

Governance Committee Minutes
9/22/15

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Mark Kannowski, Marnie McInnes, Pam Propsom (chair), Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Updates from reps regarding their committee plans this year:

Kannowski (Review Committee)—Find another person to serve before can't do business in spring. Review student opinion surveys. Tenure and promotion standards, lesser sanctions, some language in the Academic Handbook regarding inclusion.

Thede (Curriculum)—Curriculum reform (making the new requirement fit with language for existing requirements), Extended Studies (consider changing requirement from 2 to 3), RAS and Opportunity Hire procedures. The two latter things are items on which Governance and Curriculum can work together. Perhaps we should arrange a meeting with the university attorney to learn about legal interpretation regarding Opportunity Hiring policy.

McInnes (Faculty Development)—Excited they can focus on Faculty Development things this year. Some discussion of how funding works, can money be moved from one "pot" to another (which could have implications/connections to tenure and promotion standards, so they may need to have a conversation with Review Committee).

Alvarez (Student Academic Life)—Campus climate, retention (particularly minority students, relation to Greek life), book proposal (many of our students are not buying books), excitement about the common reading and writing for incoming students.

Gourley (Chair of the Faculty)--Reminded us that we have some set aside open meeting times that can be used to discuss issues of faculty interest. Still some openings on faculty committees that need to be filled. Need names (and perhaps a better process) for administrative reps to committees.

Issues for this year:

Guidelines for electing committee chairs, appointing reps to other committees, administrative appointments to committees (someone who has the authority and interest to deal with the relevant committee issues). We need to have a process for doing this and a place where this process is documented so that people have easy access to it. Guidelines for committees to keep meeting minutes and regularly post them.

University Governance Website—Academic Affairs will do it, if they have guidance. Is the Faculty Handbook available on the webpage? We need to have old committee meeting minutes available on the website (except for those that are confidential). Bridget will send Terry Bruner an email asking her to post old committee meeting minutes to the appropriate updated committee name.

Strategic Planning Committee—Hasn't met yet, but didn't have all appointments from other committees, only two of the three student reps. Brad Kelsheimer's office is supposed to coordinate. How will it report to our committee?

Anne Harris would like to meet with us. She can address proposed Hubbard Center Advisory Group and Undergraduate Research Advisory Group (attachment from Amity Reading).

Faculty and the Board of Trustees--Structure it so there is an on-going relationship, but this has to be in cooperation with the BOT. Renee Madison was supposed to look into "best practices" from the legal perspective. Unclear whether President Casey sees this as necessary any longer because of the Strategic Planning Committee, but some of us didn't see these two as being connected. We just need to be clear about who the "official faculty liaisons" to the BOT are and what their role is. Bridget will pursue this with President Casey, and then our committee will discuss.

Additional issues for future meetings

Producing a short-form overview of new Governance system

Books from President Casey--Bowen & Tobin's *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education*—he was only able to get five copies from Amazon, but has provided these for us to share and perhaps use for a future discussion with him.

Ideas for restructuring Faculty Meeting

Recommendations for faculty involvement in administrative hires that have a significant connection to faculty (e.g., VPAA, President). Part-time faculty and staff would also like an opportunity to participate.

Regular meeting time—Tuesdays, every week or every other week, 8:30 a.m. next week (Sept. 29).

Pam will contact Anne to see if she can attend a future meeting and also will work on drafts of some other ideas/documents.

Governance Committee Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)
Sept. 29, 2015

Present: President Brian Casey (guest), Bridget Gourley, Mark Kannowski, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

President Casey. Brian Casey asked to update the committee on recent campus activities. We wanted to strategize how to share this at Faculty Meeting without it taking over the entire faculty meeting. The president outlined three action items:

- working with students and staff who were directly affected by police action
- preparing for future potential incidents
- coordinating and working with law enforcement on a “panel”

We suggested that this update could occur near the top of the Faculty Meeting agenda, but that we might set a time limit on the discussion. There is an open meeting on the university calendar for Oct. 27; that’s far away, but this might be good to provide some distance and give the “panel” enough time to get started.

Our written announcement on the Faculty Meeting Agenda will read something like: “The Governance Committee is using its place on the agenda for a report from President Casey. We have asked him to give a concise summary about recent events, the university response, and plans for future activities. There will be 15 minutes for this discussion so that we can conduct the rest of business. This is the beginning of the conversation, but there will be multiple opportunities for continued discussion. It is important to be able to address pressing current issues, but that is not the prime purpose of Faculty Meeting.”

Order of next Faculty Meeting agenda. Start with the remembrance for the faculty member who recently passed away. Consent agenda. Governance Committee (advance notice, President Casey).

Faculty Meeting. Lori expressed that meetings still seem somewhat inefficient; there are a lot of announcements that could be written. How to include reports from President and VPAA—at the end it seems like attention is waning, and if it’s at the beginning it supplants other business of the faculty. January Intellectual Life Working Group looked at other faculty meeting models (e.g., Roberta’s Rules), but came to no consensus. We really need Roberts Rules for when things get contentious. But is there an imaginative way to operate within the rules we have? Group committee reports together (when there are only announcements), put time limits on reports/discussion? Where do we put the President and VPAA reports? Is there a way the Governance Committee can work with them *prior* to the Faculty Meeting so that we can actually coordinate our shared governance work? We would like the faculty to be more *proactive* in governance rather than just *reacting* to administrative announcements.

Regularizing faculty participation in Board of Trustee meetings. Does this mean faculty being voting members on the board or just to regularize a way of

communicating? President Casey's suggestion--Four major subcommittees of Board (Academic Affairs, Student Life & Enrollment Management, Development and Advancement, Business and Finance), one almost always goes into executive session, so there are three committee meetings at which it would be ideal to have faculty members in attendance. Who should serve as faculty representatives to the Board? This may actually be two questions: who should attend the upcoming October Board meeting, and in the future, who should represent us? Bridget suggested that for the upcoming meeting we continue to have herself (Chair of the Faculty), Harry Brown (past Chair of Chairs) and Francesca Seaman (past Chair of COA), given that they began this discussion with the board and are committed to finishing this process. We agreed with this resolution for the time being, but will have further discussion about who would make sense as our continuing faculty representatives. The Governance Committee feels strongly that our faculty representatives to the Board should be elected, but we need to figure how they will report back to us and the faculty as a whole.

Governance Committee Meeting Minutes
Oct. 6, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Mark Kannowski, Bridget Gourley, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay. Guests for part of the meeting: Raj Bellani (Dean of Experiential Learning and Career Planning), Anne Harris (VPAA).

Reports from Committees

Review (Kannowski): Review Committee is still short one person. As long as they have a quorum they can still do work, but last week they had to cease work because people had to leave the meeting for various reasons. If they don't get two people to serve next semester, they will be under quorum for doing any reviews for the English Department. How can we as a committee put pressure on our colleagues to serve?

Student Academic Life (Alvarez)—The committee met with representatives from Multicultural Life to learn that some students are going hungry (mostly students of color) because they chose the least expensive Bon Appetit option and it wasn't sufficient for students who don't have other dining options. David reported that Christopher Welles is already working to address this issue.

Proposal for a Hubbard Center Faculty Advisory Board

Anne Harris and Raj Bellani joined us for this discussion. Anne shared a rough draft proposing the creation of a Hubbard Center Faculty Advisory Board, based on the Prindle Advisory Board. The purpose would be to have a committee to ensure we connect curriculum to practicum. Bridget suggested that the Prindle model might not be appropriate for this task. Is this a "governance" committee or a different kind of committee? What is the relationship between this and the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee (which deals with Extended Studies)? Anne sees this new committee dealing more with internships and career preparation. The former Committee on Experiential Learning was more an approval committee, but the idea is that this committee would be different and entail faculty oversight of the internship process. At the moment, there are a lot of different models about how we do internships and it's important to have faculty input here.

What has been the faculty input thus far in the creation of the Hubbard Center? Raj indicated that some faculty and departments have been more involved than others. This suggests that a more formal relationship would be valuable. Raj would like some direction. Previously there had been three committees giving input (which made coordination difficult), and then when we streamlined our governance system we got rid of them all, and now we need something. It would be great to have guidelines for internships.

