroom expectations and academic and intellectual freedom.

8. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

- A. FGSC gives advance notice of intent to have the faculty vote on the following motion at the May 2014 Faculty Meeting:

Motion: That the faculty approve changes to faculty meeting portion of the by-laws allowing for a consent agenda to address routine business. This motion requires several changes to the academic handbook, which are shown in Appendix G.

Rationale: In November the FGSC asked the faculty to suspend the by-laws for the remainder of the academic year to allow for a consent agenda to address routine business. The purpose was to facilitate making the faculty governance process more effective and less burdensome. The hope was this allows the faculty to handle routine business as a block leaving more time for meaningful discussion during faculty meeting. The FGSC reviewed the success of the pilot project at its March 31 meeting and recommends making the relevant changes to the by-laws.

FGSC notes the importance of colleagues feeling welcome to request and item be removed from the consent agenda (or in Robert's Rules parlance "object" to an item being on the consent agenda). Such a request automatically moves the item to the proper order of business for full discussion. Colleagues should feel free to notify the Chair of the Faculty of their request either in advance of the meeting or when the chair asks for objections during the meeting.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

As a reminder, in the fall we voted to suspend our by-laws to try the concept of a consent agenda for routine business. It seems to have worked well so the FGSC suggests we formalize the concept. A couple of things are worth noting:

FGSC does not in any way want to limit debate. In fact the purpose of this approach is to allow for more debate of substantive issues. If the Chair of the Faculty incorrectly anticipates that something is routine, all

members of the community should feel welcome and encouraged to ask an item be moved for discussion, either in advance of the meeting or at the beginning of the meeting.

Second, when a faculty member has a relative in the graduating class, we would not consider the conferring of degrees routine as it is a special occasion for our community. Conferring of degrees would then move to the regular agenda to continue our tradition of allowing that faculty member to make the motion if they would like.

Please see any member of FGSC with questions. If an FAQ appears to be useful as a result of questions received before the next meeting we will certainly release one.

B. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve a one-year suspension our by-laws and standing rules regarding the distribution of faculty members from different departments and divisions on committees.

Rationale:

The start of the election cycle for AY2014-15 demonstrated that we are still struggling to get sufficient volunteers for elected committee positions. While there are likely many reasons, as FGSC has analyzed the situation, we note that we have some divisions with rather large departments, for example Division 2 includes both English and Modern Languages. Once one member of a large department agrees to serve, no one else in that department is eligible for the same committee (with the exception of COF) significantly reducing the pool of eligible candidates. FGSC suggests we test whether making service less restrictive allows faculty members to better match their interests with service.

FGSC is proposing trying this for one election cycle and then allowing committees to see whether they are able to function effectively during AY2014-15 with this more flexible options for faculty representation. Before the next election cycle what is learned from this trial can be considered it terms of whether or not the faculty wish to consider the experiment. This one year change would potentially impact the balance of representation for at-most three years, the standard term length for committee service.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

On behalf of the FGSC, I move that the faculty approve a one-year suspension of our by-laws and standing rules regarding the distribution of faculty members on committees from different departments and divisions.

This motion comes from a standing committee needs no second. As a reminder, a motion to suspend the by-laws requires a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

Before I open it up for discussion, on behalf of the FGSC, I'd like to provide some context and clarification. FGSC and I thought this was worth bringing forward. Still we are all, and I in particular as the one who must implement the decision am happy to finish out the election process in whichever way is dictated by the outcome of this vote. If I had strong opinions about the passage of this motion I would step aside of the chair role during the debate and discussion, but I feel very neutral and I think I can effectively manage the debate. If at any point someone feels I am not being objective please raise your concern and I will step aside and ask Dave Berque as past chair to manage the debate and vote.

As a clarification, what this would mean is all the restrictions on the election/vacancy memo about who is not eligible to serve with regard to their division or department only would be ignored as we moved forward. Positions which require tenure or seven years of full time service would still be enforced.

A bit more about rationale. We have always had the option for a division to nominate someone from outside

their division to serve as a representative to a committee as long as we kept the divisional/departmental balance in check and at least during the last six years have had a few examples of such service. This proposition provides further flexibility in staffing our committee structure. Hopefully, it also allows more flexibility for colleagues to choose service opportunities that better fit with their interests rather than being restricted because a colleague in the department or division has already stepped forward to serve on that committee. The idea is to try it for a year and see whether it serves our needs. If we find at the end of the year it doesn't serve our needs we will have only skewed the balance for at most a third of our committee positions. The FGSC discussed it and felt it would be ok to let those elected to finish their terms of service even if moving forward we don't continue with this flexibility.

Question from a faculty member

I have a question about what the motion means. From what I understand, if there is one representative on a committee from one department, this motion will allow there to be a second representative from the same department. What about the divisional representatives?

Response from Bridget Gourley

Yes, this would allow additional members from the same department. Currently when we count departmental representation we include both those serving as at-large representatives and as a divisional representatives to determine the number from a department. This motion would also allow flexibility in the number of divisional representatives. Currently most committees allow two from a division, this motion would temporarily remove that limit.

Follow-up question from the faculty member

So basically this is being done at the department level and is not throwing out the concept of divisional elections?

Response from Bridget Gourley

Correct. Divisions still need to vet candidates they place on the ballot. This motion just opens further who divisions may nominate for the committee positions.

Comments from another faculty member

I am less concerned about whether departments are limited to serving on a particular committee. But I am concerned about divisions not being represented. I am also concerned about whether one year is enough time to experiment with these issues. Perhaps we should try this for a three year cycle instead of just one year.

Response from Bridget Gourley

I agree, the first issue is one that we ought to acknowledge. Regarding the time line, we can always extend the experiment to an additional one or two years after the first year if we feel it is working well but we think a longer trial is important.

Question from another faculty member

So if the motion passes, all divisional representatives on one committee could come from one department?

Response from Bridget Gourley

Yes, this could happen. This wouldn't happen for the upcoming year, but could conceivably happen in the future.

Question from another faculty member

Where are we in the election cycle? Is it too late to be doing this for next year?

Response from Bridget Gourley

We are about halfway through the elections right now. We are currently voting on at-large positions on core committees. We still have some vacancies. We are finding that it is challenging to get people to serve on these committees.

Question from another faculty member

Will this affect membership of COF also?

Response from Bridget Gourley

Yes

Follow-up comments from faculty member

One problem I see with this is that when a department is involved in discreet deliberations, more than one person from a department would have to recuse themselves from a COF debate. So if multiple people from one department are serving on a committee, this could become a problem in terms of a quorum or broad enough perspective.

Response from Bridget Gourley

This is a valid concern. In one year I don't think we would get the membership so lopsided with regard to distribution to reach the COF quorum limitation but if this works well it may suggest a qualifier we need to have regarding how open we can be with representation, particularly on COF. This is part of why we want to try this on a one-year basis, to see what issues we haven't considered.

The question was called. The vote was taken. The results of the vote were 56 in favor, 20 against, and 4 abstentions. The motion carried.

Comments from Bridget Gourley

Given that the motion carried, you can ignore the divisional and departmental restrictions currently listed on the election memo, when I announce the results of the current at-large balloting I will remove the restrictions. Remember that nominations for core committee vacancies not yet decided and divisional nominations for other committees are due on Friday, April 21. Also, at-large ballots for core committee positions are currently available in e-services with a submission deadline of 11 p.m. on April 16. We still have a number of core committee vacancies to fill. Participation in the governance process allows you to help shape our situation.

Please note FGSC's written announcements. FGSC has appointed itself as a working group to further consider changes to our governance structure to enhance the effectiveness and experience. Anticipate receiving a survey this spring to help us inform our work. The broader the participation in feedback the better collection of new ideas we can create for discussion and revision through the fall semester. Given this work will not be completed by the end of the semester the current members of FGSC not going on leave next year, who by definition of their position would all be rotating off FGSC, have agreed to continue working on this issue through December 2014.

There were no additional questions for FGSC.

Written Announcements –

1. FGSC has been discussing ways to make faculty governance more effective and less burdensome all year. That included considering whether the work of CAPP and MAO could be combined into an overarching curriculum committee. After welcoming input from faculty members generally, CAPP and MAO generally and via a joint meeting, FGSC has decided not to move forward with that specific proposal at this time. Still we hope to make progress on the more general governance issues and plan to bring forward a

survey to gain broad faculty input that will help inform potential proposals. If changes are warranted current FGSC members not going on leave next year have agreed to continue work on this issue into the next academic year with the plan of having proposals for the faculty to react to and help refine in the early fall. The goal is that if changes are warranted advance notice be given in November 2014, voted on in December 2014 so they can be implemented with the election process for committee service beginning in AY2015-16.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

9. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

- A. FDC gives advance notice of intent to ask the faculty to vote on the following motion at the May 2014 faculty meeting.

Motion:

That the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) be renamed the Internal Grants Committee (IGC). A summary of the changes to the Academic Handbook are found in Appendix H.

Rationale:

The “Faculty Development” umbrella at DePauw includes components of: 1.) internal grants (administered by FDC); 2.) the Center for Teaching and Learning (administered by the Faculty Development Coordinator); 3.) Endowed Chairs (administered by the VPAA and Dean of the Faculty); and 4.) external grant support.

The role of FDC in “Faculty Development” is the review of internal grant proposals and award policies. Because of the committee’s experience in reviewing faculty proposals, FDC also reviews several student awards (e.g., Student-Faculty Research, Howe’s Grant, the new Ferid Murad Medal), which extends its reach beyond the realm of “Faculty Development”. Hence, the name change more accurately reflects what the committee currently does.

Because the Academic Handbook should reflect current practice as closely as possible, FDC has listed the full set of changes required in Appendix H of this agenda. Language to be deleted is struck through, new language is found in bold.

Question from a faculty member

What is the difference between a grant and a fellowship?

Response from Tim Cope

Grants include leave time and all other awards given by FDC right now.

Written Announcements –

FDC continues its work reviewing proposals.

10. Library Advisory Committee (LAC) (Geoffrey Klinger)

- A. Motion (to be voted on):
That the faculty endorse the open access policy found in Appendix I of this agenda, for inclusion in the Academic Handbook. Advance notice was given in the March 2014 Faculty Meeting agenda.

The complete policy with rationale and a FAQ can be found in Appendix I of this agenda.

Comments from Geoffrey Klinger

We would be remiss not to thank the committee for their good work in preparing this policy for your consideration. Rick Provine, Bruce Sanders, Brian Howard, Jason Fuller, David Gellman, and Dean Terri Bonebright thoroughly vetted this policy before presenting it to you today. In addition, the committee would also like to thank Vice President Larry Stimpert and Chair of Faculty Bridget Gourley for visiting with the committee about this policy. Finally, we would also like to recognize the hard work of the previous year's Library Advisory Committee, chaired by Jonathan Nicols-Pethick.

I must admit, I was originally fairly ambivalent about the Open Access Policy, but as I read more about it, especially on the web site that our friends at the library have devoted to Open Access, I understood why this is both important and sound policy that DePauw University should embrace. This is part of a larger issue, namely, the consolidation of academic publishing by for profit publishers over the past 30 years. One of the consequences of this consolidation is significantly higher textbook costs for our students. Moreover, these same publishers are now beginning to cherry pick the journals of our professional societies, and charging us to access our own research given that we have to cede our intellectual property rights to be published in these journals. In short, they are profiting off your, off our work.

Rick Provine sent a timely message to the faculty emphasizing the intellectual property rights component of this initiative. For me, the more important piece about Open Access it to provide free and open access to our research. And there is a selfish component to this, as well. Indeed, Bruce Sanders has noted that preliminary studies suggest that readership skyrockets when readers are given open access to academic research.

This issue is becoming more and more salient with each passing day. A growing number of schools are moving to Open Access models, and DePauw is now in a position to address what we want to do regarding this issue. It has been said, on issues of great import, one needs to lead, follow, or get out of the way. I must admit, I typically get out of the way, and sometimes follow. But on this issue, I think leading, and joining our peer institutions, is warranted. I am proud to stand in support of this motion, and hope that you will join me in making DePauw University a strong and early voice in this important conversation and movement.

Questions from a faculty member

Can you elaborate on the waiver policy? What steps do we need to go through? If I publish in a journal that is not open-access, what steps do I need to take to publish in this journal?

Response from Geoffrey Klinger

We have a clear and open opt-out policy. If you wish to publish in a journal that doesn't allow open access, then you can opt out of the open-access policy. Send a note to an administrator – either the Dean of Faculty or the VPAA – and the option would be automatically granted.

Comments from another faculty member

There are certain aspects of this motion that make me uncomfortable. I am concerned that we are being asked to endorse the open-access movement. I think this could be separated from the open-access revolution. I am uncomfortable with some of the language in the rationale, such as “avariciousness” and “profit-seeking.” There is also no mention of what the sanction would be if we publish and do not submit an opt-out waiver to the university. I also don't know what the university repository would look like. And I am concerned about the context in which my work appears. How about if I provide a simple link on my web site to my published works instead?

Response from Geoff Klinger

The opt-in op-out policy is not likely to have repercussions. We are encouraging you to retain your intellectual property rights.

Comments from another faculty member

I am in favor of this motion, both philosophically and practically. This will mean that our student co-authors will have access to their own work after they graduate.

Question from another faculty member

How is the open-access policy negotiated?

Response from Geoff Klinger

We submit a request to the journal and the journal negotiates a fee for open-access policy. The fee is being reduced as the publishers realize that this trend is moving forward.

Comments from Rick Provine, Director of Libraries

There is a lot of standard language available on this issue. You ask the publisher for the long-term rights. But the publisher still wants to earn income from publishing your work. The publisher may ask us to waive the open access for a two-year period so that they can garner initial earnings from the publication.

There were no additional questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

There were no additional questions for LAC.

Written Announcements –

LAC has no written announcements

Additional Business**11. Old Business**

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

12. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

13. Adjournment (Bridget Gourley)

Please note our May faculty meeting is Monday May 5. It is critical we get a quorum because we most confer degrees for graduating seniors. Additionally, it would be really nice to vote on the items COF, SLAAC, CAPP and FGSC gave advance notice of this month so that if the motions pass, they will be in place for the coming year. I know we are all busy now but May is likely to be busier so it would be nice not to have to arrange a second meeting.

Given we got through our needed action items let's consider ourselves adjourned.

As a reminder the deadline for the May faculty meeting agenda will be the last Monday in April.

Appendices

Appendix A. Rationale for Proposed Minor in World Literature

(condensed from documents provided by the departments of English and Modern Languages)

The English and Modern Languages Departments, with the endorsement of the Classical Studies Department, propose an interdisciplinary minor in world literature, drawing from courses in both departments and other affiliated departments. The new minor does not require any new courses or changes in staffing, and we do not expect any significant changes in enrollment patterns. It simply offers students a new avenue for studying literature at DePauw, one that combines the resources and expertise of both departments and affords a wider perspective on literature that neither department can provide on its own. In practical terms, the proposed minor represents a more intentional configuration of courses that we already offer, a more coherent context for planning and teaching these courses, and new opportunities for faculty members in both departments to collaborate.

