

September 12, 2005

1. Call to Order – 4:07 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Statement of Quorum (Neal Abraham) and Verification of Quorum

Quorum: There are 243 total voting members of the faculty, with 220 members remaining after accounting for those on leave. The quorum for the fall semester, therefore, is 88. Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum.

3. Remembrance of Professor Donald “Jack” Cook – Read by Jeff Hansen

I would like to say a few words about Prof. Donald “Jack” Cook who passed away last month at the age of 90. Jack was a native of Rock Island, Illinois and attended college in his hometown at Augustana College where he received a B.A. degree in 1937. He earned a Master’s degree from the University of Illinois in 1938 then after several years working in industry and one year as an instructor at his alma mater returned to school and earned his Ph.D. degree in chemistry in 1944 from Indiana University.

Jack wrote this about his introduction to DePauw:

“On a beautiful spring day in 1945, [I] arrived on the New York Central Southwestern Limited from Cleveland, Ohio, ...[and] was met by Dr. Riebsomer and ... driven to ... campus. After a full day of interviews, it was time to depart on the evening eastbound train. Professor Riebsomer’s gas ration card must have been low, since he conveyed [me] back to the depot on the handlebars of his bicycle. It was a rough ride down North Madison Street.”

In spite of this rough start, Jack arrived at DePauw in July of 1945 and taught for 40 years. He retired in 1980 but continued to teach part-time until 1985. During his tenure at DePauw teaching was, of course, a vital interest of Jack’s. He initiated a highly successful program to train intermediate and junior high school science teachers during the post-Sputnik era from 1958 until 1970. This program benefited nearly 1000 teachers and even went on the road to Munich, Germany and Lima, Peru.

Research was also an important part of Jack’s career. In addition to his work with numerous graduate students, at a time when DePauw University offered the MS degree, in 1963 he directed the first Undergraduate Research Participation program at DePauw with funding from the National Science foundation. During his career he secured over \$800,000 in grants for various summer institutes, equipment, and research.

After his retirement Jack was active in the Heritage Preservation Society of Putnam County, which he and his wife, Marion, founded. He was well known for his friendship with Percy Julian and his family and was instrumental in the issuing of a commemorative stamp by the U.S. Postal service in 1993, which honored Percy Julian. More recently he and Marion were interviewed for a PBS Nova documentary on Percy Julian, which is to be aired next spring.

In honor of Dr. Cook’s influence on the lives of so many DePauw students and in recognition of his strong connection to Percy Julian, the Percy L. Julian chair in honor of Donald J. Cook was established in 2001.

Jack had a wonderful ability to encourage young chemists. I remember arriving at DePauw in 1982 a young, naive student who thought being a chemist would be a really cool thing to do. I met Jack during my freshman year. He was still teaching a chemistry class for nursing majors even though he was retired. Even when he stopped teaching that class he was still frequently on the third floor of Julian so even though I never took a class from him, I bumped in to him regularly. He

always had a smile and encouraging words to offer. He took a great interest in the next generation of chemists. I especially remember the Percy Julian dinners and lectures - perhaps more fondly than my colleagues. Jack really enjoyed organizing those events. He had a flare for pomp and circumstance. The grandeur of the dinners impressed me and made me feel valued. I am sure that Jack had much to do with my being named a Percy Julian Scholar and the first Cook Scholar. The financial help provided was certainly needed and appreciated, but more important was the message that was sent. I knew Jack cared and wanted to see me succeed in chemistry.

Later when I returned to DePauw to teach in the chemistry department, Jack graciously vacated his office so I could move into it. It had been Jack's office since the building was first constructed. It must have been a bit odd for him to visit my office, which had for so long been his. But he did visit frequently and we had many long conversations about teaching and research and ways in which Jack had expressed his faith in his work - topics that were important to both of us. Jack said he "felt called to teach as some men feel called to preach."

A friend once told me, when he had done me a great favor and I wanted to repay him, that my payment should be to help someone else in a similar manner. So I'll try to repay Jack's kindness by following his example as best I can and hope to have some fraction of the influence he had on the lives of so many people.