The university is experiencing new challenges with students not in Honors Programs who want to create internships. Summer internships are *really* an issue: cost, credit, access, etc.

One of the Governance Committee concerns is that we have worked to streamline our governance structure, and now we're creating another committee. Is this an ad hoc committee that would "sunset" after its tasks are completed, or is this something that would have continuing activities? Could this be done by an existing committee? For example, align with the Curriculum Committee or be a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee?

We do agree that there needs to be faculty involvement and oversight over internships; that these activities need to be academic. Raj stated that he wants a stronger integration of academics and internships. Do we need a pre- and post-course to prepare students for the experience? Do we grant credit for internships? What about summer internships? He suggested that the Math Department has an interesting model. The Honors Programs already have models for integrating internships into the academic program; how can we have that for all students?

Do we have a structured assessment of how successful programs and internships are? Seems like we might need some of this information to be able to make informed decisions and recommendations. This information could then shape internship guidelines.

Is it really a Hubbard Center Advisory Board or a group to deal with internships?

There are also issues that the university needs to make decisions on (access, cost, academic component), and then Raj sees it as his job to carry out the directives.

Action. After discussion, we decided that it would be best to start with a Task Force. This group would be assembled by the Governance Committee, in conjunction with the VPAA. These two groups, in addition to Raj and the Curriculum Committee, could help to develop the relevant questions to be addressed. It will be important to have involvement of faculty experienced with internships (e.g., Directors of Honors Programs), as well as some who may question the value of internships. We can then see what the Task Force recommendations are and whether we have a need for a continuing committee to address these issues.

Proposal for Creation of an Advisory Board to the Office of Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (OURSCA)

Raj left and we had a discussion with Anne regarding the proposal forwarded by Amity Reading. Anne provided some background. She indicated that the upcoming library renovation has started conversations about potential space for the Center for Teaching and Learning and for an Office of Undergraduate Research. The ad hoc OURSCA Committee is an advocacy group for faculty who are doing student research, which is largely uncompensated.

Anne shared ideas about a "Flexible Six" proposal. The Board of Trustees is not in favor of a 3-2 load, which would require about 11 faculty positions (\$20 million) to enact. She offered an alternative that some might find more appealing and might accomplish similar goals. This is referred to as a Flexible Six, based on

our faculty having 6 “teaching credits/units.” The flexible sixth “unit” could include a way to credit faculty-student research, service learning, scholarly work, advising/counseling/mentoring of students, etc. This would give us a way to have accountability of the 6th unit and this activity could be included in a faculty member’s review file.

We discussed our concerns about creating another committee, after working to streamline faculty governance. We questioned whether we need a formal committee to do what this ad hoc group is already doing, which is advocating for faculty. Does it make sense to have an Advisory Board for an office that does not yet exist? Are there other ways to do this: for example, Allegheny helps coordinate student-faculty research with a really good website. If we create this as an official “Advisory Board,” will we need to have elections or appointments so that others (outside of the existing group) have the opportunity to participate?

Action. Do we want to invite Amity to attend a future meeting to discuss?

Presidential Search

We discussed faculty concern regarding how vital it is to have a “cultural competency” component in the Presidential Search, and we fear that the Board of Trustees does not understand how significant this issue is for many faculty and students.

Action. Pam will draft a memo to Kathy Vrabek, Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, trying to convey the import of the issue and making the recommendation that they have a consultant (perhaps Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, who spoke at last year’s Faculty Institute) work with them. Pam will send the draft memo to the entire Governance Committee for suggestions before sending it to Kathy Vrabek, on behalf of the Governance Committee.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Oct. 13, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom (chair), Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Approved previous meeting minutes and Pam will send to Terry Bruner (cc Bridget) to put on the university governance website.

Reports from committees

Curriculum (Scott)—Interested in working together with the Governance Committee on RAS and Opportunity Hire processes. They are working on language for Power/Privilege/Diversity requirement and changing language for existing requirements to make it all consistent.

Student Academic Life (David)—Dave Berque has arranged it so that Vince Greer and Vivie Nguyen now have access to midterm grades to support students who need assistance.

Review (Glen)—Continuing interviews for department chairs. Time for review of Dean of School of Music (specified in his contract); some discussion about what that might look like. Also the new version of the Academic Handbook is missing some language on the function of the Review Committee, so they are working on re-establishing it. Joint meeting with FDC about accountability if people no longer have to submit reports upon completion of PDF-funded projects. Still need a faculty member to serve this semester and two next semester.

This led to a discussion--Bridget is providing Mark Kannowski with a list of people eligible to serve on the Review Committee. It appears that we are reaching a crisis with regard to the committee being able to do its work. Perhaps the Governance Committee has to go before the faculty with a proposal: either someone steps up to serve or we reduce the committee size, and if the latter, we have to think about the implications (quorum size, etc.). Another option might be to approach a faculty member on another committee and ask them to serve, and then replace them on the other committee. Or is this committee so much work that it should be accompanied by reassigned time? We could also consider changing the committee (e.g., untenured members, reduce file size, set time limit on discussion on any one case, appointed committee members). Do we need to have a more open-ended discussion about our review process?

Action. Governance Committee will draft an email to the entire faculty pointing out the implications of this incomplete committee membership and the need for a broader discussion about our review and governance practices. This is a crisis. Governance Committee members should approach people individually whom we know have never served on COF/Review Committee and encourage them to serve.

FDC (Marnie)—Followed up with comments on joint issue with Review Committee; this needs continued discussion because it's a knotty question. May require a larger faculty discussion.

Hubbard Center Task Force.

Action. As the Task Force charge, we will use some of the language from Anne's draft: "The goal is to establish a broad discussion of the connections between the curriculum and the practicum at DePauw." We believe the Honors Program Directors (whose programs have an internship component) should be asked to serve and then we will put out a call to the faculty at large soliciting interested volunteers, from whom we will appoint two to three members. Pam will ask Jonathan Nichols-Pethick Michele Villinski, and Dan Gurnon to serve and she will run this by Anne Harris to see if she thinks there are any administrators or someone from the Hubbard Center who should also serve on the Task Force.

Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees—Those who attended at the October meeting will prepare a brief report to present at Faculty Meeting.

Continuation—What are we trying to accomplish with our representation? More interaction with and education of the Board. Shared governance.

Ideas for who should serve as faculty representatives to the Board--Faculty members from Strategic Planning Committee attend Winter Meeting, but how many of them and should some or all of them attend as observers at October and May meetings? Do faculty get the briefing book? Should the briefing book (or a condensed version of it) be more widely available to faculty? Should faculty representatives on the Board get a vote? (AAUP reports that at other schools—14% have voting faculty member on the BOT, 14% have non-voting faculty member on BOT.) How do we formalize their reporting back to the faculty at large? Concerns that at other institutions the BOT is having a larger role in determining faculty lines (and this dovetails with concerns regarding RAS and Opportunity Hire process). It would be good if we had a document prepared for the new president.

Action. Coming up with a formal document for the incoming president about our relationship with the BOT. Draft—Bridget will start a GoogleDoc draft and Lori has volunteered to help out.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, Oct. 27 (after Fall Break) from 8:45-10:00 a.m. in Julian 372—At that time we will have to finalize next Faculty Meeting agenda and prioritize other items for continued discussion and action.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
10/27/15

Present: David Alvarez, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

We finalized the order of the November Faculty Meeting agenda.

Reports from committees

Curriculum (Scott)—The Curriculum Committee revised language for distribution requirements. Both our committees are interested in working on reforming RAS.

Student Academic Life (David)—SAL further discussed the student “hunger problem” on campus. They are working with the Office of Student Life on vouchers for food and a survey of students’ awareness of eating options during Fall Break.

Hubbard Center Task Force

We will ask Jen Everett to represent Environmental Fellows for gender balance on the Task Force. Additional faculty appointments are Harry Brown and David Gellman. Pam will email all those who volunteered and those appointed, indicating that the latter should meet with Anne Harris and Raj Bellani, clarifying the Task Force issues to be addressed.