In some areas, the university curriculum has been a step behind the administrative thrust to internationalize DePauw's student body. Currently, DePauw hosts 260 international and foreign exchange students representing 41 countries. The Department of English has only recently adapted its writing curriculum to accommodate the many students who come to campus speaking and writing in languages other than English. In literature, we have made no comparable adaptation. A minor in World Literature is not designed specifically to meet the needs of students whose background is in a language other than English, but it acknowledges that domestic and international students have a shared interest in studying literature from a global perspective.

Naturally, English as a discipline has focused on British, American, and other anglophone literatures, and it will continue to do so. At the same time, English has always recognized close allegiances to comparative literature and the study of literatures in languages other than English. These disciplines are in continual dialogue with each other through their collective membership in the Modern Language Association. The new minor represents a configuration of courses designed to leverage these allegiances within the university curriculum, combining the resources of the English, Modern Languages, and other departments to open a new area of study.

The Department of Modern Languages is an enthusiastic partner with the Department of English in this endeavor. While remaining committed to teaching literatures and cultures in our nine target languages spanning the globe, we also offer a substantial number of classes devoted to literature in translation. With an ever-growing focus on translinguistic and transcultural topics, we offer examinations of literature that are deeply embedded in and across the specific languages and cultures in which we have expertise.

Opening and developing this area of study positions DePauw with the best undergraduate literature programs in the country. Of the 27 institutions in the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), only 6 offer programs in comparative or world literature: Beloit, Coe, Colorado, Kenyon, Oberlin, and Wooster. Many of the highest ranked liberal arts colleges in the country, however, have such programs, including Barnard, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Hamilton, Haverford, Hobart William Smith, Middlebury, Smith, Swarthmore, Wellesley, Willamette, and Williams. From this perspective, a program in comparative or world literature represents a benchmark of an elite liberal arts institution.

The new minor will require the creation of a World Literature Steering Committee, with two members from English, two from Modern Languages, and one at-large member, each serving three-year terms. The committee will function primarily to advise students in the minor, approve courses for credit in the minor, and monitor course offerings and enrollment. As the minor becomes more popular, advising responsibilities could be distributed to members of the English and Modern Languages Departments. Members of the Steering

Committee, including the Chair of the committee, will be designated upon the recommendation of the Departments of English and Modern Languages, in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Proposed catalogue description of the minor including requirements and course descriptions:

The World Literature minor offers students the opportunity to study literature from an interdisciplinary, global perspective, focusing on literature in translation and literature in languages other than English. Core courses introduce students to literary genres and important works in world literature. Elective courses may include literature courses taught in English as well as literature courses taught in another language. The minor is especially compatible with a major in Classical Studies, Modern Languages, and study abroad. Students should consult with their minor advisor when choosing courses.

TOTAL COURSES REQUIRED: Five, with at least one in Modern Languages or another affiliated department

CORE COURSES: ENG 151 and ENG 250. FREN 327, GER 307, or SPAN 335 may be substituted for ENG 151.

OTHER REQUIRED COURSES: ENG 197 or ML 197 may be counted toward the minor when the topic is world literature.

NUMBER 300 AND 400 LEVEL COURSES: Two in English, Modern Languages, or an affiliated department

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Literature courses taught in languages other than English may be counted toward the minor. Literature courses in affiliated departments may be counted toward the minor with the approval of the Steering Committee. One study-abroad course may be counted toward the minor.

Core courses

ENG 151: Literature and Interpretation

ENG 250: World Literature

FREN 327: Introduction to Literature in French

GER 307: Introduction to German Literature

SPAN 335: Introduction to Hispanic Literature

Courses in literature taught in English

ASIA 281: Traditional Japanese Literature

ASIA 282: Modern Japanese Novels

CLST 100: Greek and Roman Mythology

ENG 197: First-Year Seminar (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 255: Topics in Literary Studies (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 261: Modern Continental Literature

ENG 390: Women and Literature: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 391: Authors: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 392: Genres: Adv. Topics (when the topic is literature in translation)

ENG 396: World Literature: Adv. Topics

ML 194: Arabic Literature in Translation

ML 227: Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature

ML 260: Topics in French Literature

ML 264: Topics in Hispanic Literature

ML 326: Twentieth-Century Russian Literature

Note: Note: In ML 227 and ML 326 (above) and ML 395 (below), when the topic is Russian literature, students pursuing a minor in Russian or Russian studies do readings in the original Russian.

Courses in literature taught in another language

LAT 224: Introduction to Latin Poetry
LAT 341: Drama
SPAN 442: Literature of Spain
SPAN 444: Spanish American Literature

Topics courses taught in English (when the topic is literature)

ASIA 197: First-Year Seminar in Asian Studies
ASIA 290: Topics in East Asian Studies
ASIA 390: Topics in East Asian Studies
ML 197: First-Year Seminar in Modern Languages
ML 295: Topics in Modern Languages
ML 395: Advanced Topics in Modern Languages

Topics courses taught in another language (when the topic is literature)

CHIN 269: Topics in Chinese
FREN 401: Literatures and Cultures of the French-Speaking World
GER 411: Twentieth Century German Literature and Culture
GER 412: Topics
GRK 205: Readings in Greek Prose and Poetry
GRK 452: Readings in Greek
ITAL 375: Topics in Italian Literature and Culture
LAT 223: Introduction to Latin Prose
LAT 332: Readings in Latin
RUS 324: Topics
SPAN 390: Topics in Spanish

Appendix B: Rationale for Proposed Minor in Astronomy

(condensed from documents provided by the Department of Physics and Astronomy)

For many years the Department of Physics and Astronomy has discussed the possibility of offering a minor in astronomy. The motivation for developing such a minor is based on student interest. We always have a few students in the general education astronomy sequence (Phys 103 and Phys 104) that want to take more astronomy and have expressed interest in having an astronomy minor. In addition to these non-science majors we often have several physics majors who have an interest in pursuing astrophysics and take the astrophysics courses we regularly offer. Kertzman was awarded a Faculty Fellowship in 2009-2012 to develop two new courses in astronomy/astrophysics with an ultimate goal of designing a minor in either astronomy and/or astrophysics.

One of our challenges was to craft a minor program that will serve the needs of the different groups of students who will be interested in this minor. The majority of students in PHYS103 and PHYS 104 are non-science majors and are unlikely to have had any college level physics. Our guiding principle was that the minor should not require college physics. We firmly believe that the study of astronomy is a valuable experience for the liberal arts student and that an astronomy minor should be accessible to all students, not just those with experience in physics. On the other end of the spectrum are physics majors with an interest in astrophysics, some of whom will pursue astrophysics in graduate school. While a separate astrophysics minor might better serve those students, we feel it would not be practical to staff the needed courses with our current faculty.

As part of her Faculty Fellowship, Kertzman surveyed astronomy and astrophysics programs at several universities. A common feature of the programs for minors was a course in Observational Astronomy. As part of the fellowship she developed an Observational Astronomy course which was taught in the spring of 2012 (under PHYS 390A: Topics in Astronomy). The course enrolled 15 students; four of the students were science majors (two in physics and two in geoscience). Four of the students had previously taken one or both of PHYS103 and PHYS104. This course will be one of the core courses for the proposed minor.

Our current course offerings in Astronomy and Astrophysics are: Moons and Planets (PHYS 103), Stars and Galaxies (PHYS 104), Cosmology (PHYS 203), Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300) and Gravitation and Cosmology (taught under PHYS 390P: Topics in Physics) and an occasional astronomy related FYS (e.g. Exploring Mars, Fall 2012). Both Astrophysics and Gravitation and Cosmology have the prerequisite of one year of Physics (i.e. PHYS 120 and PHYS 130). PHYS 103, 104 and 203 have no prerequisites. We are proposing to MAO the additional of two new courses that were developed as part of Kertzman's Faculty Fellowship and have been taught under PHYS 390A: Topics in Astronomy. These two courses are Observational Astronomy (PHYS 310; no prerequisite) and Astrophysics II (PHYS 330; prerequisite Intro to Astrophysics). Gravitation and Cosmology has been taught several times as PHYS 390P: Topics in Physics. We propose to number it PHYS 360. With these courses we believe we have designed a minor program with multiple pathways that will be accessible to the non-science major as well as the physics major.

No new faculty will be needed in order to regularly offer the courses in the astronomy minor. The majority of the courses are already offered on a regular basis. The two new courses (Observational Astronomy and Astrophysics II) developed by Kertzman on her Faculty Fellowship will be woven into our regular offerings on a rotating schedule whether or not the minor is approved.

Proposed minor in Astronomy

Total Courses Required:	Four
Core Courses:	Stars and Galaxies (PHYS 104) or Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300); Observational Astronomy (proposed PHYS 310)

Additional Courses:	Two of: Moons and Planets (PHYS 103), Cosmology (PHYS 203), Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300), Astrophysics II (proposed 330), Gravitation and Cosmology (proposed PHYS 360), Topics in Astronomy (PHYS 390A)
---------------------	--

A typical astronomy minor for a non-science major would be: 103, 104, 203, and 310. Students with at least one year of college physics have more paths to the astronomy minor. A physics major might take: 300, 310, 330 and 360. A science major with a year of physics might take: 104, 203, 300, and 310.

Appendix C: Course Descriptions for MAO Consent Agenda Items

Related to Consent Agenda Item C – New courses

HONR 193 – Science Research Fellows: Understanding Science (0.5 credit) - Examines the facets of science, including science as a body of knowledge, as a process, and as a human endeavor.

HONR 194 – Science Research Fellows: Research Methods (0.5 credit) - An introduction to important techniques in scientific research, including experimental design, statistical reasoning and data analysis, with an emphasis on designing an independent research study.

Related to Consent Agenda Item C – Change in course credit and description

HONR 191 Science Research Fellows Experience I – An interdisciplinary, introductory investigation into the nature of scientific inquiry. Emphasis on the interrelated nature of science. Studies of major ideas in the different sciences. Distinctions made between science and nonscience. Study of different methods of scientific investigation, including experimentation, comparative analysis and observation. The use of probability, statistics, graphical analysis and modeling in the sciences are explored. Students are introduced to questions dealing with the philosophy of science and the role of ethics in science. *Open only to students in the Science Research Fellows Program.*

course number & description changed to

HONR 291 Science Research Fellows Experience I – An interdisciplinary introduction to independent research. *Open only to students in the Science Research Fellows Program.*

MUS 219 Composition – Creative works in various styles utilizing and developing the techniques acquired in the study of harmony and counterpoint.

course number and description changed to

MUS 320 Composition – The general goals of this course are: to nurture the student's compositional creativity and craft; to refine the student's ability to express compositional ideas through notation and other media; to broaden the student's exposure to contemporary music and compositional techniques; to improve the student's aural skills, focusing in particular on the perception of events and processes at work in contemporary music; to develop the student's ability to write effectively for individual instruments and voices, and groups of instruments and voices; to improve the student's ability to write and speak articulately about her or his music; and to deepen the student's understanding of herself or himself as an artist.

Related to Consent Agenda Item D – Change in course number

HONR 192 Science Research Fellows Experience II (variable credit) – Mid-semester, independent research linked to the SRF summer research experience. Offering is project dependent.

course number changed to

HONR 292 Science Research Fellows Experience II (variable credit)

Appendix D: Proposed Changes to the Class Attendance and Absences portion of the Academic Handbook

Text to be inserted is underlined at the bottom of the policy, where it would be added.

Class Attendance and Absences

Regular attendance at class, laboratory and other appointments for which credit is given is expected of all students according to the guidelines established by individual faculty members. There are no "allowed cuts" or "free" absences from class sessions. Faculty members may drop students from their classes or other appropriate action may be taken if absences are too frequent.

Absences for medical reasons: When an absence due to medical reasons will result in a student being unable to fulfill academic responsibilities--for example, papers and examinations--the student should notify the faculty member in advance. Each faculty member should let the students know how to give this notification. The faculty member and student should work out arrangements for possible extension or makeup work. In cases where students are hospitalized, the University physician will, with the student's permission, notify the Office of Student Life. It is the student's responsibility to contact the faculty member; in addition, the faculty member will be notified by Student Life personnel.

If a student misses two or more weeks of class for medical or other reasons beyond the student's control, the student's faculty members, in consultation with a member of the Academic Affairs staff, will decide whether the student may reasonably make up the missed work. As a general rule, students who miss two or more weeks of class may no longer be eligible to continue in the class. The final decision about whether a student may continue with a class rests with the faculty member subject to constraints set by other academic policies.

Absences for personal or psychological reasons: Occasionally Student Life staff will encounter students who must miss class for personal or emotional reasons. These cases include such events as death or illness of a family member or emergency psychological crisis. When possible, Student Life staff will ask the student to notify faculty members and indicate that faculty members may call Student Life staff for confirmation if such validation is deemed necessary. In some of these cases, the Student Life staff member has no real way to validate the student's statement. Maintaining such information over a period of time, however, could help determine possible patterns of dishonesty for an individual student. In some extreme emergencies, Student Life staff may notify faculty members directly.

Early departure or late return from breaks: Faculty members are expected to hold class on the days immediately before and after breaks. Students will not be excused from class attendance or from taking examinations at their announced time to accommodate travel schedules. It is the responsibility of students and their families to make travel arrangements accordingly.

Conflicts with other courses: Whenever possible out of class requirements should be specified in the syllabus and/or the schedule of classes and the faculty member should provide options, or an alternative time, for students who have another class obligation scheduled at the same time. If there is conflict between two course-related activities, the faculty members should resolve it. The Dean of Academic Life will be responsible for the resolution, if an agreement is not reached.

Appendix E. Proposed Changes to the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook regarding the review of Librarians

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

Personnel Policies Section

Periodic Evaluation (Article Written and Approved by the Faculty)

Evaluation of Librarians Serving in Renewable Term Faculty Positions

~~Beginning in the third year of service (and then in the seventh year, twelfth year, and every five years thereafter),~~

Effective with the 2014-15 Academic Year, librarians shall be evaluated as follows:

- **3rd Year Term Review**
- **7th Year Term and Promotion to “with rank of Associate Professor” review**
- **After completing seven years in “with rank of Associate Professor,” a librarian is eligible for timely promotion review to “with rank of Professor”**
- **After promotion to “with rank of Professor,” librarians are no longer subject to a formal review**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs appoints a review committee consisting of the ~~library director~~ **Dean of Libraries**, all full-time professional librarians (excluding the candidate under review, and those in their first year of service), and two faculty **members** from outside the library. The librarian develops a file for review in the same way as do ~~other~~ **full-time** faculty members. The committee submits a report and recommendation to the President through the Committee on Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The ~~library director~~ **Dean of Libraries** and ~~assistant associate~~ **director** are reviewed in this manner to evaluate their work as librarians; the Vice President for Academic Affairs separately reviews their administrative performance.