4. Procedures for Faculty Meeting (D. Harvey)

Meetings will follow Robert's Rules of Orders. Members may speak to a question a second time only after every member has had a chance to speak to the question. Debate is limited to the immediately pending question. To the extent possible, we will alternate between those speaking in favor of and those speaking against a motion. Votes are by a show of hands; however, any member may request a secret ballot.

Reminder of voting privileges from the Academic Handbook: "Full-time faculty members holding positions with academic rank or nominal rank, including those on sabbatical, pre-tenure, or academic leave, may vote. The President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Registrar also have voting privileges. Senior (Emeriti) Professors are eligible to vote during any semester in which they are teaching at least one course."

5. Approval of Minutes from May 2005 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the May 2005 meeting were approved by faculty consent.

6. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

Announcements

CAPP is responsible for general and long-range academic policy and planning, and it shall recommend to the faculty policies and programs relating to the academic interests of the University.

CAPP supervises programs and recommend policies relating to: admissions requirements, Aerospace Studies, Army ROTC, Experimental Division, University Studies, Winter Term, graduation requirements, pre-professional programs, public occasions, and other programs of similar relevance to academic policy. All new majors and minors, whether departmental or interdisciplinary in nature, shall be considered by CAPP and subsequently voted on by the

faculty. This committee shall coordinate the activities of one Executive Committee: International Education Committee.

Issues on which CAPP is working include the following: AQIP with an emphasis on strengthening the academic and intellectual environment; clarifying language in the Handbook about who should be involved in preparing RAS proposals; Winter Term, a proposal for a major in Film Studies, and a review of interdisciplinary programs.

Report from First-Year Seminar Subcommittee (Sherry Mou)

The members of the committee were introduced. The First-Year Seminar Subcommittee is working with SLACC, Academic Affairs and Student Services to sponsor a workshop for first-year students on academic integrity to be held Sunday, September 18th.

A call for proposals for first-year seminars for the 06/07 academic year will be forthcoming; the deadline is October 10, just before the fall break.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

Announcements

COF is beginning its work on chair reviews. Faculty are encouraged to participate in DPCs and to write letters on behalf of colleagues up for review.

AQIP discussions are focusing on two projects: (1) Creating an intellectual community outside the classroom: recruiting students not by SAT scores but seeking students who are good at critical thinking; conversations with Admissions should focus on what kind of students we want to attract to DePauw University. (2) Need for a more transparent faculty governance process: rethink how time is used at faculty meetings; instead of a list of reports, why not one or two substantive issues to be discussed at length; systematic evaluation of all levels of administration.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michele Villinski)

Announcements

MAO responsible for policies and actions of the faculty relating to the daily operation of academic programs, and it shall have the responsibility for making recommendations to the faculty concerning the institution and implementation of these policies and details.

MAO supervises the independent major, scheduling, registration, classrooms, course changes, calendar, the grading system, comprehensives, academic counseling, learning resources, the libraries, and the computer center. MAO shall consider all changes to existing majors or minors and subsequently bring those changes to a vote before the faculty. If MAO determines that a proposed change to a major or minor represents a significant change in policy, MAO will also refer the proposal to CAPP for consideration before bringing the changes to a vote before the faculty.

Issues on which MAO is working include the following: working on department processes for independent study courses, the evaluation of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs, and working with CAPP on timing issues of declaring majors. Ken Kirkpatrick has been working with MAO on online course proposal form. This is in the department information section of e-services.

The Library Advisory Committee (a subcommittee of MAO) will be looking for volunteers to serve on a task force for the search for a Head Librarian.

AQIP discussions are focusing on the following areas of interest: intellectual engagement from day one; interdisciplinary programs strengthened; a balanced lives initiatives (wellness); a vision for the libraries; and examining DePauw through an environmental lens.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Rebecca Schindler)

Announcements

The duties and members of SLACC were announced.