Faculty Representatives to Board of Trustees meeting.

We discussed who makes sense to serve as faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees’ (BOT) meeting. We concluded that the four faculty members directly elected to the Strategic Planning Committee should attend the BOT meeting and represent faculty interests. If one of these individuals can’t go, another faculty member on the Strategic Planning Committee could fill in, although three representatives rather than four would be fine. They should report back to the faculty at-large with a brief written report and an offer to answer questions at Faculty Meeting. When Pam met with President Casey to discuss this issue, she asked if the faculty representatives to the BOT meeting could get the briefing book, or a portion of it. The President requested time to consider this. The President indicated that he would like a way for the BOT and faculty to interact more meaningfully.

Coordinating governance work with the administration.

We would like to invite VPAA Anne Harris and President Casey to attend Governance Committee meetings once a month so that we can coordinate our shared governance. One committee member expressed a concern that we don’t have a clear faculty vision for what “the faculty” wants to pursue, but others responded that that’s why we have the formal committee structure in place.

Writing Committee

Rebecca Schindler, Director of the Writing Program, requested that the W Committee be able to change the language regarding faculty appointments to the committee, such that there is one faculty representative from each of the four following areas: Science & Math, Social Science, Arts, and Humanities. We discussed this request and various issues that it raises:

--Who does the appointments to the Writing Committee? (probably VPAA, but Handbook or new governance structure says it's three appointments by the Governance Committee).

--It seems odd to divide up Arts & Humanities when it's an artificial separation.

-- Would this change require a faculty vote, given that we just changed our governance and committee structure?

We decided that we are not inclined to change the committee's structure at this moment. One concern is that it is already difficult to find faculty members willing to serve on committees; specifying a narrow criterion for eligible members might make that even harder. Any committee, including the Writing Committee, can invite additional individuals to participate in its meetings and work, so they could ask for input from a faculty member from specific curricular areas if they so desired.

One Governance Committee member asked if we could add the word "assessment" to the Writing Committee charge. We tended to agree that this was a good point, but then do we need to do this for all committees/groups that have responsibility for graduation requirements? We would like the Writing Committee to share information more broadly with the faculty regarding the assessment they've already done and are engaging in (e.g., Institute for international students, first-year writing assessment done this year). It would be great if we could receive a written report and the W Committee could present a brief oral report at Faculty Meeting. We did not fully consider Rebecca's other requests that we revise the committee name and charge. Pam will talk with Rebecca Schindler and ask the VPAA about assessment more generally.

Ad hoc Office of Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activity (OURSCA) Committee

We appreciate the work that this ad hoc group has already done and would like to encourage them to keep doing what they're doing. Before we make a decision about turning this into a regular committee, we have a number of questions:

--Does the OURSCA ad hoc group have a CUR representative?

--How do we have an Advisory Board for an office that doesn't exist?

--Would this committee be redundant? How does its work overlap with that of the Hubbard Center Task Force and/or FDC?

--As the group exists at the moment, it is self-selected. Would an official committee require broader representation?

--What would they imagine doing and what would the outcome be? Some would like to see something broader than a mission statement. We would like to know about the "action plan" they've created.

-- What are the revised expectations in the university Handbook for student-faculty research?

Pam will invite Amity (or another representative) to a future Governance Committee meeting for 15 minutes of discussion.

Release time for Chair of the Faculty

We endorse the reassigned time Bridget has received for next semester to compensate for the job of Chair of the Faculty, but we also would like to consider bigger issues. Has the job gotten too big (e.g., having to take on Faculty Institute as well other duties)? Is there a job description? The Academic Handbook just specifies that this position runs Faculty Meeting, but not more than this. Maybe talk to past Chairs of the Faculty like Howard Brooks, David Harvey, and Dave Berque to get their perception on how the job responsibilities have changed.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 3, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Updates from the chair. Pam has contacted all faculty members of the newly appointed Hubbard Center Task Force, the directly elected faculty members of the Strategic Planning Committee about attending the Board of Trustees meetings, Amity Reading regarding the OURSCA proposal, and invited VPAA Anne Harris and President Brian Casey to attend Governance Committee meetings once a month.

Approval of previous meeting minutes. Accepted without change.

Brief reports from committees. There were none.

Review Committee Discussion. We had received requests from the Review Committee to address two issues.

Appendix B job descriptions. Mark Kannowski's email indicates that detailed job descriptions include Winter Term responsibilities, but Winter Term obligations for faculty have been temporarily suspended. Another issue is that the Committee on Experiential Learning (CEL) is supposed to have oversight over Winter Term courses and review the program every year, but the CEL has ceased to exist in our new governance structure. When the faculty voted to make this change to Winter Term, there was a statement about it being re-evaluated in a few years. Finally, Mark asked "what are the Winter Term obligations for faculty?...who decides what faculty obligations are so that they can be included in the Detailed Job Descriptions..."

Action. Regarding Appendix B, for the moment, the reference to WT in Appendix B job description needs to be changed, perhaps to include something like: "This teaching obligation has been temporarily suspended as of..... until its review, and this requirement may change subject to further university action."

Regarding Review of WT, this seems appropriately delegated to the newly formed Hubbard Center Task Force. They can make a recommendation on mechanism (i.e., whom and how) for WT Evaluation.

Regarding faculty WT obligations—Although the Governance Committee does not have the authority to rewrite job descriptions and determine faculty workload, we would like the opportunity to weigh in on this decision and not have it totally determined by the administration.

Review of administrators. Review Committee is conducting a review of the Dean of the School of Music, which coincides with the conclusion of his term of appointment as stipulated in the appointment letter. This review of an administrator is an opportunity to create a clear, formal, transparent process for faculty involvement in selection and review of administrators. This is offered in the spirit of enhanced collaboration and shared governance between faculty and

administration, providing us with an opportunity to better understand and appreciate the good work that administrators do and to simultaneously hold them accountable. Our goal would be to write a policy recommendation for the Academic Handbook that we could take to the faculty at-large for approval.

This led to a discussion of potential faculty involvement in broader administrative reviews (e.g., growth in administration in Student Life; how is effectiveness evaluated?). We have little understanding of how administrative reviews are currently conducted. Is there an announcement when an administrator is reviewed (similar to the one for faculty review) so that faculty, students, and staff who have input can submit it? However, our primary interest is in the top administrative positions that have a direct impact on faculty: SOM Dean, VPAA, and President.

A related issue is the growth in administration, administrative structure, shifting of offices and reallocation of resources, especially with new president coming in. Would the Strategic Planning Committee be involved in this?

Action. Lori will inquire what the current administrative review process is. David will share the models of administrative review at other institutions (he sent us email links). Pam will resend document she put together regarding AAUP recommendations about faculty role in administrative hiring and review. She will also send a note to David Newman on the Strategic Planning Committee regarding the issue of administrative growth and structure.

Bridget and Lori are creating a Google Doc regarding other institutions' practices with faculty representation to the Board of Trustees.

Writing Committee. Rebecca Schindler had sent an email with a number of requests for the Writing Committee. Last week we discussed the committee membership issue. This week we addressed the other two issues regarding a name change and revision to its charge.

Name change--We agreed to change the name to the Writing Curriculum Committee. This will have to be proposed for a formal faculty vote.

Charge—The proposed modification adds one phrase (underlined): “Oversees all aspects of the writing program and writing curriculum, including supporting the W competency...and supports the Writing in the Major (WIM) programs ...and the curricular aspects of the first-year seminar program (FYS).” We had a discussion of the Writing Committee’s “ownership” of the FYS. Do they oversee *all* of FYS or only the *writing* portion of this course? Who approves FYS courses? At the moment it’s the Writing Committee, but should this be the purview of MAO/Course and Calendar Committee instead? S used to be a more significant portion of FYS and some of us would like to see it reintegrated. The Writing Committee charge also includes “reviewing guidelines and the (W) program more generally.” This led to a discussion about program evaluation/assessment. It seems like W is engaging in a variety of impressive assessments and we would love for the university as a whole to know more about this. In addition, when we established the FYS program, there was supposed to be an evaluation of this at some point. Is this the W Committee responsibility?