If a librarian has taught a credit-bearing course, the annual report shall include reflection about the teaching of that course which will be reviewed by the VPAA in consultation with COF if necessary.

Appendix F. Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy found in the Academic Handbook

Text to be inserted is shown underlined and bold and text to be deleted struck through.

Academic Integrity

1. Introduction

Academic integrity refers to the ethical standards and policies that govern how people work and interact in the academic enterprise at a college or university. These standards and policies attempt to do more than define and condemn what is wrong or unethical; they also attempt to provide a foundation for the mutual trust and individual responsibility necessary in a healthy academic community.

Both faculty members and students have the responsibility of upholding the principles of academic integrity. Faculty and staff members should create an environment in which honesty is encouraged, dishonesty discouraged and integrity is openly discussed. Faculty members should follow the principles of academic integrity in their own work and conduct. Students are obligated not only to follow these principles, but also to take an active role in encouraging other students to respect them. If students suspect a violation of academic integrity, they should make their suspicions known to a faculty member or staff member in academic affairs. Students reporting dishonesty must be prepared to give evidence in a hearing before the University Review Committee (URC).

Many faculty members ask students to work collaboratively with others on written projects, oral presentations, revisions, labs, or other course work. The guidelines for collaborative work differ substantially from course to course, but in most cases part or all of a collaborative project must be completed independently. Faculty members should make clear, in writing, their expectations for collaborative work. Students should make sure they understand what is expected of them; they are responsible for knowing when collaboration is permitted, and when not. Handing in a paper, lab report, or take home exam written entirely by a member of one's collaborative group, except when given explicit permission to do so by the instructor of the course, is an act of academic dishonesty.

Almost all the types of academic dishonesty described below have to do with working with others or using the work of others. This is not to suggest that working with others or using their work is wrong. Indeed, the heart of the academic enterprise, learning itself, is based on using the ideas of others to stimulate and develop your own. In this sense, all academic work is collaboration, and therefore academic integrity focuses on those acts that demean or invalidate fruitful collaboration.

2. Types of Academic Dishonesty

Cheating. Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials in any academic exercise or having someone else do work for you. Examples of cheating include looking at another student's paper during a test, bringing an answer sheet to a test, obtaining a copy of a test prior to the test date or submitting homework borrowed from another student.

Fabrication. Inventing or falsifying information. Examples of fabrication include inventing data for an experiment you did not do or did not do correctly or making reference to sources you did not use in a research paper.

Facilitating academic dishonesty. Helping someone else to commit an act of academic dishonesty. This includes giving someone a paper or homework to copy from or allowing someone to cheat from your test paper.

Plagiarism. Using the words or ideas of another writer without attribution, so that they seem as if they are your own. Plagiarism ranges from copying someone else's work word for word, to rewriting someone else's

work with only minor word changes (mosaic plagiarism), to summarizing work without acknowledging the source. (See the Writing Center Guide to Avoiding Plagiarism for further information on plagiarism.)

Multiple submission. Submitting work you have done in previous classes as if it were new and original work. Although professors may occasionally be willing to let you use previous work as the basis of new work, they expect you to do new work for each class. Students seeking to submit a piece of work to more than one class must have the written permission of both instructors.

Abuse of academic materials. Harming, appropriating or disabling academic resources so that others cannot use them. This includes cutting tables and illustrations out of books to use in a paper, stealing books or articles and deleting or damaging computer files intended for others' use.

Deception and misrepresentation. Lying about or misrepresenting your work, academic records or credentials. Examples of deception and misrepresentation include forging signatures, forging letters of recommendation and falsifying credentials in an application. Of particular concern, given the current popularity of collaborative projects, is taking credit for group work to which you did not contribute significantly or meet your obligations. In a collaborative project, all members of the group are expected to do their share. Group members may work together on each phase of the project or they may divide the tasks--one person might do background research; another might take charge of the lab experiments; another might be responsible for drafting the report. Even in a modular project, however, each member of the group is responsible for being familiar and involved with the entire project. Be sure to get clear instructions on your individual and collective responsibilities from each faculty member for each course.

Electronic dishonesty. Using network access inappropriately, in a way that affects a class or other students' academic work. Examples of electronic dishonesty include using someone else's authorized computer account to send and receive messages, breaking into someone else's files, gaining access to restricted files, disabling others' access to network systems or files, knowingly spreading a computer virus or obtaining a computer account under false pretenses.

Carelessness. When does carelessness become dishonesty? Students sometimes make minor mistakes in completing academic assignments. Mistyping one of many endnotes in a long paper, for example, may in most cases be considered a careless mistake, rather than an act of deliberate dishonesty.

When students make multiple mistakes in acknowledging sources, however, these mistakes cannot be considered simply careless. Students who copy long passages from a book or a Web source, for example, make a deliberate choice to do so. Such students have taken a short cut; instead of explaining the source of their ideas, they have simply stolen ideas from others. In such cases, carelessness is a form of dishonesty.

Students are responsible for knowing the academic integrity policy and may not use ignorance of the policy as an excuse for dishonesty.

Other types of academic dishonesty. The list above is a partial one. Instructors may explain in their syllabi other types of academic dishonesty relevant to the work in particular disciplines or particular courses.

3. Overview of the Process

All cases of academic dishonesty must be reported by faculty members and settled through the process outlined below. Faculty members may not impose a grade penalty for academic dishonesty except through the process outlined below.

The process is designed 1) to provide prompt resolution of cases, 2) to help the student understand both the

charge and penalty, and 3) to allow the student to discuss what happened and/or contest the charge or penalty being made. At all stages of the process, the focus should be on education, and open, frank discussion should be encouraged. Students frequently commit acts of dishonesty when they are under pressure of one sort or another; or they may persuade themselves that borrowing someone else's words and ideas is not a serious offense. This settlement process gives faculty members and students a chance to discuss why academic integrity is so important to the university community.

In the process of investigating the charge, the instructor may discuss his or her suspicions with the student. In cases of cheating on exams, it may be appropriate to confront the student during the exam or immediately after; however, even in cases when the student admits to the violation verbally, a formal conference to review and sign the written settlement form should be arranged. In confronting students with charges of academic dishonesty, instructors may choose to have a colleague present to act as an observer. That colleague need not be a member of the same department, but should be someone knowledgeable about the academic integrity policy.

4. The Settlement Process

When an instructor becomes aware of a possible case of academic dishonesty, he or she should move quickly (usually within three days) to investigate the violation and to contact the student. If suspected violations occur at the end of the semester, the instructor ~~may~~ **should** assign a grade of Incomplete and ~~arrange to confer with the student~~ ***begin the settlement process as quickly as possible, but no later than*** at the start of the following semester. ***Even when suspected violations occur after grades have been submitted, Reports must be made the settlement process must be started*** before the end of the semester following the ***suspected*** violation.

The formal process of initiating a charge and settlement involves the following steps, with occasional minor variations depending on the nature and timing of the case

- I. The instructor arranges to confer with the student to discuss the integrity violation and the evidence supporting it. During or shortly after the instructor's conversation with the student, the instructor presents the student with a written statement of the charge and the proposed penalty (see the Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form

The student has the opportunity to respond to the charge. After listening to the student, the instructor may decide to revise the charge or penalty, or drop the charge all together. If, for any reason, the faculty member believes that the violation deserves a penalty more severe than failure in the course, he or she may immediately refer the case to the University Review Committee (URC).

- II. The student has three business days to respond to the charge, either by assenting to the charge and penalty by signing the settlement form, or by requesting a hearing before the URC. At that hearing, the student may either dispute the charge or the severity of the penalty. While considering how to respond to a charge, students are encouraged to seek advice from someone knowledgeable in matters of academic integrity, such as a faculty advisor, an academic dean, or another trusted advisor. If a student charged with a violation does not respond in the specified time, the matter is immediately turned over to the URC for a hearing.
- III. Once the settlement form has been signed, it is forwarded to the academic affairs office to be kept for five years. If this proves to be a second violation of the academic integrity policy, an academic dean will convene a disciplinary hearing of the URC.

Note: Once an academic integrity charge has been initiated against a student, he or she may not withdraw from the course in question ***unless the charge is dropped by the faculty member or the student is found to be***

not responsible through a hearing or an appeal. A hold is placed on the student's transcript until the charge has been settled.

5. Penalties for Academic Dishonesty

Students who have violated the academic integrity policy are penalized more severely than students who have simply not turned in an assignment. While the degree of penalty varies according to the judgment of the instructor, a first offense is usually penalized in three ways:

- I. the settlement form itself, which when signed is filed in the academic affairs office;
- II. a grade of zero on the relevant assignment; and
- III. a lowered final course grade.

Occasionally, even for a first offense, the penalty is failure in the course. If a more severe penalty is called for, the instructor may request a hearing of the University Review Committee (URC).

Academic dishonesty outside of a particular class (forged signatures and fabricated résumés, for example) also leads to penalties. Students will be asked to sign the academic dishonesty settlement form. Either the accused student or the faculty/staff member making the charge may request a hearing before the URC.

A second violation of the academic integrity policy leads automatically to a disciplinary hearing before the URC, and may result in suspension or dismissal.

6. Student Records

First Offenses. Signed settlement forms for first offenses are filed in the academic affairs office for five years. The name of the student is kept confidential. The settlement form does not become part of the student's permanent record, except if the student is found responsible for a second violation of the academic integrity policy.

Second Offenses. In cases where a student is found to be responsible for a second violation of the academic integrity policy, a ~~note about the violation~~ ***copy of the URC decision*** will be placed in the student's permanent record (kept in the Office of Student Life) and will be reported if the student releases the record to employers or other schools. ***A second offense is defined to be one that takes place in whole or in part after a student has been presented with a settlement form for a prior case, unless the student is found not responsible for the prior case.***

7. The Academic Integrity Hearing

If a hearing before the University Review Committee is necessary, either because the charge or penalty is disputed or because this is a second offense, it will be convened by an Academic Dean ***as quickly as possible, but usually no later than three weeks after the Dean has received the signed or unsigned settlement form.*** ~~at a time when all participants can attend.~~ Committee members will be provided with a detailed outline of the hearing process.

The URC consists of a ***teaching faculty member who is a*** current or former member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two ***additional*** teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by the convenor from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. ***SLAAC will identify this pool in February of each year with the pool to begin service on March 1st. SLAAC may add members to the pool as needed. In the event an insufficient number of members of the pool are available when a URC needs to be convened, the convenor may ask other faculty members or students to serve on the URC. In such cases the convenor will share the names of the URC with the Chair of SLAAC. Each URC board member will receive training prior to serving on his or her first URC.*** The convenor observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

The membership of this committee is made known to parties involved prior to a hearing. Student, faculty members and administrative alternates are also designated for the committee. Either party can ask the

committee's chair that a committee member not serve on the hearing panel because of bias or conflict of interest. The chair shall decide if there are sufficient grounds to honor this request. If a committee member is unable to attend the hearing, or if a member is excluded because of potential bias or conflict of interest, an alternate will be asked to serve. **Committee members are required to attend the hearing in person.**

Nature of the hearing. There are two types of academic hearings: one to decide a disputed charge or penalty, the other to consider disciplinary matters following a second offense. A hearing of the University Review Committee is intended to be an orderly, fair inquiry into the facts bearing on the case **and only material related to the written charges may be considered during the hearing.** † **The hearing** is not intended to be a trial concerned with technical formalities.

The party bringing the charge and the accused student will usually attend the hearing in person. If there is no reasonable alternative that permits a timely hearing, either or both parties may participate remotely or may provide only a written statement with the permission of the convener. If one or both parties fails to participate in a previously scheduled hearing, If the accused student fails to appear after proper notice of the hearing, the hearing will go forward and the committee will reach its conclusion on responsibility and the appropriate penalty on the basis of evidence presented at the hearing.

Related Cases. At the discretion of the convener, related cases may be heard sequentially by the same hearing board. When structured in this way, the parties involved in the first case will be heard, followed by the parties involved in the second case and so on. The hearing board will then deliberate before deciding if they wish to call the parties for one or more cases back in sequence for additional questions. This process may be repeated as necessary before the hearing board starts its final deliberations. At the discretion of the convener, a hearing for related cases may span multiple days.

Confidentiality. Hearing proceedings are confidential. Committee members, students, faculty members, recorders, advisors, and witnesses are enjoined from mentioning names of those involved or details that might reveal the identity of the student or faculty member, and from discussing presentations or committee deliberations.

Presentation; burden of proof; rights. When a hearing is convened to hear a disputed charge or penalty, the faculty member referring the case presents the evidence of the offense to the panel. The student may present counter-evidence if he or she wishes. Either party may have a faculty member, staff member, or student advisor and each has the right to call and question witnesses. The burden of proof is on the faculty member, who must establish the responsibility of the student by a preponderance of the evidence. (In matters of academic integrity, the evidence does not have to constitute overwhelming, irrefutable proof of responsibility, but only has to convince the panel that the violation took place.) Faculty members may refer cases based on the testimony of other students; in doing so, however, the faculty member should make sure either that the students who provided the testimony are willing to appear as witnesses at the hearing or that there is corroborating evidence that substantiates the charge. Other procedures for due process shall be followed, and records (including a tape recording of the hearing) shall be kept. Tapes will be erased after the appeal period has elapsed. Written records will be destroyed after five years.

URC penalties. The URC imposes penalties for dishonesty according to the nature of the violation. URC penalties may include a letter of warning, grade penalties, failure in the class, suspension, or dismissal. If the URC finds that there has been no violation, or if the URC does not find a preponderance of evidence that a violation has taken place, the student will be exonerated.

Second Offense. When a hearing is convened to consider disciplinary penalties related to a second offense, the chair reviews the offenses, as put forth in the settlement forms or in previous hearing reports, and asks the student if there are any comments he or she would like to make in regard to these offenses. Since these cases

have already been decided, either through settlement or previous hearing, there is no need to reconsider them. In most cases, it is unnecessary to call witnesses, unless the committee or the student feels the reports are unclear in some respect that a witness can clarify. The sole consideration of the committee at a second offense hearing is whether further disciplinary sanctions (usually suspension or dismissal) should be applied.

8. Appeals

Either the instructor or the student may appeal the decision of the URC to the vice president for academic affairs. Appeals must be made in writing to the vice president for academic affairs within three business days of receiving the written notification of the decision. Appeals will be considered only if they are based on one or more of the following criteria:

- I. new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing ***and which is provided as part of the written appeal***; or
- II. procedural error that can be shown to have affected the outcome of the hearing; or
- III. appropriateness of sanction only in cases of suspension or dismissal.

The vice president for academic affairs will decide whether or not there is a basis for appeal, and, if so, upon consideration of the appeal, may revise the URC decision or the penalty. The decision of the vice president for academic affairs is final ***and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convenor of the URC and to the chair of the URC.***

(Approved by the DePauw University Faculty, November 4, 2002; **updated April 7, 2014.** University Review Committee (URC) Hearing Procedures are available in the Office of Academic Life. Hearing Procedures are updated and revised periodically by the Academic Affairs administration in consultation with the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee.)