Academic Integrity Policy: the student handbook states that the faculty has a responsibility to create an environment encouraging academic integrity. A total of 51 cases of dishonesty were reported last year (doubling from 3 years ago), which follows the national trend. Access to the Internet and the availability of wireless technology has made plagiarism much easier for students. Students don't understand why plagiarism is fraud. All students in first-year seminars are receiving a copy of the new book, *Doing Honest Work in College* by Charles Lipson. The first part of the book discusses why academic integrity is important and the second part is a style handbook for citations. The rationale for the new push in academic integrity is appended.

The faculty policy on academic integrity is under the purview of SLAAC. A link to the policy may be found on the DePauw website:

<http://www.depauw.edu/univ/handbooks/dpuhandbooks.asp?ID=101&parentid=100>

For further information about the academic integrity policy and hearing procedures, please contact Rebecca Schindler, chair of SLAAC rschindler@depauw.edu, or Marnie McInnes, dean of Academic Life mmcinnnes@depauw.edu.

AQIP discussions are focusing on the following areas of interest: healthy lifestyles (food options), the profile of DePauw University's student body with the aim of enhancing academic engagement as well as diversity, and the impact of Greek system.

7. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Kerry Pannell)

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted upon):

That the Chairs of coordinating committees (COF, CAPP, MAO, SLACC), the chairs of FDC and COA, and the Chair of the Faculty should serve on a steering committee for faculty governance. The Chair of the Faculty should serve as convener of the committee. The committee – designated the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC) – should meet regularly to oversee the faculty governance system and to engage in or delegate strategic planning matters for the faculty. The committee will assist the administration in directing its inquiries and requests for input to the appropriate faculty committee and, where necessary, in constituting representative ad-hoc committees.

Motion to remove from the table passed.

Friendly amendment offered: replace "should" with "will" in all cases. Amendment accepted.

Is this a permanent or temporary committee? This would be a permanent committee, meeting once or twice a semester.

Does the committee's charge overlap with COA? The Committee on Administration serves in an advisory role to the administration. The proposed committee will coordinate issues among faculty committees.

Speaking against the motion: adding another layer of busy work (another committee). Instead of more committees the faculty should be meeting in less structured meetings.

Response: Committee is not decision-making, so discussion would be plentiful. Sensitive to the idea of too many committees, but this could end up reducing the number of committees.

Speaking for the motion: This motion would prevent the perception that the administration committee-shops to get the results it wants. Also provides a voice-of-faculty to which the administration can address issues.

This proposal would not prevent chaotic faculty meetings, but instead encourages more thought about these meta-issues.

Speaking against the motion: Would create more service overload, already shortages in committees.

Response: Would save work, by facilitating work of the committees, helping the chairs to work with each other.

This type of meeting worked with MAO and CAPP on some issues in the last few years. There has been confusion in past on which committee should work on which issues. This would fix that.

Question is called. Motion as amended is:

That the Chairs of coordinating committees (COF, CAPP, MAO, SLACC), the chairs of FDC and COA, and the Chair of the Faculty will serve on a steering committee for faculty governance. The Chair of the Faculty will serve as convener of the committee. The committee – designated the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC) – will meet regularly to oversee the faculty governance system and to engage in or delegate strategic planning matters for the faculty. The committee will assist the administration in directing its inquiries and requests for input to the appropriate faculty committee and, where necessary, in constituting representative ad-hoc committees.

Secret ballot is requested. 83 yes. 39 no, 3 abstention. Motion as amended passes.

Announcements

The duties and members of SLACC were announced. COA advises the administration on issues such as benefits and health insurance.

AQIP discussions are focusing on the following issues. Intellectual environment: physical, intellectual and social spaces (academic theme houses, more space like the Julian atrium). Student-faculty collaboration. Students taking more academic risks. Winter Term. Time Bank issues (lunch hour, are convocations possible). Senior capstone experience, make it more integrative and interdisciplinary. Wellness: 3-2 workload was mentioned a lot. May not be possible within 3 years, but thinking about 3-3/3-2 alternating load. International diversity

initiatives: attract students who see themselves as part of global society. Internationalize course offerings (faculty development support for developing global stance in courses). Communication and morale issues.