Action. Pam will talk with Rebecca to share our decisions and questions, and to brainstorm.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 10, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Guests: Craig Carter (Student Body President), Anna Gawlik (VP for Student Life)

Our student guests indicated that students have been planning since the summer to have another Day of Dialogue. Student Government and Renee Madison had been planning for a half-day (4-8 pm) on April 6, with a structure similar to a White Privilege Conference that Anna attended. They received a lot of negative feedback from students, wanting this to be an entire day and including the entire student body (late afternoon would exclude student-athletes). Craig and Anna realize that cancelling a day of class every year may not be sustainable. Their idea for next semester's program is that it would start with a keynote speaker; then there would be workshops for the entire campus community (faculty, staff, and students) divided by different topics, and people could choose what topic to engage in. The workshops would be repeated so that people could attend more than one. These workshops would be led by outside facilitators. At the end of the day there would be caucuses, separated by faculty, students, staff, and then there would be a debriefing. One suggestion is that the rest of the day would be something fun and positive, although not all students are in favor of this last component. The students would see this as a sustainable model for this day being integrated into the university calendar every year.

We asked what assistance they are requesting from the Governance Committee. They would like help in achieving the cancellation of classes on April 6. They have already checked the university calendar and there are no special events planned for that day (except for softball and lacrosse games). In addition, they would like faculty representatives on the planning committee. Some suggested that this seems a task more appropriate to the Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC); Craig sits on that committee and is in communication with them.

We recognize that the Governance Committee does not have the power to cancel classes, but we could bring this to the faculty for a vote at the December Faculty Meeting. We asked the students for a short written description of their proposal, which we could then provide to the faculty at-large at Faculty Meeting. We also suggested that it would be helpful if it included an overarching goal for the end of the day with an action plan for follow-up steps.

Other issues that arose during the discussion: How to balance academic freedom/free speech and respect for others; difficulty of having a genuine dialogue for fear of being labeled as racist or sexist, etc. This should probably be coordinated with the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee; if this is to occur every year, we

need it integrated into academic calendar. Changing day of the week every year so doesn't always hit the same classes.

We thanked our guests for the good work they've already done and excused them so we could discuss a plan to respond to their requests. 1.) Faculty representation on the planning committee. We decided it would be a good idea to send a joint email request with the Diversity and Equity Committee asking for faculty volunteers to serve on the planning committee. DEC would then make appointments. We suggest that there be some representation from DEC on the planning committee, but this can be coordinated with the student planning committee. 2.) Should we cancel class? The Governance Committee endorses the idea cancelling classes and having a day committed to this. We decided that the Governance Committee would present this proposal at the December Faculty Meeting and Craig Carter can be present to answer questions, if faculty votes to allow him to speak. The Governance Committee should be to be prepared to present the proposal and respond to questions, if the faculty vote down allowing the student to speak. This will be on the Faculty Governance portion of the agenda and will include the written student proposal in the appendix.

Action. Pam will contact Craig Carter and Anna Gawlik to share our ideas and request their brief written proposal to share with faculty. She will also contact DEC asking if they would be willing to send a joint email with the Governance Committee soliciting faculty volunteers for appointment to the DePauw Dialogue 2.0 planning committee.

Nov. 17 Open Meeting—At the last Chairs' Meeting there was a question regarding whether Power/Privilege/Diversity is the right title for this new general education requirement. What is the requirement? One faculty member concern was that the title was daunting: does a course have to address *all three* components? There was actually more concern about the "International Experience" requirement, which was not clearly defined. FDC is planning workshops for the summer so people can get together and maybe their collaborative work could help to define and "norm" the courses. There seem to be at least two issues—language for catalog (which can be succinct) and a set of guidelines for faculty about what courses meeting this requirement should entail or address (like the guidelines that exist for W courses). The Curriculum Committee sees itself as responsible for the former. Who is taking responsibility for the latter? Would it be the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee? We would still like to have some discussion about what we expect of these courses.

We suggested that this could be a topic for the Nov. 17 Open Meeting. We could have representatives from FDC, Curriculum, and Course and Calendar Oversight Committees. We would view this as an opportunity for these committees to elicit faculty input so that the committees can then to do their parts regarding this new requirement.

Action. Pam will contact these committees and ask if they will have members present who can participate in the Open Meeting.

Ideas for future meetings. 1.) Presidential Search document has “interesting” paragraph about president “guiding” our discussion of a “teacher-scholar” model, but is this inconsistent with ongoing discussion of “flexible six” model?
2.) RAS, diversity, Opportunity Hires.

Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 17, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Meeting minutes

The minutes from the two previous Governance Committee meetings were approved. Pam will send them to Terry Bruner for posting on the Faculty Governance website.

Admissions Committee

Bridget conveyed an inquiry from John Berry, chair of the Admissions Committee. He has asked what the faculty role is in setting admissions standards. Does the Admission Committee determine *or* advise regarding admissions requirements? A brief blurb on our Faculty Governance website describes the committee's role as providing "perspective when changes to admission standards are considered"; however, in the Academic Handbook Appendix—Constitution and Authority of the Faculty—faculty duties include "the fixing of academic requirements for admission, subject to the final authority of the board." It would be good to determine where the directive for admissions is coming from. The Curriculum Committee has oversight of the Admissions Committee. Perhaps we should consult with the Curriculum Committee regarding how we should proceed to give faculty more meaningful input to admissions. This seems to be a structural problem. Someone reported that Tim Good worked really hard on this when he chaired the Admission Committee, but nothing ever happened. Does the Admissions Committee decide what the faculty want in an incoming class, and then this information goes to the Strategic Planning Committee, because the latter deals with budget, which also needs to be considered? This would require a change our governance structure because currently Admissions reports to Curriculum Committee. The problem in the past has been that the Curriculum Committee has had too much on its plate and some things would fall by the wayside, so that's why we have additional committees like the Admissions Committee.

As far as a governance structure and reporting strategy, Sheryl suggested one option: that the Admissions Committee gathers input from faculty regarding desired admissions requirements, then it makes a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee, which then passes on its recommendation to the Strategic Planning Committee. We determined that we would like to consider this suggestion further before making any final recommendation.

Additionally, John Berry will be going on leave next semester so we will have to appoint a replacement to the Admission Committee.

Action. Bridget will talk with John Berry to clarify his question. Is he asking whether the Admission Committee has to come back to faculty at-large for input and vote or if the committee can make recommendations on own, or is the question regarding the authority of the Admission Committee with respect to the Office of Admission and the administration. (Marnie and Pam ran into John at another meeting and he indicated that the issue is the latter.)

A related concern was finding the new version of the Academic Handbook, which is not yet online. Bridget indicated that Academic Affairs will address this in December when they have more time. To find the current draft of Academic Handbook, one should see the April 2015 Faculty Meeting Minutes.

Action. Pam will contact Anne Harris and urge her to make getting the updated version of the Academic Handbook online so that all faculty members have access to the same version.

Writing Committee Update

Pam summarized her meeting with Rebecca Schindler. Pam conveyed that the Governance Committee agreed to officially change the committee name to the Writing Curriculum Committee and will bring this before the faculty for a vote. With regard to assessment of the writing program, Rebecca stated her understanding is that Mike Sinowitz submitted annual reports to the Curriculum Committee and Academic Affairs. The writing program is also assessed via questions on the student opinion surveys and syllabus review. The Writing Committee sees its charge including all curricular aspects of the First-Year Seminar (FYS) program. To approve FYS course proposals, the Writing Committee uses the guidelines that the faculty voted on. If the Governance Committee would like a broader evaluation of the new FYS program, Rebecca suggested that the Curriculum Committee could direct the Writing Committee to do it. Rebecca indicated that she and Susan Hahn are already working on a long-term assessment strategy for the Writing Program.

Rebecca also noted that Rebecca Alexander will be on leave in the fall and Governance will need to appoint a replacement for her on the Writing Curriculum Committee (Rebecca Schindler suggested it be someone from the Arts).

Bridget noted that she would like to see each committee write a 2-page summary at the end of every year indicating what its major activities were and including suggestions for the next year.