Appendix G: Proposed revisions to the Academic Handbook to accommodate a Consent Agenda

(Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike-through~~; text to be inserted is shown in **bold**.)

Changes under Faculty Meetings:

3. Voting

- a. Full-time faculty members holding positions with academic or nominal rank, including those on sabbatical, pre-tenure, or academic leave, may vote. (See [Article I.B of the Personnel Policies](#) for a definition of full-time faculty positions.) The President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Registrar also have voting privileges.
- b. Faculty members in part-time positions may attend faculty meetings and participate in debate, but not vote; however, Senior (Emeriti) Professors are eligible to vote during any semester in which they are teaching at least one course.
- c. A quorum shall consist of 40% of the faculty eligible to vote and not on approved leave (rounded to the nearest whole number). This number shall be determined for each semester by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, using the faculty roster as of the Friday immediately preceding the first faculty meeting of each semester. Immediately after the call to order at the first faculty meeting of each semester, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall announce the quorum requirement for that semester. The next order of business after the call to order at each faculty meeting shall be the verification of a quorum by the Chair of the Faculty; (for the first meeting of the semester, the quorum verification shall occur after the Vice President for Academic Affairs has announced the requirement).
- d. All voting in meetings, unless otherwise stipulated, shall be by show of hands. However, at the request of any faculty member the vote shall be by secret ballot.
- e. **Any voting faculty member may object to including an item on the Consent Agenda. Such an objection will result in full debate of the item under the appropriate order of business.**

4. Order of Business

At all regular faculty meetings the following items must be included in the order of business:

- 1) Call to order and verification of quorum,
 - 2) ~~Correction and approval of minutes,~~ **Consent Agenda,**
 - a) **Approval of minutes**
 - b) **Approval of new courses and announcement of course changes (as needed)**
 - c) **Approval of election results (as needed)**
 - d) **Conferring of baccalaureate degrees (as needed)**
 - e) **Other (as needed)**
 - 3) Reports from coordinating committees,
 - 4) Reports from other committees,
 - 5) Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs,
 - 6) Remarks from the President,
 - 7) Old business,
 - 8) New business,
 - 9) Announcements, and
 - 10) Adjournment.
5. Parliamentary Procedure
- a. The following shall be circulated at least three days before each faculty meeting: copies of the minutes of the last meeting and an agenda including the specific committee motions to be voted on at the next meeting **including the exact text of the consent agenda**. All committee motions on which there is to be a vote at a faculty meeting must have been announced in the agenda circulated before that meeting.
 - b. All business shall be conducted according to proper parliamentary procedure as set forth in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

Appendix H: Proposed revisions to the Academic Handbook to accommodate a change in the name of the Faculty Development Committee

(Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike-through~~; text to be inserted is shown in **bold**.)

A global search and replace will be done to replace the name ~~Faculty Development Committee (FDC)~~ with **Internal Grants Committee (IGC)**.

Faculty Development Committee

1. Function. ~~This committee shall plan and execute faculty development programs within the University and coordinate institutional programs with faculty development programs of outside agencies. The committee will cooperate with the Committee on Faculty in establishing policies for faculty development.~~
This committee shall make recommendations to the President of the University concerning the granting of institutional research and development ~~funds,~~ **resources and** leaves of absence, ~~and selection of institutional nominees for grants or awards given by outside agencies.~~ Policies and procedures of faculty development ~~internal funding~~ programs are outlined in detail ~~in~~ **on** the **Academic Affairs website**. [Faculty Development Handbook](#) which is available online or from the Academic Affairs Office.
2. Membership. Six elected faculty members (one elected from each division and two elected at-large) of which no more than two may be from one division and no more than one from each department. The chair for this committee shall be chosen from among the elected faculty members.

Ex-officio members (without vote): the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his or her representative); the ~~Coordinator for Faculty Development~~ **Coordinator**.

Appendix I. Rationale, Proposed Open Access Policy to added to the Academic Handbook, and FAQ

Open Access Policy: Rationale:

Whereas the open access movement is about two things: the furtherance of knowledge and recapturing our own intellectual property.

And whereas the vendor model restricts the sharing of knowledge, and puts the knowledge we create in the control of profit-motived third parties.

And whereas, adopting an open access policy allows us to retain the rights to our own work, easily access the work of others, and creates a broader more inclusive base of knowledge from which to learn and conduct our research.

And whereas the proposed open access policy is meant to encourage you to make your scholarship open access, but it in no way prevents you from publishing in current journals.

And whereas schools such as Bryn Mawr, Oberlin, Hope, Trinity, Wellesley, the University of California system, and many other institutions have adopted similar policies.

Be it resolved, that the faculty endorse the following Resolution regarding the implementation of the following Open Access Policy at DePauw.

Open Access Policy: Resolution:

The faculty of DePauw University is committed to disseminating the results of its published research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the faculty adopts the following open-access policy:

Each faculty member will, henceforth, retain – where feasible and appropriate – copyright privileges with respect to his or her scholarly articles. Whenever possible, faculty authors will negotiate open-access agreements with scholarly publishers. Whenever and wherever faculty authors negotiate open access agreements with a publisher, said authors will henceforth grant to DePauw University special permission to make available his or her scholarly articles in the university’s institutional repository. (For the purposes of this Open Access policy, scholarly articles are understood to be articles published in peer-reviewed journals).

Each faculty member grants to DePauw University a non-exclusive worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the author is a member of the faculty. As the copyright holder of the article, the faculty author maintains the exclusive and irrevocable right to withhold from DePauw University the granted worldwide license for any given article provided that the faculty author submit the appropriate waiver to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) or the VPAA’s designate.

The policy does *not* apply to: any articles completed before the adoption of this policy; any articles for which the faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy; or any articles for which the author requests a waiver. The VPAA or the VPAA’s designate will waive application of the policy for a particular article or delay access to said article for a specified period of time upon express direction by the author.

To facilitate access to his or her scholarly articles, authors will provide one electronic copy of the final peer-reviewed version of each article for which no waiver has been obtained, along with the appropriate

bibliographic data. This electronic copy will, whenever practical, be delivered no later than the date of publication for the article to the appropriate representative of the VPAA's Office in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by Library Advisory Committee (LAC) in consultation with the VPAA's Office.

The VPAA's Office may make the article available to the public in an open-access institutional repository for as long as the faculty author and copyright holder grants such access. The current policy is in no way intended to hinder faculty efforts to publish their work in the best peer-reviewed scholarly journals but is, rather, an attempt to make articles more widely available, when and where possible. The faculty-led LAC will maintain responsibility for protecting faculty interests and overseeing the operation of the repository as well as interpreting this Open Access policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending changes to the faculty from time to time.

Open Access Policy: Frequently Asked Questions:

Why are we doing this?

- Because it serves the educational goal of the furtherance of knowledge. By making research freely available to the public, you maximize the possibility that others will benefit from your research. This makes the research more valuable.
- It counters some of the avariciousness of commercial publishing companies.

Why make this an "opt-out" policy? Why not just allow faculty to "opt-in" or individually retain a license for open-access distribution?

- An opt-out policy encourages open access more than an opt-in policy does. So just as an opt-out organ donation policy results in more organ donations so too, an opt-out open access policy will result more open access articles being published.

What are the advantages for faculty authors?

- You retain more of your own intellectual property and more widespread dissemination of your scholarly work.

Does the policy apply to articles I wrote before the policy was adopted?

- No. However, if any articles published before the policy was adopted can be legally submitted to the institutional repository, faculty members are encouraged to do so.

Does the policy apply to co-authored papers?

- Yes.

What if the journal publisher refuses to publish my article because of this prior license?

- The faculty member may always opt-out of the policy to get the article published.

Will this policy harm current publishers?

- The publishing industry is in flux. Large conglomerates rake in huge profits while small academic publishers struggle. The larger goal of furthering knowledge and research has taken a back seat. The contents of scholarly publishing are the fruit of our labors, and we continually pay unsustainably higher costs to buy it back. New models need to emerge. This is just the first step.

How will this license affect the peer-review of my article and the promotion and tenure process?

- Open access is a separate issue from peer-review and promotion and tenure. There are plenty of scholarly, peer-reviewed, open-access journals, and you can still publish in other journals with the opt-out policy.

What will DePauw do with the articles?

- The goal is to make them accessible to the world.

Will DePauw ever sell articles for profit or allow others to do so?

- No. The author will retain full copyright privileges. This is part of the beauty of open access. The author actually owns the rights to their article as long as it is under copyright.

Is the university taking the rights to my article?

- No. You retain the rights to your article. You simply grant us the non-exclusive right to “publish” it. In the current model of publishing, most authors do not retain the rights to their own work.

Who owns the copyright in articles I write?

- You do.

What does it mean to say that this is a “non-exclusive license?”

- It means you still retain the right to get your article published elsewhere. For example, you would not have to get permission from your publisher to get your article published in an anthology.

Can others distribute my work, for instance, placing it in a course pack?

- If your work is in an open access journal there is no need for others to create a course pack, the article is already available to the public. However, you retain copyright meaning that others cannot profit from your work without your permission.

What if I leave DePauw, or pass away?

- As copyright holder, you retain the right to withdraw your work from the repository. In the event of your passing, your heirs would also retain the full rights and privileges of current copyright law provided that such copyright is passed to them through an appropriate legal instrument (e.g. a will).

Where should I turn if I have questions, or would like more information?

- You can contact any member of the Library Advisory Committee: Terri Bonebright (Dean of Faculty; VPAA designate), Jason Fuller, David Gellman, Brian Howard, Geoff Klinger (Chair), Rick Provine (Director of Libraries), Bruce Sanders.
- For more about open access, visit <http://libguides.depauw.edu/content.php?pid=422707>.

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
May 5th, 2014**

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom (Bridget Gourley)

2. Verification of Quorum

The quorum was reached at 4:05 p.m.

3. Consent Agenda (Bridget Gourley)

There was a request to move item A, Conferring of Degrees for May Graduates off the consent agenda. This item was taken up as regular business. No other items were moved off the consent agenda. There were no requests to move items off the consent agenda. There were no objections to the consent agenda. All items except item A on the consent agenda were approved.

B. Approve of Minutes from the April 2014 Faculty Meeting

C. Approve the creation of a minor in Astronomy (advance notice given by CAPP in April 2014)

A rationale can be found in Appendix A of this agenda.

D. Approve program name change: Women's Studies to Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies (recommended by CAPP and MAO)

A rationale from the program can be found in Appendix B of this agenda.

E. Approve inclusion of Italian as secondary language in the Romance Languages major (recommended by CAPP)

A rationale from the department can be found in Appendix C of this agenda.

F. Approve change to the physics major (recommended by MAO):

Number 300 and 400 level courses – change from four and one-half, to three and one-half

G. Approve changes to the Film Studies major (recommended by MAO):

Increase the required course credit by 0.25 credits to 9.25 credits, add FILM 429 as a core course, increase the number of 300-400 level course by 0.25 credits, and add FILM 429 to the senior capstone requirement. Complete list of major requirements can be found in Appendix D of this agenda.

H. Approve changes to the Communication and Theatre majors (recommended by MAO):

Additional 300 level courses (COMM 335 Media Law, COMM 337 International Media) as appropriate preparation for the senior capstone experience. Complete paragraph within the senior capstone experience description found in Appendix E of this agenda.

I. Approve of the following new courses (recommended by MAO):

CLST 351 – Airs, Waters, Places: Classics and the Environment (1 credit)

COMM 292 – Project in Communication (0.5 – 1 credit, variable)

FILM 429 – Film Studies Senior Project Prep (0.25 credit)

GEOS 290 – Topics (variable credit)

GEOS 390 – Topics (variable credit)

HIST 190 – Topics (1 credit)

HIST 233 – British Empire (1 credit).

MATH 340 – Topics in Statistics (1 credit)

MUS 288 – Named Chamber Ensembles (0.25 credit)

MUS 240 – State of the Art (1 credit)

MUS 340 – Music Entrepreneurship (0.5 credit)

MUS 380 – 21CM Topics (variable credit)

MUS 440 – Practicum (0.5 credit, may be repeated)

PHYS 190 – Topics (variable credit) - A. Astronomy. P. Physics.

PHYS 290 – Topics (variable credit) - A. Astronomy. P. Physics.

PHYS 310 – Observational Astronomy (1 credit)

PHYS 320 – Astrophysics I (1 credit)

PHYS 330 – Astrophysics II (1 credit)

PHYS 360 – Gravitation and Cosmology (1 credit)

J. MAO announces the following changes in prerequisites:

Due to recent additions of new intro courses in Biology:

- Any course that requires Bio 215 - the prerequisite should be Bio 215 or Bio 101
- Any course that requires Bio 145 - the prerequisite should be Bio 145 or Bio 102
- Any course that requires Bio 135, 145 and 215 - the prerequisites should be Bio 135, 145 and 215 or Bio 101 and 102.

K. MAO announces the following change in course title and description:

COMM 200 title to change to Foundations of Communication Studies

COMM 491 title to change to Advanced Project in Communication

L. MAO announces the following change in course number and description:

BIO 135 number to change to BIO 235 Organismal Biology

M. MAO announces the following change in course number, distribution group, prerequisites, and description:

ECON 335 to change to ECON 245 – Environmental and Natural Resource Economics (added SS distribution)

N. MAO announces the following change in course number, prerequisites and description:

BIO 444 changes to BIO 344 – Ecological and Evolutionary Genetics

O. MAO announces the following change in course description and prerequisite:

FILM 430 – Film Studies Senior Project

Complete details for consent agenda items I., K through O. can be found in Appendix F, including course descriptions.

P. MAO announces approval of the following new experimental 0.5 credit extended studies on-campus courses:

Winter Term courses:
Energy and Infrared Light (Caraher)
Nonprofits and Global Health (Crary)
Developing Ceramic Surfaces (Brickell)
Statics (Brooks)
Literary Microanalysis (Brown)
Zero Waste and the Ethics of Stuff (Everett/Pope)
Renaissance Culture and Combat: Fights for Living Dead in Denmark (Hayes)
Radio Management and Programming (McCall)
Existentialism, Film and Literature (Shannon)
DePauw Opera (Smith)
Inhabiting Dramatic Literature (White)

May courses:
Archaeology Field School (Marshall)

Q. MAO announces the 2017-18 Academic Calendar has been approved.

See <http://www.depauw.edu/academics/academic-resources/advising/registrar/academic-calendar/acad-calendar-2017-18/>

4. Conferring of Degrees for May Graduates

(Was item A. on the consent agenda circulated in advance of the meeting.)

It was moved and seconded that the faculty authorize the Board of Trustees to confer degrees on candidates eligible for graduation at the conclusion of the semester ending in May 2014.