Action. We will put a motion on the next Faculty Meeting agenda for a formal name change for the Writing Committee.

Meeting with the president and VPAA

We would like to meet regularly with the president and VPAA to coordinate our shared governance work, but Tuesday mornings don't work for the administrators. People agreed that a Thursday lunch time would work.

Action. Pam will contact President Casey and VPAA Anne Harris to get on their calendars.

Announcement

Amity Reading will send us the Ad Hoc OURSCA group action plan, and she or someone from the group will plan to attend part of our Dec. 1 meeting.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 24, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Approval of previous minutes.

Faculty meeting agenda. Pam presented a draft proposal for the December Faculty Meeting . Bridget will modify to include old Handbook language.

Admissions Committee. Update that John Berry's question had to do with authority of faculty to set admissions criteria. His idea is to have an open forum and see what faculty want, and then work with administration to see their response; try to hammer out faculty role in the admissions process. Bridget said Cindy Babington has indicated lots of inquiries regarding her admissions presentation so she is considering doing another. Maybe this can be a topic for a lengthier January discussion: how can faculty have input into admissions?

Lunch with Anne on Thurs., Dec. 10. Pam emailed Anne regarding having the latest version of the Academic Handbook online and Anne said she will prioritize this in Academic Affairs. Governance Committee members discussed potential topics for our Dec. 10 lunch meeting with Anne Harris. Although a number of interesting topics were raised, we didn't feel that the Governance Committee had positions on all of them yet and we didn't just want to ask the VPAA about her positions or suggestions.

We decided on the following: What is the VPAA preparing for the Winter Board of Trustees meeting? We would then like to discuss the process of the Governance Committee and the VPAA working together on issues of shared concern. We will share our list of potential topics with the VPAA and then plan how we can work together to address these issues by the end of the year.

OURSCA. We will meet with Amity Reading and possibly other members of the Ad Hoc OURSCA group at our Dec. 1 meeting. We discussed issues we would like clarified:

--Lori submitted a "write in" suggestion that this be named a "working group" rather than "task force" or "advisory board."

--We want to indicate that we appreciate their enthusiasm and we're supportive of their efforts to raise the visibility of this high impact practice.

--We also had some questions for the group:

--Has this group already decided how integrating research will be implemented? Should every student have an independent research experience or should research be integrated into our regular classroom and lab experiences?

--Does this add another layer of administration and require more release time?
What do we already have in place that we could better utilize and coordinate? For example, how could this fit in with Hubbard Center, FDC, and CTL?

--How will the Ad Hoc group solicit expressions of interest from other faculty, especially those who might have differing perspectives or other models?

--If this represents a culture change and has institutional commitment, does this need to get included in tenure and promotion review criteria? This proposal is consistent with the advertisement for a new president suggesting that the university is promoting a "teacher-scholar model."

Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Dec. 1, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay
Guests: Dan Gurnon, Lydia Marshall, Amity Reading (for Ad Hoc OURSCA Committee)

Ad Hoc OURSCA (Office of Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity) Group. The Governance Committee invited representatives from the Ad Hoc OURSCA Committee to meet to discuss their proposal. We thanked them for their work and indicated that we appreciate their enthusiasm.

Q: What do you want from Governance Committee?

A: Official OK from faculty governance system to have a committee. They've gotten approval from administration. They want to go through faculty governance channels to have buy-in there.

Q: How would you get expressions of interest from other faculty and get others involved in the OURSCA Committee or Group?

A: They want to reach out to the divisions to have a representative from each curricular area. "If we build it, they will come." If we make this more visible, more faculty might get involved.

Q: Do you see this becoming a permanent committee, with faculty elections and appointments?

A: They do want it to become permanent part of governance. They want to create an Office of Undergraduate Research and a corresponding committee that gives input to the director of that office. Seven of 13 schools in GLCA already have offices of undergraduate research.

Q: Has this group already decided how integrating research will be implemented? Is it extra-, co-, curricular? Is this still open?

A: Still part of the discussion. Could also involve the integration of the practicum component into particular majors. Would rely on partnerships with the Hubbard Center.

Q: Would you consider internships part of this?

A: Depends on the discipline; would work with departments to do whatever is appropriate for that particular area. For example, maybe a journalism internship would count. A student doing an off-campus research experience might be better served by going through both OURSCA and Hubbard Center rather than just the Hubbard Center. Another thing that's not happening in a concerted way is encouraging students to attend research conferences to present.

Q: How would this interface with FDC?

A: FDC addresses student-faculty research grants, but there really is no place to address primarily *student* research. They want to avoid being redundant. See OURSCA as a “connector” between faculty and students interested in research; getting more students to expect a research experience and having them actively approaching faculty rather than just vice versa. How this would actually be done is one of the things the committee would need to discuss.

Q: Do we hire another person in the administration to do this? Is there release time? How do other institutions handle this?

A: Advice they’ve received is that you really want faculty rather than administrators heading this. University is trying to hire a grants person. That individual could be the co-director of OURSCA. Release time would really still need to be discussed. Ongoing conversations about 3-2 and library renovation (which could produce the space). At other institutions, it’s often a faculty member with 1 course release and a staff member with varying degrees of involvement.

Q: Why not mix this in with the Hubbard Center?

A: This isn’t just about off-campus activity. The Hubbard Center also doesn’t currently address “creative activity.”

Q: There are concerns about additional costs, but could this potentially save some money in eliminating redundancy (e.g., every Honors Program has a staff assistant)?

A: Yes. Could be more efficient to have someone in charge of integrating a variety of activities that often fall between the cracks.

Q: What’s the relationship between OURSCA and faculty development process (e.g., Faculty Development Coordinator, Dean of Faculty)?

A: The OURSCA group not trying to discourage faculty research without students. They want to be a support for connecting students and faculty in research. Grants Writer could help faculty be aware of funding out there and help them apply, but this person also would have responsibilities outside of this.

Q: Three worries:

1. Committee membership is currently self-selected. We would feel better if before proceeding there was an open call for other interested faculty. (The OURSCA folks seemed receptive to this.)
2. Also self-selected charge.
3. Does it make sense to have an Advisory Board to office that doesn’t exist? Does this become a backdoor process that others can use to get what they want? Would prefer the term Task Force or Working Group (they were fine with that).

Q: How do we deal with potential greater interest from students than faculty can serve?

A: If the reward and recognition structure were different, it might attract greater faculty interest. It would be good to have an office to keep track of this; advocate for compensation and support for faculty and students in research.

Other suggestions

--Survey faculty to see what research is already being done.

--Presidential search document states that we're looking to hire a new president who can lead us in promoting a "teacher scholar model"; how does OURSCA group fit with that? (This might be quite different from Flex Six or 3-2 model).

Discussion

What did we think? They seem to be open to our suggestions—broader faculty representation, open to how undergraduate research and creative activity would be implemented.

Should this be part of the regular governance structure? Might be good so that its not a "hidden" committee and would be seen as a regular type of service. Would have broader representation.

What role do we play in linking this up to other structures (e.g., FDC, Hubbard Center)? Links practicum to curriculum. Links faculty and administration. Could streamline staff positions. Helps to coordinate activities. How would the Grants Writer link up with the Hubbard Center?

Does Governance Committee have any authority over this? Could create an ad hoc appointed committee. Could move to a standing committee if it takes off. To put in the bylaws we would have to give advance notice at faculty meeting. We don't have the power to create an Office of Undergraduate Research, but we can endorse their proposal. Work *with* the Hubbard Center rather than this being *within* the Hubbard Center.

People felt it was a tad premature for an official committee, but we would like to open up the OURSCA membership to other faculty members. Encourage them to keep doing what they're doing. They didn't come to us for the official creation of a new committee in the Handbook and governance structure, but they wanted to make sure they went through the faculty official governance group. We want to encourage them with their continued work and have them invite other faculty members to join their group to get broader representation.

Other business. We will meet with VPAA Anne Harris next week. Our topic will be what she is planning to present at the Winter Board of Trustees meeting. We also can talk with her about our meeting with the OURSCA group and get her input in terms of structure, funding, 3-2/Flex Six. Last week we generated a list of topics we would like to jointly work on with Anne in the future and the Governance Committee gave permission for Pam to send that list to Anne.

Minutes. The minutes of previous meeting were not only approved, but were deemed "beautiful" and "moving."

Governance Committee Meeting
Minutes
Dec. 10, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Mark Kannowski, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay
Guest: Anne Harris (VPAA)

Spring committee replacement positions. Need someone for Rebecca Alexander on WCC, John Berry on Admissions, one-semester replacement for Mark Kannowski on Review Committee, plus an additional 18-month member. Carrie Klaus for asked about procedure for replacing Jim Mills on FDC deliberations when his own proposal is being reviewed and we gave her the “go ahead” to do so.

Coordinated work with the Administration. We had invited Anne Harris to meet with us to discuss issues of joint interest. Anne reported that the Board of Trustees (BOT) winter meeting agenda is still being discussed and hasn't been finalized. She is not sure she'll be addressing the entire BOT; the VPAA doesn't always present to the entire board. Anne reported that a recent big issue has been the McDermond Center and the Task Force Report. Anne has not implemented all of the Task Force recommendations. There are external advisory boards to both McDermond Center and Pulliam Center, which complicates things in terms of governance. As announced at Faculty Meeting, the university will be doing a search for a Director of the McDermond Center; Michele Villinski will still be Director of the Management Fellows program. Task Force recommendations—expanding size of class, revising/updating curriculum, four tenure-lines in Business. Governance Committee members inquired whether the Task Force report can be made public so that others know what it says. There is a potential tension in terms of governance because of external advisory and internal advisory boards, and a director. Anne believes they have a working solution. For example, one idea is to have visiting professorships rather than all new tenure lines in Management Fellows.

Talked about the need to diversify students in Honors Programs. DePauw is one of the only institutions to host two Posse Scholar classes and a Bonner class, but we don't celebrate this enough. So much hangs on the new Power, Privilege, & Diversity requirements and Global Crossroads initiative.

BOT has a genuine desire to better understand our curriculum.

3-2-1 conversation. If Anne gets to talk to the BOT, she would like them to see what a current faculty workload looks like and how much more we could do if we had this Flexible Sixth course. Number one thing faculty said they would do with the “flexible 1” would be student-faculty research. This is not a “done deal.” This might be a joint conversation for the Strategic Planning Committee and Governance Committee. 3-2-1 would help DePauw be competitive; also relates to campus

climate, allowing faculty to have more interaction with students and be recognized for it.

Library. One more try at a big renovation. About \$4.5-5 million away. “Space of academic tradition on campus.” Access and collaboration. Some incredible plans have been drawn up. Two ideas—reading room in the back and an entrance onto Indiana Street that opens us up to housing in that area.

Academic Mission. New gen ed requirement opened up the conversation. We’re thinking about the kind of community we are and want to be. Have more discussion about and resources for pedagogy.

Items for the future. The Curriculum Committee will be evaluating Winter Term. RAS and Opportunity Hire process—university is researching it this year.

Philadelphia Center. Needs a committee to address: Philly Center, GLCA approved program, run by Hope College. Hope College will hire only Christian faculty, and this came up with hiring a new director of the Philly Center. Some colleges will not participate/send students to Philly Program any more. What will our university response be? Let interested students know about Hope’s policy and let them make an informed decision about whether or not they personally want to participate? What committee should address this? (Anne shared with Pam a copy of documentation presented at the GLCA presidents’ meeting regarding this issue. Pam could share this with everyone or just send most relevant sections.)

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
2/16/16

Present: Meryl Altman, David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Guest: Anne Harris, VPAA

McDermond Center update. Anne had already shared with us the McDermond Center Task Force Report and the January Update on the Task Force Report. The new McDermond Center Director position will be somewhat similar to Andy Cullison's at Prindle. The university is working with a search firm. Anne wants us to think very carefully about these center director positions and their integration into the university (its governance structure, its review cycles, and more). She will send us the position description. The Management Fellows Program is currently very white and male, and we would like it to be more diverse.

Anne came to the Governance Committee today because she is seeking an "at-large" faculty member for the search committee and she would like us to appoint someone. Andy Cullison is the chair of the search committee. Search committee--Michele Villinski, Carol Smith, Dave Becker (McDermond Advisory Board), Mark Rabideau (21C Music), Brad Kelsheimer, someone from Economics Department (to be nominated by Economics Dept. Chair), Jonathan Nichols-Pethick, Harry Brown (was on the Task Force); there will be student reps as well. This will be an open search. It would be good to have someone who would bring diversity on the search committee. Might also be good to have a scientist, given that Anne mentioned scientific entrepreneurship is a booming area. If we feel there needs to be two additional faculty members, Anne is open to it.

Questions:

--Timeframe? Good to have someone on the search committee in place two weeks from now. Search will be complete by end of spring semester.

--What exactly is the relationship between Management Fellows Director and McDermond Center Director? Both report to VPAA. McDermond Center more outward looking and serving entire student body; Management Fellows focused on curriculum and Management Fellows students. The people in these two positions need to get along.

--Academic experience necessary for Center Director? It's open at the moment.

--How does this "entrepreneurship" actually get integrated into the student experience rather than just being another add-on? Our students are already overcommitted. Anne agrees that it needs to be integrated into the curriculum. We

need more coordination of speakers and events. Outreach to students who wouldn't normally see themselves there.

--Does the Management Fellows Program allow lateral entry? If not, how "open" is it to all qualified students? That's a major motivator of having a Center Director, separate from the Management Fellows Program. To appeal to students not in the Management Fellows Program and who might be non-Economics majors.

--How are the Honors Programs a part of our regular review cycle? Someone suggested that director reviews could be comparable to chair reviews; another suggested that it fits in with our ongoing discussion about developing a policy for review of administrators. How do we periodically review the curricula of the Honors Programs? How do we have this conversation as a campus? Are these Honors Programs "elitist?"

--Larger issue of semester-long internships. Do we see them as a regular part of an *academic* curriculum? How are they contributing to students' *education*? This continues to be the work of the Hubbard Center Task Force.

--Can the McDermond Center documents be shared with faculty at large? This might be a good step in the spirit of transparency and shared governance. Maybe it fits in with the search and bringing candidates to campus, updating people about what's going on. Anne will talk with Michele Villinski about this.

The Philadelphia Center. No update on The Philadelphia Center situation.

Curriculum Committee. Scott reported the committee discussed RAS. Some on Curriculum Committee feel that it (Curriculum Committee) should be the group to address the more long-term curricular and hiring issues. Maybe move faculty position requests to the fall rather than the spring (when RAS traditionally requested them). Still considering and looking at how to prevent conflict of interests and remove people from the voting when their department has a position request in.

Committee minutes. Bridget shared that faculty meeting minutes are on DePauw's Faculty Governance website and therefore open to the world, which seems ok. But she suggested that perhaps our committee meeting minutes should be open to only DePauw faculty members. We may be moving over to Box.

Writing Coordinating Committee. Needs a faculty replacement. We will wait until next week to act on this.

Review Committee. Meryl announced that there will be an open meeting next Tuesday at 4:00 with two topics: 1.) Changes to the Handbook to formalize inclusive pedagogy as part of good teaching. 2.) Appointment of a subcommittee to review student opinion survey.

Student Academic Life. David reported that the VPAA asked them to consider campus bias incidents and the reporting process for these. They are considering how to make this information public so the community knows what's going on without violating privacy. Bridget suggested an end of the year summary like we do with campus crime, as required by the Clery Act.

Faculty Development Committee. Jim reported that FDC is talking about how to include a statement supporting diversity and inclusiveness. Where does the money come from to support this? Also coordinating with Glen on Review about this. An additional question is whether FDC grants automatically go into one's personnel review file.

Action. Pam will write a draft email requesting nominations (including self-nominations) for McDermond Center Director search committee member(s).

Action. Pam will contact Jonathan Nichols-Pethick, Chair of the Hubbard Center Task Force, to see how the group is progressing and to indicate that Anne can facilitate their access to data, if necessary.