The vote was taken and the motion carried.

Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

5. Committee on Academic Policy and Planning – CAPP (Nicole Brockmann)

A. CAPP's report consists of an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for CAPP.

Written Announcements –

1. Please consider volunteering to serve on RAS. We would like to fill the committee by Friday, May 9 if possible.
2. Many thanks to the members of this year's CAPP for their excellent work this year: faculty representatives John Caraher, Tim Good, David Guinee, Danielle Kane, Scott Thede, and Francesca Seaman, and student members Cody Watson and Mehek Siddiq. John Caraher will serve as chair of CAPP for 2014-15.

6. Management of Academic Operations – MAO (Jennifer Adams)

A. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the changes to the Class Attendance and Absences

portion of the Academic Handbook, as seen in Appendix G. Text to be inserted is underlined at the bottom of the policy, where it would be added. (Advance notice was given at the April 2014 Faculty Meeting.)

Announcement from Bridget Gourley

The motion came from a coordinating committee and therefore needs no second and is before us for discussion.

Comments from a faculty member

I am speaking against the motion. This motion does nothing to change the status quo. The changes don't prohibit what is currently going on.

Response from Jennifer Adams

MAO appreciates this concern. We have been working all semester to ameliorate the problems that students encounter with out-of-class activities. The motion does bring the Dean of Academic Life to the table, who can resolve relevant issues between faculty and students.

Question from a faculty member

Doesn't the Dean of Academic Life already do this?

Response from Jennifer Adams

Yes, in practice, but we feel this firms up the policy in writing.

There were no other questions or comments about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

- B. MAO gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote in September 2014 to approve the replacement of the Academic Probation and Dismissal portion of the Academic Handbook (Appendix B) with the proposed text found in Appendix H of this agenda. Current text is also listed for reference.

There were no questions about the proposal.

There were no questions for MAO.

Announcements –

MAO had no written announcements other than those that appeared on the consent agenda.

7. Committee on Faculty – COF (Matthew Balensuela)

- A. Motion (to be voted on) COF that the faculty approve changes to the personnel policies section of the Academic Handbook regarding the review process for librarians. The exact changes are found in Appendix I of this agenda. Deletions are ~~struck through~~ and additions are in **bold**.

Announcement from Bridget Gourley

The motion came from a coordinating committee and therefore needs no second and is before us for discussion.

Comment from Matthew Balensuela

This motion will reduce the number of reviews required for librarians after they reach rank of full professor.

Question from a faculty member

Librarians have a rank of Associate Professor or Professor but don't have tenure. What happens to their appointments after they are promoted to the rank of Professor if they are not subject to formal review? Previously, they have been subject to review once every five years. How will this work in the future?

Response from Matthew Balensuela

The librarians are currently reviewed every year by the Dean of Libraries and every five years by COF. Librarians were thus subject to double reviews. This motion removes the required reviews by COF.

There were no other comments or questions. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

B. Update on survey to move review files on-line

Comments from Matthew Balensuela

There is general (but not overwhelming) consensus on moving COF materials online. There are strong concerns about security – that review materials will be downloaded to anyone's computer. Going forward I think COF will need to do more to address these issues.

There were no questions for COF.

Written Announcements –

COF working to wrap up its work for the year.

8. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee – SLAAC (Kathryn Millis)

A. SLAAC gives notice of our intent to ask the faculty to vote in September 2014 on the following proposed change to the *Academic Handbook*. Motion will be to revise the Disruptive Student Policy and to rename it the Classroom Atmosphere Policy.

The suggested changes to the *Academic Handbook* can be found in Appendix J of this agenda. Text to be inserted is shown underlined and bold, and text to be deleted struck through.

Background Information on Proposal

These recommended edits address two basic ideas. First, it clarifies that faculty members may limit the use of technological devices that are common causes of “disruption” or “distraction” complaints. It acknowledges two constraints on this authority: accommodation of disabilities and public safety.

Second, it addresses the possibility that a student has a concern about something said or done by the faculty member (rather than another student).

Comparable policies from other institutions address both of these possibilities.

There were no questions for SLAAC.

Written Announcements –

1. SLAAC seeks volunteers from among the faculty to serve on University Review Committees (URC) and the Community Standards Council (CSC) during AY 2014-15. As usual, we hope for a wide mix of volunteers to avoid and address concerns about diversity and equity.

University Review Committees (URC) are convened to address cases of possible academic dishonesty. We will provide brief training. If asked to serve (and available at the time), you'll spend a few hours on a hearing and

discussion with other members of a small panel.

Community Standards Council (CSC) hearing boards are convened on Wednesday evenings (probably) to address non-academic student conduct such as alleged alcohol violations. The group does not address sexual misconduct. You're asked to attend four hours of training (if new, two if returning), and to perhaps serve on several boards per semester, depending on need and schedules.

We are assembling these groups now, rather than in September as in recent years.

2. SLAAC looks forward to a productive AY 2014-15. Smitha Rahman (Division 4) will chair. Other faculty representatives will be Lynn Ishikawa (Division 2), Hiroko Chiba (At-large) and Kathryn Millis (At-large).

We need representation from Division 1 (3-year term) and Division 3 (2-year term).

9. Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Bridget Gourley)

- A. Motion (to be voted on): That the faculty approve changes to the faculty meeting portion of the by-laws allowing for a consent agenda to address routine business. This motion requires several changes to the academic handbook, which are shown in Appendix K. Advance notice was given at the April 2014 Faculty Meeting.

Announcement from Bridget Gourley

The motion came from a coordinating committee and therefore needs no second and is before us for discussion.

Rationale: In November the FGSC asked the faculty to suspend the by-laws for the remainder of the academic year to allow for a consent agenda to address routine business. The purpose was to facilitate making the faculty governance process more effective and less burdensome. The hope was this allows the faculty to handle routine business as a block leaving more time for meaningful discussion during faculty meeting. The FGSC reviewed the success of the pilot project at its March 31 meeting and recommends making the relevant changes to the by-laws.

FGSC notes the importance of colleagues feeling welcome to request that an item be removed from the consent agenda (or in Robert's Rules parlance "object" to an item being on the consent agenda). Such a request automatically moves the item to the proper order of business for full discussion. Colleagues should feel free to notify the Chair of the Faculty of their request either in advance of the meeting or when the chair asks for objections during the meeting.

There were no comments or questions about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

Written Announcements –

1. FGSC plans to release a survey related to the faculty governance processes before we scatter for the summer. Please make time to respond to inform our future work. As a reminder, if the survey suggests changes are warranted, the goal is to give advance notice in November 2014 and vote in December 2014 so that the changes can be implemented with the election process for committee service beginning in AY 2015-16.

Reports from other Committees

Committee rosters are available at:

<http://www.depauw.edu/offices/academic-affairs/faculty-governance/committees-and-contacts/>

10. Faculty Development Committee – FDC (Tim Cope)

A. Announcement of the new Faculty Development Coordinator, Jeff Kenney.

We have a new Faculty Development Coordinator, Jeff Kenney. Thank you to Jonathan Nichols-Pethick for his service. Jonathan has moved on to other responsibilities.

B. Motion (to be voted on) that the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) be renamed the Internal Grants Committee (IGC). A summary of the changes to the *Academic Handbook* are found in Appendix L. Advance notice was given at the April 2014 Faculty Meeting

Announcement from Bridget Gourley

The motion was made by the committee and seconded and is before us for discussion.

Rationale:

The “Faculty Development” umbrella at DePauw includes components of: 1.) internal grants (administered by FDC); 2.) the Center for Teaching and Learning (administered by the Faculty Development Coordinator); 3.) Endowed Chairs (administered by the VPAA and Dean of the Faculty); and 4.) external grant support.

The role of FDC in “Faculty Development” is the review of internal grant proposals and award policies. Because of the committee’s experience in reviewing faculty proposals, FDC also reviews several student awards (e.g. Student-Faculty Research, Howes Grant, the new Ferid Murad Medal), which extends its reach beyond the realm of “Faculty Development.” Hence, the name change will more accurately reflect what the committee currently does.

Because the Academic Handbook should reflect current practice as closely as possible, FDC has listed the full set of changes required in Appendix H of this agenda. Language to be deleted is struck through and the new language is found in bold.

Question from a faculty member

The rationale makes a lot of sense. I was always proud of the fact that DePauw provides support for faculty development and that the committee isn’t simply about funding. I’m not wildly against or wildly in favor of this motion. Will there still be some reference to the phrase “faculty development” in the charge to this committee, such as the rationale for why we are doing this work?

Response from Tim Cope

Faculty development is now Jeff Kenney’s job. This has been the purview of the Faculty Development Coordinator, not the Faculty Development Committee. I still think the name change is appropriate because it accurately supports what the committee does. The Faculty Development Committee is really the Internal Grants Committee. FDC does not currently engage in faculty development.

Comments from a faculty member

Part of the deleted language says that FDC “will cooperate with the Committee on Faculty in establishing policies for faculty development.” Has COF considered this change?

Response from Tim Cope

No, we haven’t discussed this with COF.

Comment from Matthew Balensuela, chair of COF

COF hasn't formally discussed this issue.

Comments from Tim Cope

There has been a lack of connection between FDC and COF. There has been no requirement for project reports to go in a candidate's file. The reports are put in the file by the candidate. I asked COF to consider this option. COF responded by stating that faculty development should be kept separate from faculty review. But in my view, maybe there should be a stronger connection between FDC and COF in the future.

Question from a faculty member

How do leaves of absence fit under grants? If you're renaming this "internal grants" how does this fit?

Response from Tim Cope

A leave of absence is like an internal grant for release time. As I've always read it, a leave of absence implies a sabbatical leave.

Comments from Terri Bonebright, Dean of Faculty

An unpaid leave of absence would not go through FDC but would go through the VPAA.

Question from a faculty member

The phrase "selection of institutional nominees for grants or awards given by outside agencies" is deleted from the new language. We did this in the past when I served on FDC. Who will do this in the future?

Response from Tim Cope

We will have a Grants Coordinator.

Comments from Terri Bonebright

We have always hoped that FDC or the Dean of Faculty would have enough time to explore outside grants. I have found that it takes a specialized type of person to pursue these opportunities. We are hoping to hire someone to fill this type of position. It is worth mentioning that we now have the Center for Teaching and Learning that coordinates with ARC, S, Q, W, and FITS. There has been a shift in faculty development away from FDC and toward these other committees.

Comments from Tim Cope

True, the Center for Teaching and Learning and other committees now coordinate faculty development activities.

There were no other comments or questions about the motion. The vote was taken and the motion carried.

There were no questions for FDC.

Written Announcements –

FDC has no written announcements.

11. Committee on Administration – COA (Jeane Pope)

Comments from Jeane Pope

Scott Spiegelberg could not be here today and asked me to give you this report. I have two items to share with you. First, COA has been working on collecting the faculty's thoughts and opinions about a post-promotion review. On behalf of COA, I'd like to thank those of you who recently filled out a survey on this topic; we appreciate the views expressed and are working on distilling this feedback for next year's committee. Second,

COA has sent two requests to the Office for Sustainability that will help develop better mechanisms for the faculty to express their questions or concerns to the administration about environmental responsibility. VP Christopher Wells responded that the Office for Sustainability will be devising a process for responding to these requests and will re-connect with COA in the fall. I will be happy to answer questions about these or other COA-related issues. Thanks.

There were no questions for COA.

Written Announcements –

COA has no written announcements.

12. Athletic Board (AB) (Pam Proptom)

A. Update on an advising document

The Athletic Board has created a brief one-page document providing what we hope will be helpful suggestions for faculty advisors of student-athletes when it comes to assisting them with course selections and scheduling. For example, one recommendation is that early morning MWF courses generally produce fewer missed classes for athletic travel. The document will be sent to the First-Year Advising Committee and shared more broadly with faculty members and students. Look for an email in the near future.

B. Update on the “guest coach” program

The Athletics Department would like to introduce a remodeled “Guest Coach” program this fall. Faculty members who are interested in participating could select the team they’d like to visit, briefly meet with the coach, attend a practice, and then sit on the bench with the team (but not coach!) during an athletic contest. We believe this is an opportunity to build connections between athletics and academics, and for faculty to learn about the kind of instruction and education that goes on in coaching. Look for an email this summer.

C. Athletic post-season competition and travel during finals

We are proud that so many of our athletic teams have been successful this year and made it into post-season play; however, this does produce some scheduling issues during finals. Faculty members who have student-athletes on the baseball, softball, golf, and tennis teams should anticipate coaches and student-athletes contacting them to make arrangements for finals. We hope that you will work with student-athletes so that they can successfully complete their coursework and have the experience of post-season play for which they have worked so hard.

There were no questions for the Athletic Board.

Written Announcements –

AB has no written announcements.

13. Extended Studies Implementation Team Report (Dave Berque)

A. Update

The Extended Studies Implementation team has worked hard this spring bringing together the pieces of our new program for launch next year. In particular I’d like to acknowledge the work of MAO and chair Tiffany Hebb and the Committee for Experiential Learning (CEL) and chair Anne Harris and all of Raj Bellani’s staff who have worked tirelessly this spring to help pull this office. Other important offices supporting this work were

Financial Aid, Student Affairs, the Registrar's office, Information Services and of course Academic Affairs.

Please note the updates below on the progress and know the team is meeting during finals week and into the summer to help assure procedures are in place to make the process less rushed and more uniform for all aspects of the program next year.

There were no questions for the Extended Studies Implementation Team.

Written Announcements

1. Summary of Student Applications

- At the time applications closed on April 27th we had received 346 completed applications for 22 off-campus academic courses and an additional 97 applications for 6 co-curricular courses. Each student could apply to at most one course, which means 443 students had applied for an off-campus experience.
- Students who are not admitted into their first choice course will be able to apply for another course, pending the availability of seats, and there are indeed seats available in some courses.
- Each student will receive information about financial support by the end of May, before being asked to pay a deposit for the course.
- Seats that are still open in the fall will become available to new First Year students.

2. Faculty Development Events on May 21, 2014 (location to be announced by email)

- 1-3 p.m. workshop for faculty who are new to traveling off-campus with students
- 3-3:30 p.m. reception and refreshments
- 3:30-4:30pm p.m. Syllabus workshop for all 2015 Extended Studies courses (on-campus and off-campus)

3. Now that we have the first application cycle under our belts, the Implementation Team will be working to develop an integrated timeline for all deadlines associated with Extended Studies next year (proposal submission and review, student application, financial aid, etc.)

14. Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC) (Caroline Jetton)

A. DEC's report is an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for DEC.

Written Announcements –

Since the last university faculty meeting, DEC crafted and sent a follow-up message to the campus community, started planning the various sections to be included in our end-of-year report, met with President Casey, and met with Terri Bonebright. We continue to work on our end-of-the year report.

Additional Business

15. Remarks from the President (Brian Casey)

Today I will provide an update on admissions. Our overall admit rate has been reduced from 61% to 56%. The academic credentials of the incoming class are stunningly high. The average high school GPA is 3.82 and the average ACT score is 28. These are significant moves. The average net tuition increased. The School of Music admitted 52 students. The honors and fellows programs admitted their target numbers. We are no longer

admitting students with high school GPAs below 3.2.

The incoming class is academically strong but is smaller than in previous years. Five hundred fifty (550) new students will arrive next year. This puts pressure on the budget. This is in line with what we talked about in February. The Board's response has been very positive. The Board will be meeting in the next couple of days to discuss the budget.

Question from a faculty member

Will we be receiving a raise?

Response from President Casey

Yes. We went to the Board with our hand out. I do not know what the percentage raise will be. I think there will be a raise.

Question from a faculty member

You said 550 new students are expected to arrive. How many committed students are there today?

Response from President Casey

We have received commitments from 530 students. The other variable is the Lilly awards. These have yet to be awarded this year.

Follow-up question from a faculty member

You have talked about the precipice admissions strategy for next year. This was identified as a risky strategy. Would it be fair to say that the risk taken this year has turned out to be disappointing?

Response from President Casey

Yes, in terms of number admissions, but in terms of quality of students, we're seeing definite improvement. We're also interested in national trends. We have been receiving data all weekend. This is a multi-year plan. The Board is remarkably happy about this outcome.

Question from a faculty member

Do you have any response regarding Title IX?

Response from President Casey

The White House released a statement and a series of protocols for how to deal with sexual violence. Fifty-five (55) institutions are currently under review. I think we will be dealing with this issue for a while. I think our process could be better. It isn't perfect, but we're working on it.

There were no other questions for President Casey

16. Remarks from the VPAA (Larry Stimpert)

Thank you to Bridget Gourley for her work as Chair of Faculty for three years, and thank you to Vanessa Fox for dutifully taking the minutes. I have been regularly attending three standing committees this year. I recognize that we can be more efficient with our committee work, but I thank everyone who has contributed to these efforts. I also thank everyone who participated in the admissions process this year.

I plan to send you a report of this year's Academic Affairs activities in the next couple of days. I inherited an extraordinary staff. I appreciate the work of the deans, Jane Griswold and the other dedicated staff members in Academic Affairs.

On Thursday and Friday this week, there are a couple of upcoming events. The faculty recognition event is on Thursday. On Friday, we celebrate one of the most important bookends to our careers at President Casey's home.

Regarding the multicultural course designation, we plan to proceed with this even as CAPP will consider putting together a formal proposal.

There were no questions for Larry Stimpert.

Comment from Terri Bonebright, Dean of Faculty

President Casey, at the last faculty meeting, asked us to look at the courses we currently teach to consider which courses fit the model of a potential "M" requirement. We also looked at other liberal arts colleges. We will share these data with everyone. We will work on this with department chairs. We have a set of categories for the types of courses: Race and Ethnicity, Sex, Religious and Spiritual Diversity, etc. We don't want the list of courses to be too broad or too narrow. I will send some information to department chairs later this week so that we can begin putting this in place next year.

17. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

18. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

19. Announcements

A. Faculty and Staff Campaign (Michele Villinski and Erik Wielenberg)

The Faculty/Staff Campaign Executive Committee cordially reminds you that the campaign is on-going and extends our appreciation to all colleagues who have already contributed. You should have received an envelope of information in campus mail last month, including a pledge packet with details about the goals of the campaign and how to participate. As a reminder, three easy ways to be part of the campaign are: 1.) click on the "Giving" tab on the DePauw webpage, 2.) use payroll deduction, and 3.) select a DePauw license plate. As always, the campaign focuses on percentage of employees who participate. Questions about the campaign may be directed to any executive committee member or to Blake LeClair (blakeleclair@depauw.edu, extension 4086).

In addition to the written announcement, Michele Villinski with Jim Benedix standing in for Erik Weilenberg reminded us of the faculty/staff campaign – on-going through the end of June.

She indicated that, if you have misplaced your participation envelope, they were available from one from the tables near the door of the Ballroom on your way out.

And she gave three creative possibilities to consider for inspiration regarding an amount:

1. This year's graduating class has approximately 550 graduates. Put a dollar sign in front of that: \$550.
2. Seem like too much? What's your department's GPA? Probably somewhere between 2.70 and 4.00 – perhaps that's doable for a donation?

3. Or, go ahead. Make Brian Casey's day and give an amount equal to the indoor square footage at DePauw – about 2.5 million!!

B. Committee Elections for AY2014-15 (Bridget Gourley)

Please consider volunteering for the remaining committee vacancies. The last round of balloting will be out Wednesday. If you have questions about a position please let me know I'd be happy to address them. If you are considering a position and want to know more about it look at the current committee roster and ask a member of the committee, the chair or the administrative liaison, all would be additional good sources of information. Think of committee service as a way to learn about another area of campus and colleagues you might not otherwise get an opportunity to know.

Written Announcements

Final committee rosters will be posted to the faculty governance web pages over the summer.

20. Adjournment

Appendices

Appendix A: Rationale for Proposed Minor in Astronomy

(condensed from documents provided by the Department of Physics and Astronomy)

For many years the Department of Physics and Astronomy has discussed the possibility of offering a minor in astronomy. The motivation for developing such a minor is based on student interest. We always have a few students in the general education astronomy sequence (Phys 103 and Phys 104) that want to take more astronomy and have expressed interest in having an astronomy minor. In addition to these non-science majors we often have several physics majors who have an interest in pursuing astrophysics and take the astrophysics courses we regularly offer. Kertzman was awarded a Faculty Fellowship in 2009-2012 to develop two new courses in astronomy/astrophysics with an ultimate goal of designing a minor in either astronomy and/or astrophysics.

One of our challenges was to craft a minor program that will serve the needs of the different groups of students who will be interested in this minor. The majority of students in PHYS103 and PHYS 104 are non-science majors and are unlikely to have had any college level physics. Our guiding principle was that the minor should not require college physics. We firmly believe that the study of astronomy is a valuable experience for the liberal arts student and that an astronomy minor should be accessible to all students, not just those with experience in physics. On the other end of the spectrum are physics majors with an interest in astrophysics, some of whom will pursue astrophysics in graduate school. While a separate astrophysics minor might better serve those students, we feel it would not be practical to staff the needed courses with our current faculty.

As part of her Faculty Fellowship, Kertzman surveyed astronomy and astrophysics programs at several universities. A common feature of the programs for minors was a course in Observational Astronomy. As part of the fellowship she developed an Observational Astronomy course which was taught in the spring of 2012 (under PHYS 390A: Topics in Astronomy). The course enrolled 15 students; four of the students were science majors (two in physics and two in geoscience). Four of the students had previously taken one or both of PHYS103 and PHYS104. This course will be one of the core courses for the proposed minor.

Our current course offerings in Astronomy and Astrophysics are: Moons and Planets (PHYS 103), Stars and Galaxies (PHYS 104), Cosmology (PHYS 203), Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300) and Gravitation and Cosmology (taught under PHYS 390P: Topics in Physics) and an occasional astronomy related FYS (e.g. Exploring Mars, Fall 2012). Both Astrophysics and Gravitation and Cosmology have the prerequisite of one year of Physics (i.e. PHYS 120 and PHYS 130). PHYS 103, 104 and 203 have no prerequisites. We are proposing to MAO the additional of two new courses that were developed as part of Kertzman's Faculty Fellowship and have been taught under PHYS 390A: Topics in Astronomy. These two courses are Observational Astronomy (PHYS 310; no prerequisite) and Astrophysics II (PHYS 330; prerequisite Intro to Astrophysics). Gravitation and Cosmology has been taught several times as PHYS 390P: Topics in Physics. We propose to number it PHYS 360. With these courses we believe we have designed a minor program with multiple pathways that will be accessible to the non-science major as well as the physics major.

No new faculty will be needed in order to regularly offer the courses in the astronomy minor. The majority of the courses are already offered on a regular basis. The two new courses (Observational Astronomy and Astrophysics II) developed by Kertzman on her Faculty Fellowship will be woven into our regular offerings on a rotating schedule whether or not the minor is approved.

Proposed minor in Astronomy

Total Courses Required:	Four
Core Courses:	Stars and Galaxies (PHYS 104) or Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300); Observational Astronomy (proposed PHYS 310)
Additional Courses:	Two of: Moons and Planets (PHYS 103), Cosmology (PHYS 203), Intro to Astrophysics (PHYS 300), Astrophysics II (proposed 330), Gravitation and Cosmology (proposed PHYS 360), Topics in Astronomy (PHYS 390A)

A typical astronomy minor for a non-science major would be: 103, 104, 203, and 310. Students with at least one year of college physics have more paths to the astronomy minor. A physics major might take: 300, 310, 330 and 360. A science major with a year of physics might take: 104, 203, 300, and 310.

Appendix B: Rationale for the Women’s Studies Program name change to Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program

MOTION TO CAPP – submitted by Anne Harris, Director of Women’s Studies, on behalf of the Women’s Studies Program Steering Committee and Affiliated Faculty

The Women’s Studies steering committee, with the support of its affiliated faculty, proposes that the program’s name be changed to Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (with an SOC designation of WGS) to more accurately reflect the history of the program and its current curriculum. We wish to build on the twenty-year history of the program at DePauw and acknowledge developments in the curricular offerings of Women’s Studies courses by its faculty. The many contributions to the program from multiple disciplines over the past twenty years have shaped the curriculum and discussions of Women’s Studies. This motion is not so much a change in the program (it proposes no changes in graduation requirements for the major or minor) as an acknowledgement of the history and commitment to issues of women, gender and sexuality throughout its curriculum. In the spring of 2012, changes to the Women’s Studies major and minor, prompted by expanding course opportunities for students, were approved by the faculty. Now is an opportune time to acknowledge the diversity of issues that the Women’s Studies program addresses by a change to the program name. We have worked on the name change throughout the year, considering multiple options and soliciting feedback from our program’s shareholders. With 2.5 full-time faculty positions in place, a varied and vigorous assembly of affiliated faculty, and a sustainable and diverse curriculum that addresses multiple conditions of women and engages in critical thinking about the operations of gender and sexuality, the program is in a good position to recognize the multiplicity of its curriculum and the rich tradition of its history. In seeking this name change, the program at DePauw is in line with other GLCA schools which host a variety of program titles articulating issues of gender and sexuality. We present this motion to CAPP following its review by the program’s affiliated faculty. This name change reaffirms the program’s long-standing commitment to examining the structural role of gender and sexuality in society in their intersections with political and personal identities.

Appendix C: Rationale to allow Italian to be counted as a secondary language for the major in Romance Languages**From the department of Modern Languages**

"Now that the Italian minor has passed, the Department of Modern Languages would like to make a small change to the Romance Languages major that would allow the inclusion of Italian as a secondary language for the major. French and Spanish are still the only possible primary languages for the RL major, since there is no major in Italian.

Revised catalog language we propose for the Romance Languages major, with changes noted:

Students must meet the requirements for a major in either French or Spanish and take at least three courses at the 300-level or above in ~~the other language~~ another Romance language (French, Italian, or Spanish) (including at least one literature and one language course) or two courses at the 300-level or above in another Romance language plus one course at any level with an ML prefix on a topic related to the secondary language.

Final version of catalog language:

Students must meet the requirements for a major in either French or Spanish and take at least three courses at the 300-level or above in another Romance language (French, Italian, or Spanish) or two courses at the 300-level or above in another Romance language plus one course at any level with an ML prefix on a topic related to the secondary language."

Appendix D: Proposed Changes to the Film Studies Major

Proposed additions to the major in **bold** and underlined.

Total courses required:	9.25
Core courses:	FILM 100 (ENG 167), FILM 200 (COMM 237), FILM 429 , FILM 430
Other required courses:	One additional course in each of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Film theory, criticism, and history courses • Production or screenwriting courses • Topics courses in film cultures and traditions
Number 300 and 400 level courses:	4.25 (including the Senior Prep and Project)
Senior requirement and capstone experience:	Successful completion of FILM 429 and FILM 430

Appendix E: Proposed Changes to the Senior Capstone Requirement in both the Communication and Theatre majors

Proposed additions in **bold** and underlined.

Communication Major Senior Requirement and Capstone Experience (Fourth Paragraph)

In preparation for these options, all students are required to take one of the following 300-level courses prior to enrolling in senior seminar: COMM 314 Theatrical Theory and Criticism, COMM 315 Topics in Theatre History and Criticism, COMM 322 Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, COMM 323 History of Public Discourse, COMM 326 Communication in Organizations, COMM 327 Communication and Cultural Identity, COMM 334 Media Criticism, **COMM 335 Media Law, COMM 337 International Media**, or COMM 350 Research Methods. Priority for placement in a fall seminar is determined in three ways: 1. Completion of all other required courses in the major; 2. Completion of at least two of the required 300 level courses with priority given to those students who've completed one of the required seminar preparation courses within the major; 3. The existing university registration sequence. Coursework completed in meeting the senior requirement can be applied toward meeting the 300-400 level course requirement.

Theatre Major Senior Requirement and Capstone Experience (Fourth Paragraph)

In preparation for these options, all students are required to take one of the following 300-level courses prior to enrolling in senior seminar: COMM 314 Theatrical Theory and Criticism, COMM 315 Topics in Theatre History and Criticism, COMM 322 Rhetorical Theory and Criticism, COMM 323 History of Public Discourse, COMM 326 Communication in Organizations, COMM 327 Communication and Cultural Identity, COMM 334 Media Criticism, **COMM 335 Media Law**, **COMM 337 International Media**, or COMM 350 Research Methods. Priority for placement in a fall seminar is determined in three ways: 1. Completion of all other required courses in the major; 2. Completion of at least two of the required 300 level courses with priority given to those students who've completed one of the required seminar preparation courses within the major; 3. The existing university registration sequence. Coursework completed in meeting the senior requirement can be applied toward meeting the 300-400 level course requirement.

Appendix F: Course Descriptions for MAO Consent Agenda Items

Related to Consent Agenda Item I – New courses

CLST 351 – Airs, Waters, Places: Classics and the Environment (1 credit) – This course repurposes the title of 'Airs, Waters, Places,' a Hippocratic treatise on the influence of place upon human health. In line with the Hippocratic investigation into the relationship between environment and human health, this course explores how ancient Greek and Roman thinkers and artists conceive of the environment and its role in shaping human culture and how the environment, in turn, informs the ideas and art of ancient Greek and Roman writers. Topics may include ancient conceptions and representations of the cosmos (ecology), wilderness, farming, and pastoral poetry.