Action. Pam will also write a note to Kathy Vrabeck, chair of the presidential search committee, encouraging the search to be open at the end for the three final candidates who come to campus, if this is at all possible. If not, we would suggest that at least a larger group of faculty be invited for visits/interviews with the final three. The Governance Committee could help in identifying faculty for this role.

Action. Bridget will write a sentence revising the Governance Committee description indicating that this group meets once a month with the President and VPAA.

Next meeting. Tuesday, Feb. 23 with former and current Chairs of the Faculty.

Questions for past Chairs of the Faculty.

What *should* the job be and what is the *perception* of the job?

What are the job tasks? Intellectual tasks vs. minutia?

Have the requirements expanded? Does it require administrative support?

Other compensation (e.g., release time)?

How do we make the job appealing?

Announcements.

Bridget announced that Friday, Feb. 26 is the faculty meeting agenda deadline.

Pam encouraged committees to get their meeting minutes to Terry Bruner so she can post them on the Faculty Governance website.

Tuesday, March 1 Governance Committee meeting will be a lunch meeting with President Casey and Anne Harris in the Administration Building.

Faculty Governance
Meeting Minutes
Feb. 23, 2016

Present: Meryl Altman, David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Guests: Dave Berque, Howard Brooks, David Harvey

Chair of the Faculty role.

Governance Committee met with three past Chairs of the Faculty and the current Chair of the Faculty to discuss the position. The conclusions from the discussion were that the position has changed significantly over time. The original purpose was to have a faculty member running the faculty meeting rather than an administrator doing it. Increasing duties for this position have come in a top-down fashion from the administration. There is the perception among some Board of Trustee members and administrators that this is the most powerful faculty leadership position, the “voice of the faculty,” and the “point person” to contact about any faculty governance issue.

Regarding the workload, it has varied from a large amount of work to a very, very large amount of work. Running faculty meetings is work, but when additional things come up (e.g., curricular revision, a grievance case) it becomes a lot of work and entails the emotional/social work of dealing with colleagues who have strongly divergent points of view. The workload is somewhat unpredictable. Sometimes a research component can take a significant amount of time (e.g., having to look through the archives to find precedents). There was general agreement that the most painful part of the job is elections and filling the committee roster.

Questions that we considered included the following: How do we want the president and VPAA to hear from the faculty? Who speaks for the faculty? Does the position merit compensation (e.g., a course release)? Are there tasks that could be off-loaded from the Chair of the Faculty?

Recommendations—there might be some room for adjustment in elections. An Academic Affairs administrative assistant could probably help with creating the ballot (although this would still require input from the Chair of Faculty). The perception that the Chair of the Faculty speaks for the faculty needs to be debunked, as often as possible. But then who does speak for the faculty? Perhaps it should be up to the Faculty Governance Committee to assess faculty opinion and report out.

The job responsibilities have grown and we can either continue to define it as it currently stands or scale back the position and just have the person run faculty meetings.

McDermond Center Director search committee.

From the nominations we received, we appointed Suman Balasubramanian from Math and Angela Flury from English. Pam will let Andy Cullison and Anne Harris know.

Next week's meeting. Tuesday, March 1 from 12:40-2:00 with the President and VPAA in the Administration Building.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 8, 2016

Present: Meryl Altman, David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

New president. We decided to send Mark McCoy a congratulatory note and invite him to attend a meeting with us some time this semester.

Tenzer Center Director Search Committee. We will put out a call for two at-large faculty members to serve on this committee. We believe it would be good to have someone from Communication and/or Media.

Writing Coordinating Committee. Michael Seaman has been appointed as a replacement for the rest of the semester.

Chair of the Faculty position. Concern that the position has grown and become too burdensome; too many tasks have come down from the administration. Some committee members are uncomfortable with the perception that this is the most powerful faculty position and “voice of the faculty.” Seems like the “voice of the faculty” should be the Faculty Governance Committee. Need to have adequate staff support for the person in this position. Not bad for Chair of the Faculty to be the “point person,” but with the recognition that the individual is a “point person” and not the voice of the faculty; that he or she will take issues to the appropriate committees. We now have a Governance Committee that can address issues that previously had no clear place to go (e.g., a body to appoint faculty reps to search committees) and the Chair of the Faculty can direct the issues to this committee.

Could the position be split? Someone who runs Faculty Meeting and someone else who sits on the other committees (Faculty Governance and Strategic Planning)? Potential problems of coordinating the tasks and establishing this as a practice for the future. Better to have an institutional structure in place rather than structure it around individual personalities and preferences.

Could we change who runs elections? Current and former Chairs of the Faculty indicated this was the most onerous part of the job. Could an administrative staff person help to run this? Challenge for a staff person when she has to tell a faculty member that he or she is not eligible to run for a position; puts them in an awkward position. Handbook reads that Chair of Faculty can appoint an assistant to help run elections and that VPAA will provide administrative support; seems like things are already in place.

Course release? If it's this much work, it seems like the position merits release time as compensation. On the other hand, if the position is restructured somewhat, then perhaps this wouldn't be necessary. Governance Committee would like to endorse one course reassigned time per year for Chair of the Faculty, with this arrangement to be reviewed periodically. What about similar compensation for

Chair of the Review Committee? If we adopt Flex Six, this might be less of an issue because service might count as one's flexible sixth "credit."

Day of Dialogue. Craig Carter asked if Governance was working on document to make Day of Dialogue permanent. I told him no, but would be happy to work with Student Government and suggested they start a proposal and we could coordinate with us, DEC, and the administration. Ask Course and Calendar Oversight to take this up.

We approved meeting minutes from Feb. 16, 2016.

Action. Pam will draft an email to Anne Harris with our recommendation for the Chair of the Faculty to be given one course reassigned time in compensation for the extra work the position entails. Pam will communicate with Craig Carter and Chair of the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee about coordinating future Days of Dialogue.

Future

We will meet next week to appoint Tenzer Center Director search committee members.

We will probably need the April 19 meeting to make faculty member appointments to committees.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 15, 2016

Present: Meryl Altman, David Alvarez, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Reports. Pam reported that she contacted Jonathan Nichols-Pethick regarding the Hubbard Center Task Force's progress thus far. He noted that a challenge has been finding a time to meet with a group this large. Eric Edberg for Course & Calendar Oversight Committee reported that they plan on evaluating this year's DePauw Dialogue and if it is determined that it should continue, the committee will move quickly to put this on next year's calendar. Anne Harris, David Guinee (Chair of Curriculum Committee), Rich Cameron (Chair of RAS), and Pam Propsom met to discuss revising the RAS process. Dave's idea is that Curriculum Committee should be in charge of long-range planning and therefore do the review of tenure-track lines and opportunity hires. We agreed and Dave will draft some initial language revising the Curriculum Committee charge, and then work with Governance on further revisions and getting any changes approved for the Academic Handbook.

Search committee appointments.

Tenzer Center Director search committee—We appointed Nahyan Fancy (History) and Kent Menzel (Communication & Theatre) as the two at-large faculty representatives to the search committee.

School of Music Dean search committee—We had a lengthy discussion of the process being used to hire the next Dean of the School of Music. Andrew Hayes (Communication & Theatre) was appointed to be the College of Liberal Arts at-large faculty member to the search committee.

Meeting with next president. Mark McCoy will join us from 1:00-2:00 on Tuesday, March 29. Potential issues for discussion:

- His vision of shared governance and plan for the university.
- What challenges do you see ahead and how can we help you?
- New process of Governance Committee meeting once a month with the President and the VPAA.
- Faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees.
- Expressing support for Anne Harris and the job she's done thus far as the VPAA.
- Ongoing discussions about faculty participation in administrative hirings and reviews, and periodic reviews of administrators.

VPAA. We made some minor edits to a draft memo regarding reassigned time for Chair of the Faculty. Pam will send to Anne.

Faculty Governance Meeting Minutes
March 29, 2016

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Proptom, Scott Thede

Guest: Mark McCoy (Dean of the School of Music and President Elect)

Members of the Governance Committee and President Elect McCoy met to discuss moving forward in shared governance. In the presidential training in which he participated, he spent a great deal of time studying shared governance. He suggested a book he would like us to read together--*Shared governance in times of change*. He believes DePauw can do better, but we face a challenging economic future.