COMM 292 – Project in Communication (0.5 – 1 credit, variable) – A. Interpersonal Project, B. Interpersonal Course Teaching Assistant, C. Theatre Project, D. Theatre Course Teaching Assistant, E. Media Studies Project, F. Media Studies Course Teaching Assistant, G. Rhetoric Project, H. Rhetoric Course Teaching Assistant, J. Communication Course Teaching Assistant. *Prerequisite: permission of department. No more than two course credits may be taken as projects. Not open for Pass/Fail credit.*

FILM 429 – Film Studies Senior Project Prep (0.25 credit) – The Film Studies Senior Capstone Experience is the culmination of the Film Studies major, designed to provide students with a challenging final project of significant length and complexity, spanning fall and spring semester of senior year at DePauw. Whether the final project is a scholarly thesis paper of significant length and scope or a creative/production-oriented venture (such as a feature-length screenplay, short narrative film or documentary), the capstone project requires extensive planning, on-going organization, persistence and dedication, along with the ability to meet deadlines and work closely with a faculty advisor. To this end, the Film Studies Senior Project Prep (FILM 429) is a .25-credit prelude to the Film Studies Senior Project (FILM 430). In consultation with the Director of Film Studies and a faculty project advisor from the program, students prepare and submit proposals and supporting documents to the FS faculty committee. Once proposals are approved, students complete additional preparatory work, including research, extensive outlining, and/or preliminary pre-production, which is submitted to their advisor for evaluation. These phases of the project provide a solid base from which to begin the second, full (1) credit semester, and the more intensive writing/production phases of their capstone projects.

GEOS 290 – Topics (variable credit) - An exploration of selected topics in the geosciences. May be repeated for credit with different topics.

GEOS 390 – Topics (variable credit) - An exploration of selected topics in the geosciences. Prerequisite: Sophomore standing. May be repeated for credit with different topics.

HIST 190 – Topics (1 credit) - An introductory study of a special topic with an emphasis on discussion and participation. Descriptions of HIST 190 courses offered in a given semester are available on the History department Website or in the History department office prior to registration for that semester. May be repeated for credit with different topics.

HIST 233 – British Empire (1 credit) – At its apogee, the British Empire incorporated nearly one-quarter of the world’s landmass and population. This course examines the British imperial “world system” from the granting of the East India Company charter through imperial liquidation, with a particular emphasis on events during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The course’s geographic range includes considerations of British imperialism in South Asia, Asia, the Pacific, Africa and the Americas. The class analyzes important historiographical debates, the differences between formal and informal imperialism, competing visions of Empire, indigenous responses, and the cultures of imperialism.

MATH 340 – Topics in Statistics (1 credit) – An exploration of selected topics in mathematics. May be repeated for credit with different topics.

MUS 288 – Named Chamber Ensembles (0.25 credit) - Based on an audition, selected students will be assigned to a specific named chamber ensemble. Students will rehearse as a group independently and under the tutelage of a chamber music coach. Ensembles will perform on and off campus representing the School of Music.

MUS 240 – State of the Art (1 credit) –State of the Art gives students a thorough overview of the challenges and opportunities facing professional musicians and music organizations in the current marketplace. Starting with an exploration of high-profile contemporary situations, the course then examines the economics of professional classical music, using NEA arts participation data and various articles and online resources as texts. As the course moves to an exploration of successful arts organizations, small ensembles, and individual performers, students develop case studies of successful current musical enterprises. *Course not open to first-years.*

MUS 340 – Music Entrepreneurship (0.5 credit) – A project-based introduction to the attitudes, skills, and habits needed for musicians entering the marketplace to create their own opportunities rather than (or in addition to) seeking employment from existing musical organizations. Topics include entrepreneurial mindset; authentic motivation; portfolio/project-based career models; importance of marketplace distinction; networking and relationship building; developing a personal (or group) following; promotional writing (biographies, press releases, etc.); traditional and electronic marketing, including social media and video; funding models; and basics of personal finance. *Open to first-years and sophomores by permission only. Open to CLA students by permission only.*

MUS 380 – 21CM Topics (variable credit) – Investigations of specialized topics in entrepreneurship and music business. These courses expand upon other courses offered in the 21CM curriculum.

MUS 440 – Practicum (0.5 credit, may be repeated) – A workshop-format course in which students individually or in small groups conceive, develop, and execute a project or projects involving 21CM skills in areas such as creative programming and presentation; alternative venues; effective promotion, marketing, and audience development; and community engagement. In addition to their own planning, students, working with the faculty member, will be responsible for finding an external or internal professional adviser. Prerequisites: Music Entrepreneurship (MUS 340) and State of the Art (MUS 240), or permission of the instructor.

PHYS 190 – Topics (variable credit) - A. Astronomy. P. Physics. Selected topics in astronomy or physics. May be an independent study project.

PHYS 290 – Topics (variable credit) - A. Astronomy. P. Physics. Selected topics in astronomy or physics. May be an independent study project. Prerequisite: depends on the topic.

PHYS 310 – Observational Astronomy (1 credit) - Includes Laboratory. The overall goal of this course is to develop the skills needed to become knowledgeable life-long observers of the night sky. It includes the study

and understanding of celestial coordinate systems, motions of the Sun and stars, seasons, phases of the moon, motion of the planets, systems of time keeping, and similar phenomena. The course teaches the skills necessary to observe objects our Solar system (the Moon, the planets, the Sun, comets, and asteroids), and well as objects outside of our solar system (stars, galactic nebulae and external galaxies) through observing with the naked eye, binoculars and telescopes. It includes the use of astronomical reference tools such as star charts and planetarium software. Digital recording of astronomical observations through astrophotography and CCD imaging will be covered.

PHYS 320 – Astrophysics I (1 credit) – In astrophysics the concepts of classical and modern physics are applied to the study of astronomy, providing a physical basis for understanding the components and structure of our universe. The focus of Astrophysics I is stars. Topics to be covered include: spectroscopy, stellar classification, stellar properties, binary stars, stellar structure, stellar evolution, and the end states of stars (white dwarfs, neutron stars, and black holes).

PHYS 330 – Astrophysics II (1 credit) – In astrophysics the concepts of classical and modern physics are applied to the study of astronomy, providing a physical basis for understanding the components and structure of our universe. Topics covered in Astrophysics II include: the Milky Way, galaxies and galactic structure, active galactic nuclei, high energy phenomena, dark matter, and an introduction to cosmology.

PHYS 360 – Gravitation and Cosmology (1 credit) – This is a course about gravity: its description as spacetime curvature, its effect on the motion of bodies, and its role in shaping the evolution of the universe. The first part of the course is devoted to a discussion of the main features of General Relativity, with an emphasis on the behavior of light and matter in the vicinity of black holes. Part two of the course constitutes an introduction to Big Bang cosmology. Topics covered include the physics of the early universe, the cosmic microwave background, the evidence for dark matter and dark energy, and inflation.

Related to Consent Agenda Item K – Change in course title and description

Text to be deleted is struck through text to be added in bold.

~~COMM 200 Communication Theory~~ **Foundations of Communication Studies**

~~Designed to introduce students to the theoretical foundations of the discipline, this course examines the interdisciplinary nature of communication studies.~~ **This course introduces students to the interdisciplinary field of communication studies. Drawing on primary and secondary source material, the course encourages students to explore a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of human communication.** Emphasizing the department's commitment to an integrated program of study, this course provides students with the foundational concepts and skills necessary for successful completion of majors in Communication and Theatre through the study of primary and secondary source material.

~~COMM 491 Project in Communication~~ **Advanced Project in Communication**

~~A. Interpersonal Project, B. Interpersonal Course Teaching Assistant, C. Theatre Project, D. Theatre Course Teaching Assistant, E. Media Studies Project, F. Media Studies Course Teaching Assistant, G. Rhetoric Project, H. Rhetoric Course Teaching Assistant, J. Communication Course Teaching Assistant, K. Co-Curricular Project, M. Senior Capstone Thesis or Project.~~ ***Prerequisite: permission of department. No more than two course credits may be taken as projects. Not open for Pass/Fail credit.***

Related to Consent Agenda Item L – Change in course number and description

BIO 135 Organismal Biology – Includes laboratory. Introduces concepts of structure-function relationships in representative multicellular organisms (plants and animals). Aspects of organismal maintenance, environmental response, growth, and reproduction are related to structure, and comparisons made between specializations in representative plants and animals. *Students with advance placement in biology may receive credit for this course.*

changed to:

BIO 235 Organismal Biology – Includes laboratory. With an emphasis on land plants and animals, this course

provides an introduction to the evolution of the structure-function relationships that characterize these organisms. Topics covered include the evolution of adaptations associated with nutrition, internal transport, gas exchange, water and ion balance. *Prerequisite: BIO 101 and 102.*

Related to Consent Agenda Item M – Change in course number, distribution group, prerequisites, and description

ECON 335 – Environmental and Natural Resource Economics

This course uses economic theories and concepts to explain behavioral causes of environmental and natural resource problems and evaluate policies for addressing them. Topics vary and may include sustainable development, allocation of natural resources, pollution control measures, effects of environmental regulation on U.S. competitiveness and environmental justice. *Prerequisite: ECON 294*

changed to:

ECON 245 – Environmental and Natural Resource Economics (added SS distribution)

This course uses economic theories and concepts to explore environmental and natural resource problems and evaluate policies for addressing them. Topics vary and may include energy, water, agriculture, sustainable development, environmental justice, and other timely issues. *Prerequisite: ECON 100*

Related to Consent Agenda Item N – Change in course number, title and prerequisite change

BIO 444 – Population Genetics and Evolution

Normally includes laboratory. An examination of the role of evolution as the central organizing concept in biology and role of population genetics as the core of evolutionary theory. *Prerequisite: BIO 135, 145 and 215, or permission of instructor.*

changed to

BIO 344 – Ecological and Evolutionary Genetics

This course examines how interactions among organisms and their biotic and abiotic environments influence the quantitative and molecular genetics of natural populations. Following a brief introduction to theoretical population and quantitative genetics, students make extensive use of the primary literature to examine current research in this area. *Prerequisite: BIO 101 and 102.*

Related to Consent Agenda Item O – Change in course description and prerequisite

FILM 430 – Film Studies Senior Project

This capstone course will be taken during senior year and will be a culmination of the Film Studies major. With the help for the Film Studies director and faculty advisors, students will design and complete an original project, either scholarly or creative. Candidates will then be interviewed by an interdisciplinary faculty committee.

changed to

FILM 430 – Film Studies Senior Project

This course is the culmination of the Film Studies Senior Capstone Experience, building on the work completed in FILM 429. Working closely with their FS faculty project advisor, students immerse themselves in intensive writing and revision, and/or the progressive filmmaking phases of pre-production/production/post-production. Three deadlines must be met over the course of the semester: the first installment; completed first draft or edit; and the final draft or edit. (A failing grade on any project development phase results in course failure; and students must earn a C- or above in the course to graduate.) At year's end, students present their work to a faculty and student audience. *Prerequisite: FILM 429*

Appendix G: Proposed Changes to the Class Attendance and Absences portion of the Academic Handbook

Text to be inserted is underlined at the bottom of the policy, where it would be added.

Class Attendance and Absences

Regular attendance at class, laboratory and other appointments for which credit is given is expected of all students according to the guidelines established by individual faculty members. There are no "allowed cuts" or "free" absences from class sessions. Faculty members may drop students from their classes or other appropriate action may be taken if absences are too frequent.

Absences for medical reasons: When an absence due to medical reasons will result in a student being unable to fulfill academic responsibilities--for example, papers and examinations--the student should notify the faculty member in advance. Each faculty member should let the students know how to give this notification. The faculty member and student should work out arrangements for possible extension or makeup work. In cases where students are hospitalized, the University physician will, with the student's permission, notify the Office of Student Life. It is the student's responsibility to contact the faculty member; in addition, the faculty member will be notified by Student Life personnel.

If a student misses two or more weeks of class for medical or other reasons beyond the student's control, the student's faculty members, in consultation with a member of the Academic Affairs staff, will decide whether the student may reasonably make up the missed work. As a general rule, students who miss two or more weeks of class may no longer be eligible to continue in the class. The final decision about whether a student may continue with a class rests with the faculty member subject to constraints set by other academic policies.

Absences for personal or psychological reasons: Occasionally Student Life staff will encounter students who must miss class for personal or emotional reasons. These cases include such events as death or illness of a family member or emergency psychological crisis. When possible, Student Life staff will ask the student to notify faculty members and indicate that faculty members may call Student Life staff for confirmation if such validation is deemed necessary. In some of these cases, the Student Life staff member has no real way to validate the student's statement. Maintaining such information over a period of time, however, could help determine possible patterns of dishonesty for an individual student. In some extreme emergencies, Student Life staff may notify faculty members directly.

Early departure or late return from breaks: Faculty members are expected to hold class on the days immediately before and after breaks. Students will not be excused from class attendance or from taking examinations at their announced time to accommodate travel schedules. It is the responsibility of students and their families to make travel arrangements accordingly.

Conflicts with other courses: Whenever possible out of class requirements should be specified in the syllabus and/or the schedule of classes and the faculty member should provide options, or an alternative time, for students who have another class obligation scheduled at the same time. If there is conflict between two course-related activities, the faculty members should resolve it. The Dean of Academic Life will be responsible for the resolution, if an agreement is not reached.

Appendix H. Proposed Changes to the Academic Probation and Dismissal portion of the Academic Handbook

Proposed Language:

Satisfactory Academic Progress for Financial Aid and Academic Standing

Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) is used to determine financial aid eligibility and academic standing. The main goal of the SAP system is to make sure that all degree seeking students are making timely progress toward earning a degree.

There are four SAP statuses:

- Satisfactory
- Warning
- Suspension
- Probation

There are two primary measures that determine SAP: academic performance as measured by grade point average and progress toward degree as measured by earned college credits that are applicable to the degree. GPA is referred to as a **qualitative measure**; credits earned as a **quantitative measure**. The quantitative measures include both credits earned and percentage of credits attempted that are earned. The qualitative measures include both cumulative and major GPAs.

To graduate from DePauw with a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music, or Bachelor of Musical Arts degree requires 31 course credits and minimum 2.0 GPA, cumulative and in the major. The Bachelor of Music Education Degree requires 33 course credits with a 2.0 cumulative GPA.

DePauw uses a graduated scale of minimum standards students must achieve to be in satisfactory standing.

Semester	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Minimum GPA	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Major GPA				2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Minimum Credits Earned	2	6	10	14	18	22	26	29
Percent of Attempted Earned	50%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%

Semester Minimum

Full-time students must earn at least 2.0 course credits and at least a 1.0 semester GPA each semester. Students who fall below these semester minimums are suspended.

SAP Process

At the end of each semester, student performance is reviewed by members of the Financial Aid and Registrar's offices. Students who are meeting the above minimum standards are judged to be making satisfactory academic progress toward a degree.

Students who have been doing satisfactorily and then fall below any of the above standards are given a **warning** to improve performance. If they fail to meet the benchmark for the next semester [or perform below the semester minimum], they are **suspended**. They may appeal the suspension (see Appeals Process below) or apply for readmission after spending some time away from DePauw.