President Elect McCoy briefly shared some of his vision moving forward. We discussed the on-going SOM dean search, which is a replacement for President Elect McCoy. McCoy said the SOM faculty have indicated that they do not want an interim SOM Dean and that is why they are moving quickly with the search.

Other points of discussion with McCoy centered around issues of inconsistency between current practice and the Academic Handbook with regard to the School of Music Dean position and other academic administrative structural changes (i.e., creation of Dean of Faculty and Dean of Academic Life as separate positions from the VPAA). We discussed plans for moving conversations forward to address these issues, timing regarding a new Dean of the SOM hire, and potential changes to the description of the role in the Handbook. President Elect McCoy felt confident a new Dean could be brought on board knowing Handbook changes were pending.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 5, 2016

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Minutes. We discussed the issue of how we share minutes and other committee documents from year to year, after people rotate off the committee. This is related to the larger issue of confidentiality; what are the rules of or limits to confidentiality? Glen had forwarded a document with descriptions from AAUP on this topic.

Handbook. Following our discussion with President Elect McCoy, Anne Harris has contacted us about proposed changes to the Handbook regarding the SOM Dean position, relation to VPAA position, hiring and review processes, etc. Additional Handbook issues to address include the division of the VPAA job into Dean of Faculty, Dean of Academic Life, and Dean of Experiential Learning. Are there any restrictions at all on the president's ability to create new positions? Bridget suggested there needs to be some flexibility to adapt to changes on the ground. We did wonder about our number of administrative positions and whether this has increased over the last 15 years. (Seems like at least Strategic Planning Committee should have this information.)

Glen asked if he could share notes from our meeting with Mark McCoy with Review Committee, and notes from Review Committee meeting with McCoy with those of us on Governance Committee.

Topics for future discussion with President Elect McCoy

--What is relationship between SOM and CLA? Odd that SOM faculty sit on university committees and are represented in faculty governance system if they are indeed a separate entity; why is there a need for an additional structure?

How do we move forward?

--Suggestions for issues committees should address in the coming year and top issues they should always have on their radar.

--Fixing minor "housekeeping" issues in Handbook revision.

--Drafting a document regarding faculty participation in administrative hiring and review. David will resend a document from IU about administrative review. Also suggesting an open search for university presidents in the future (see AAUP document). David and Pam will work on a draft.

--Drafting a document regarding what confidentiality means. Glen will work on this.

Independent Review Report on Sept. 23 incident. We asked if there was anything in the report that the Governance Committee should address. One recommendation in the report is the formation of a liaison committee between DePauw and city of Greencastle. Bridget will follow up with Mark McCoy on a timeline for this. Could Governance ask for a response to the report from Diversity and Equity? (This committee may be overwhelmed at the moment; we could have a conversation with them to see if there's some group they would recommend taking it on.) Bridget will ask if Strategic Planning sees anything in the report that is relevant to their work.

Announcements. Any handbook language that you know has to be changed in our clean up, send to Bridget. Deadline for May Faculty Meeting agenda is Friday, April 22.

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 12, 2016

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Minutes. Approved minutes of our Feb. 23, March 8, March 15, and April 5 meetings. Before we approve our minutes from our meeting with Mark McCoy we will share the draft minutes with him to check for accuracy and whether he is willing to have them shared with the Review Committee (given that both Governance and Review are addressing some common issues). Committee members discussed and concluded that it is acceptable to share minutes between committees on common issues (e.g., Governance and Review Committees regarding process issues).

Shared governance. Glen shared copies of the governance book that Mark McCoy suggested. Pam will bring copies of the governance book Brian Casey suggested to share at the next meeting.

Draft document on faculty involvement in administrative hiring and review. Thanks to David Alvarez for starting a document. In our next meeting with Anne Harris we will have questions about how people in administrative positions with direct relevance to faculty work (e.g., Dean of Faculty) are currently reviewed (if they are) and the schedule for their appointments. Should these be “split reviews:” faculty evaluate individuals on elements relevant to faculty; administrators evaluate individuals on elements relevant to administration? For example, in recent review of Dean of the School of Music (DSOM), Review Committee evaluated faculty component; HR did administrative component. Or should this be integrated in some way so that everyone knows the complete info on performance, everyone’s voice and input has been heard in the decision-making?

Most of these positions are not defined in the Academic Handbook. Some university handbooks are much more detailed (e.g., defining roles, reporting structures). It would be really nice to have an organizational chart so we can understand these positions better. Complicated with SOM being a “separate” entity on campus: what is its relationship to College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and our joint governance structure? What does it mean if it is “autonomous?” Seems too small to be completely autonomous and have its own governance structure. Lack of equivalency between positions in CLA and SOM (e.g., VPAA is not the same as Dean of SOM; what is the relationship between the two?). Could Dean of Faculty position be renamed Dean of CLA?

What would the review process for administrators be like? A full Review Committee-like review with the candidate putting together a file, etc.?

The Academic Handbook guides faculty action. The administration makes decisions about organizational structure, but the faculty role would be to write a “position paper” and discuss/negotiate any proposed changes with the administration. We want a clear, accurate Handbook, but then there’s a challenge of it being potentially too detailed and not allowing any administrative flexibility to respond to changes on the ground. We are still discussing this issue.

Regarding the size of the faculty, the faculty *has grown*, but we have not *continued* to grow. What about administrative growth? Another budgetary feature is that the faculty is old (and that’s costly). VPAA job description is overwhelming and workload seems unsustainable. Do we need Dean of Sciences, Dean of Arts, etcetera, but then that further bloats the administration?

Goal is “periodic structured review of administrators with faculty input.”

Action. Pam will share the draft document with Anne and ask for her input, responses to our questions for discussion at our next meeting with her. Continue to think about how to translate David’s draft document into language consistent with DePauw organizational structure.

Draft document on confidentiality. Thanks to Glen for this document. A useful distinction is made between governance’s *representative* versus *evaluative* function. Our challenge is when, for example, Review Committee reviews SOM Dean it is using its representative function, not its “professional expertise,” but this also seems like a *personnel* issue. When Review interviews departmental faculty members, they are told that nothing said will be attributed to an individual, but they are not given strict confidentiality that their information will not be shared with anyone outside the committee. One difference between review of an individual faculty member and DSOM is the power dimension, the latter having *a lot* of power. Does this mean that there is a greater need to share the outcome information more widely?

Do we “review” department chairs (which is stated in the Handbook)? Review Committee interviews department members prior to a chair’s appointment or reappointment. Was the review of DSOM similar to the “review” or interview for department chairs? Glen responded that it was; Mark McCoy did not submit a file, but Review Committee members interviewed faculty in SOM.

What about looking at confidentiality from a “need to know” perspective in terms of sharing information between committees? (Perhaps too open to interpretation.)

At other institutions, at the end of the year each committee writes a 1-2 page summary of what it did, what’s still on its plate, what the committee should be thinking about 5 years out.

Review Committee has been told that they can't go back to previous year's minutes on active issues because of "confidentiality." Is this problematic or an appropriate protection?

Action. Pam will contact Curriculum and Student Life chairs, asking them to approve meeting minutes and send to Terry Bruner to post on the Faculty Governance website. Will also ask Review Committee for "digestible" version of its minutes.

Next week. Faculty appointments to committees. Continue discussion regarding confidentiality and faculty role in administrative hiring and review. Bridget suggested that we think about two things: are we attempting to write "guiding principle" language or actual Handbook language? What does it mean that the faculty can "meet" without administrators present?

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2016

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Committee Appointments. We made appointments to committees and Bridget will seek out someone from the Arts for Course and Calendar Oversight Committee.

Minutes. We modified and approved minutes from April 12, 2016 meeting.

Discussion. We continued to discuss shared governance, faculty role in hiring and review of administrators.

Next meetings. VPAA next week (Honor Programs & Directors, faculty role in hiring and review of administrators). The following week we meet with the President Elect.