Students who successfully appeal a suspension are placed on **probation**. In most cases, they will have one probationary semester to bring their performance into line with the satisfactory academic progress standards. In most cases, if they fail to do so they are again suspended. However, some students who come close to reaching the target may be continued on probation.

Appeals of Suspensions

Students who are suspended for failing to meet SAP guidelines may appeal their suspension in writing to the Academic Standing Committee, which includes representatives from the faculty, Academic Affairs, Student Life and Financial Aid. Usually, appeals are heard approximately two weeks after semester grades have been posted (approximately January 15 and June 15). In the appeal the student presents his/her case for continuing. If the student is behind in credit earned, the appeal should include a plan for catching up, which may include taking courses elsewhere over the summer. If the student has fallen below the minimum GPA standards, the appeal should include a plan for improving performance. Note that course work done elsewhere or online does count toward the quantitative, but not the qualitative measures, because course work done elsewhere does not count into DePauw GPAs.

Students who successfully appeal a suspension may continue on probation in the following semester. Those whose appeals are denied may apply for readmission after being away for a minimum of one semester.

Existing Language:

Academic Probation and Dismissal

The Committee on Academic Standing reviews all students whose semester, cumulative or major GPA falls below a 2.0 or who were below a 2.0 the preceding semester. The committee clears students who were previously on probation when they regain a 2.0 average in all areas.

Students whose semester, cumulative or major GPA is below 2.0 are placed on academic probation. In addition, students whose academic programs require student teaching are warned if their cumulative grade average is below a 2.5. Various support mechanisms are provided to students in academic difficulty.

Students are required to select a major by the sixth week in the second semester of the sophomore year. The Committee on Academic Standing will take appropriate warning actions in the case of students who have failed to do so by the end of the sophomore year. The committee may also require students who fail to demonstrate satisfactory progress toward the major to drop that major and select a new major before continuing at DePauw.

Students who achieve below a 2.0 in two consecutive semesters, receive less than a 1.3 any given semester or do not make satisfactory progress are subject to academic suspension. Students are also subject to suspension if the cumulative GPA at the close of the:

- second semester is below a 1.3
- third semester is below a 1.65
- fourth semester is below a 1.80
- fifth semester is below a 1.85 and/or unsatisfactory progress is made in the major
- sixth through eighth semester is below a 1.9 and/or unsatisfactory progress is made in the major

Students who are suspended are notified by the committee in writing; they may appeal the decision if there are extenuating circumstances.

Students who are suspended for academic reasons may apply for readmission after being away one semester; however, experience has shown that in many cases a full year's separation from DePauw increases the probability of academic success. Students are evaluated on their demonstrated readiness to return to DePauw's academic environment and the likelihood of their eventual successful completion of a degree in a timely manner. Additional criteria the readmission committee uses includes:

- student's insight into what caused the original academic difficulty
- evidence that the things that prevented successful academic performance previously have changed

positively

- the amount of time spent away from DePauw and how productively it has been used (statements from employers or others may be requested)
- academic achievement that, if undertaken, has improved substantially.

(Approved by the DePauw University Faculty, October 20, 1990; revised April 5, 1999; June 6, 2002; June 13, 2005)

Appendix I. Proposed Changes to the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook regarding the review of Librarians

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

Personnel Policies Section

Periodic Evaluation (Article Written and Approved by the Faculty)

Evaluation of Librarians Serving in Renewable Term Faculty Positions

~~Beginning in the third year of service (and then in the seventh year, twelfth year, and every five years thereafter),~~

Effective with the 2014-15 Academic Year, librarians shall be evaluated as follows:

- **3rd Year Term Review**
- **7th Year Term and Promotion to “with rank of Associate Professor” review**
- **After completing seven years in “with rank of Associate Professor,” a librarian is eligible for timely promotion review to “with rank of Professor”**
- **After promotion to “with rank of Professor,” librarians are no longer subject to a formal review**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs appoints a review committee consisting of the ~~library director~~ **Dean of Libraries**, all full-time professional librarians (excluding the candidate under review, and those in their first year of service), and two faculty **members** from outside the library. The librarian develops a file for review in the same way as do ~~other~~ **full-time** faculty members. The committee submits a report and recommendation to the President through the Committee on Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The ~~library director~~ **Dean of Libraries** and ~~assistant associate~~ director are reviewed in this manner to evaluate their work as librarians; the Vice President for Academic Affairs separately reviews their administrative performance.

If a librarian has taught a credit-bearing course, the annual report shall include reflection about the teaching of that course which will be reviewed by the VPAA in consultation with COF if necessary.

Appendix J. Proposed Changes to Disruptive Student Policy found in the Academic Handbook

Text to be inserted is shown underlined and **bold** and text to be deleted ~~struck through~~.

~~Disruptive Student Policy~~ Classroom Atmosphere Policy

Exchange of Ideas during Class. At DePauw University, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance **and faculty members should work to provide and maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.** ~~In our classrooms w~~We strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of ~~courtesy, respect and professionalism~~ **civil discourse.** A student's ~~inappropriate~~ **comments or** behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment. **For example, while students and faculty are encouraged to debate ideas and offer differing viewpoints, even when these exchanges are uncomfortable, they should recognize that personal attacks are unacceptable.**

Use of Technology during Class. Faculty members generally have discretion to set guidelines for, and restrictions on, the use of technology during class, with the goals of supporting learning while also minimizing distractions for all students. **Expectations will naturally vary from course to course, instructor to instructor, and even from class period to class period based on differences in teaching and learning objectives. In many cases, faculty members will choose to allow students to use technology, but will limit this use to activities that support the learning process. In other cases, for example to minimize distraction, instructors may implement additional restrictions on the use of technology. In each case, faculty members may find it helpful to explain their expectations as part of the course outline or in other ways. Students will benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations in this area, just as they benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations with respect to attendance, academic integrity, and other policies.**

Notes: There are two exceptions to the broad discretion given to faculty members above.

(a) The Americans with Disabilities Act gives students the right to use assistive technology or a suitable alternative if this has been determined to be an appropriate accommodation for their disability. ADA procedures require that such accommodations be reached by the campus ADA coordinator in consultation with the student and that they be communicated in writing to the instructor with the student's consent. Instructors may work with students and the ADA coordinator to determine the most effective way to implement the accommodation. Whenever possible, students should be allowed to use the assistive technology without disclosing their disability. For advice and guidance please consult with DePauw's ADA Coordinator.

(b) DePauw University uses an electronic notification system to distribute campus emergency alerts via text messages. When class policies require phones to be stored out of sight and/or reach during class, phones should still be set to vibrate. Emergency messages will cause multiple phones to vibrate at nearly the same time.

Frank yet respectful informal discussions between faculty members and students are the preferred response to **problems that are covered by this policy** ~~disruptive behavior.~~ **However,** each case is different and given these complexities faculty members **or students who have concerns** may wish to **seek advice, as outlined below, to prepare for these discussions or to take other steps.**

I. Options for Students

1. Students may consult with resources including faculty advisors, department chairs, or staff members in a variety of offices including Student Life, Academic Life, Multicultural Student Services, International Student Services and the Women's Center to seek advice informally. Based on their judgment, these staff members may consult with, or encourage students to consult with, the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Academic Life. Students may also consult informally with either of these Deans as a first step.

2. Students are encouraged to provide their input using the student opinion form that is administered at the

end of the semester in almost all DePauw courses. When students feel comfortable doing so, they are also encouraged to talk with faculty members in person, either during the semester or after the course ends.

3. DePauw has a formal grade grievance policy that may be applicable depending on the nature of the student's concern. See www.depauw.edu/handbooks/academic/policies/grievance/

4. Students may file a formal complaint by submitting a signed letter to the Dean of the Faculty during the semester, or at any time after the course concludes.

When concerns are raised, Academic Affairs Administration will be responsible for follow-up, if warranted, which could include informal mentoring; formal improvement plans; faculty development opportunities; documentation placed in personnel files with a copy to the faculty member; and/or consideration during the annual re-appointment, renewal and compensation processes, which could have employment ramifications. Any necessary follow-up will be undertaken in accordance with DePauw' personnel procedures (see: www.depauw.edu/handbooks/academic/personnel/). Actions taken through these procedures are typically confidential.

II. Steps for Faculty Members

Faculty members may wish to consult with the student's academic advisor, **the Department Chair** colleagues, and/or a designated member of Academic Affairs (currently the Dean of Academic Life), even at the stage of informal interventions. **If informal measures are unsuccessful, faculty members should follow these procedures:**

~~(Please note: The Disruptive Student Policy is not meant to cover behavior that occurs outside the classroom and/or involves harassment. Other policies are in place to handle those situations; the University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks. Incidents of harassment should be reported immediately to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, or Campus Safety officers.)~~

~~If informal measures taken to address a student's disruptive behavior are unsuccessful, faculty members should follow these procedures:~~

- ~~1. The faculty member should warn the student in writing that the disruptive behavior is unacceptable and that if it continues the student may not be allowed to remain in the course. Depending on circumstances, a warning may need to be made during class, as well; for example, the faculty member may ask the student to leave the classroom for the day. The faculty member should also encourage the student to talk to an academic advisor or dean in Academic Affairs.~~
- ~~2. The faculty member should keep notes on the dates, times, and details of the incidents of disruption, the impact of disruption on those present, and warnings conveyed to the student, as these are useful in later stages of the proceedings.~~
- ~~3. If the behavior continues after a written warning has been given, the faculty member should notify the Dean of Academic Life in writing, giving a summary of what happened and the action that has been taken. Upon receipt of this summary, the dean sets up a three-way meeting involving the faculty member, student, and dean. In order to minimize the procedure's interference with courses, this meeting is scheduled as soon as possible, preferably before the next class meeting.~~
- ~~4. At the meeting, the faculty member and student are invited to discuss the situation. The goal of the meeting is to give both parties a chance to discuss, in a safe space, what has happened. Such a discussion may enable the faculty member and student to see the problem from a different point of view or to hear the perspective of the other person in a new way. The dean's role is to moderate the discussion, insuring that the conversation remains civil and on target. Either party may, but neither must, bring an advisor (DePauw student, faculty member, or staff member) to the meeting. Advisors may consult privately with~~

the person whom they are accompanying, but they do not enter the discussion.

5. As soon as possible after the meeting the faculty member makes a recommendation to the Dean of Academic Life.
 - If the faculty member recommends that the student be allowed to remain in the course then the dean and faculty member should consult regarding how best to convey this decision and any stipulations or conditions to the student.
 - If the faculty member recommends that the student be dropped from the course, he or she reports this conclusion in writing to the dean of Academic Life; the dean then conveys the faculty member's conclusions along with a written summary of the three-way meeting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 - A recommendation to dismiss the student from the course must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the student is not allowed to return to the course, the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides what appears on student's transcript for the course: W, F, or no entry.
6. A pattern of disruptive behavior in several courses may be addressed by representatives of the offices of Academic Affairs and Student Life.

Please note: This policy is not meant to cover behavior that occurs outside the classroom and/or involves harassment. Other policies are in place to handle those situations; the University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks. Incidents of harassment should be reported immediately to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, or Campus Public Safety officers.

Revised and adopted by the Faculty, ~~Dec. 7, 2008,~~ **September 2014.**

Appendix K: Proposed revisions to the Academic Handbook to accommodate a Consent Agenda
(Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike-through~~; text to be inserted is shown in **bold**.)

Changes under Faculty Meetings:

3. Voting

- a. Full-time faculty members holding positions with academic or nominal rank, including those on sabbatical, pre-tenure, or academic leave, may vote. (See [Article I.B of the Personnel Policies](#) for a definition of full-time faculty positions.) The President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Registrar also have voting privileges.
- b. Faculty members in part-time positions may attend faculty meetings and participate in debate, but not vote; however, Senior (Emeriti) Professors are eligible to vote during any semester in which they are teaching at least one course.
- c. A quorum shall consist of 40% of the faculty eligible to vote and not on approved leave (rounded to the nearest whole number). This number shall be determined for each semester by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, using the faculty roster as of the Friday immediately preceding the first faculty meeting of each semester. Immediately after the call to order at the first faculty meeting of each semester, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall announce the quorum requirement for that semester. The next order of business after the call to order at each faculty meeting shall be the verification of a quorum by the Chair of the Faculty; (for the first meeting of the semester, the quorum verification shall occur after the Vice President for Academic Affairs has announced the requirement).
- d. All voting in meetings, unless otherwise stipulated, shall be by show of hands. However, at the request of any faculty member the vote shall be by secret ballot.
- e. **Any voting faculty member may object to including an item on the Consent Agenda. Such an objection will result in full debate of the item under the appropriate order of business.**

4. Order of Business

At all regular faculty meetings the following items must be included in the order of business:

- 1) Call to order and verification of quorum,
- 2) ~~Correction and approval of minutes,~~ **Consent Agenda,**
 - a) **Approval of minutes**
 - b) **Approval of new courses and announcement of course changes (as needed)**
 - c) **Approval of election results (as needed)**
 - d) **Conferring of baccalaureate degrees (as needed)**
 - e) **Other (as needed)**
- 3) Reports from coordinating committees,
- 4) Reports from other committees,
- 5) Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs,
- 6) Remarks from the President,
- 7) Old business,
- 8) New business,
- 9) Announcements, and
- 10) Adjournment.

5. Parliamentary Procedure

- a. The following shall be circulated at least three days before each faculty meeting: copies of the minutes of the last meeting and an agenda including the specific committee motions to be voted on at the next meeting **including the exact text of the consent agenda**. All committee motions on which there is to be a vote at a faculty meeting must have been announced in the agenda circulated before that meeting.
- b. All business shall be conducted according to proper parliamentary procedure as set forth in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

Appendix L: Proposed revisions to the Academic Handbook to accommodate a change in the name of the Faculty Development Committee

(Text to be deleted is shown in ~~strike-through~~; text to be inserted is shown in **bold**.)

A global search and replace will be done to replace the name ~~Faculty Development Committee (FDC)~~ with **Internal Grants Committee (IGC)**.

Faculty Development Committee

1. Function. ~~This committee shall plan and execute faculty development programs within the University and coordinate institutional programs with faculty development programs of outside agencies. The committee will cooperate with the Committee on Faculty in establishing policies for faculty development.~~
This committee shall make recommendations to the President of the University concerning the granting of institutional research and development **funds, resources and** leaves of absence, ~~and selection of institutional nominees for grants or awards given by outside agencies.~~ Policies and procedures of ~~faculty development~~ **internal funding**-programs are outlined in detail ~~in~~ **on** the **Academic Affairs website**. [Faculty Development Handbook](#) which is available online or from the Academic Affairs Office.
2. Membership. Six elected faculty members (one elected from each division and two elected at-large) of which no more than two may be from one division and no more than one from each department. The chair for this committee shall be chosen from among the elected faculty members.

Ex-officio members (without vote): the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his or her representative); the ~~Coordinator for Faculty Development~~ **Coordinator**.