Faculty Development Committee (David Gellman)

Announcements

Deadlines for the fall semester:

Faculty Fellowship applications for 2006-2009 are due on Wednesday, September 14th.

Sabbatical and Pre-tenure Leave Luncheon will be held on Tuesday, September 20th, from noon-1:30 pm in the Union Building 231/232.

Fisher Fellowship and Time-Out applications are due on Wednesday, October 5th.

Sabbatical and Pre-tenure Leave applications are due on Wednesday, October 12th.

Fall Report Deadline has been moved to Monday, October 24th from the 15th due to fall break.

Mellon: Strengthening Intellectual Communities and Venture Fund applications are due on Wednesday, October 26th.

Mellon: Local Initiatives and Inter-Institutional Initiatives Fund applications are due on Wednesday, November 2nd.

Page limits are important. Pay attention to the directions on the application page. Rules are needed to level the playing field. And yes, double-spaced pages.

AQIP: 1) More time for professional work (teaching and research), teaching loads, combating report and file bloat, streamlining governance. 2) Collaboration between departments, creating space for collaboration, collaborative research, team teaching as a regular part of system, comprehensive portfolio system for faculty, interdisciplinary programs. 3) Student funding for research across the curriculum. Equity and process concerns. Psychology department as a model.

8. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Latest handbook is available on the web. Hard copies have not yet been printed for all faculty members because some motions are still to come before the faculty. Hard copies for all faculty members will be available when this process is complete.

Retention for the sophomore class is 92.4%, higher than the recent 5-year average of 91%, thanks to depauwyear.1 program. The 5-year graduation rate is at a 20-year record. Retention for seniors is 85.7%, also a 20-year record. Enrollment is 2401 students. There is a larger number of Alpha students. The total number of degree-seeking students is 2346.

Response to Hurricane Katrina. Details are posted on website. DePauw has offered to enroll students displaced by the hurricane, but the students that have contacted us thus far did not want to start the semester late. DePauw has identified furnished housing normally reserved for visiting faculty members, which has been made available for displaced families and/or displaced faculty members, for the semester or for the year. Members of DePauw's faculty have also volunteered housing space for families. DePauw has offered to host displaced faculty, providing offices, computers, Internet and library access, and possibilities of part-time teaching. The Hartman

House is working with students to organize disaster relief assistance teams for “alternative fall break” trips to work in support of the Red Cross.

Meeting of department chairs and coordinators: task forces to look at workload and reassigned time of chairs and coordinators. Support staff for departments, should it be by department or supporting several departments?

Plans for renovation of the Performing Arts Center are posted in the PAC near the School of Music and Communications offices. These plans offer better spaces for teaching, rehearsal, and social gathering.

Will continue a faculty advisory committee on admissions. This is still a tentative solution. We are looking at whether this should become a permanent committee.

The death of senior Vanessa Anne Baer was announced. Details on her funeral in Wabash and memorial service on campus are posted on the web.

No questions from the faculty.

9. Remarks from the President

Most important discussions are in class, but discussions outside of class can be important as well. Please support DePauw Discourse, the one-year-old program started for alumni. The Discourse occurs during class times because the Time Banks do not allow any class-free times during the week.

Retention rate is a compliment to the quality of the faculty.

No questions from the faculty.

10. Old Business

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted upon): Jim Benedix

That the following additions (in *italics*) be made to sections II.B and II.D of the *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty*.

II. Faculty Meetings

A. There shall be...

B. All faculty members may attend faculty meetings and participate freely in discussions. *At each meeting a roll will be taken by the secretary to determine which faculty members were present for the discussions and actions that have taken place. The roll will then be placed in the minutes for that meeting.*

C. Voting

1. Full-time faculty members...

D. 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,
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,
10. *Recording of the Roll*, and
11. Adjournment

Motion to remove from table passed.

Speaking for the motion: Maintaining a role of those attending faculty meeting will encourage more engagement by the faculty. It will provide a written record that can help inform debate. Issues discussed over many months are quite normal (Gen Ed as example), but people who vote it down have not been part of the earlier discussions. Speaking earlier would allow more to get done.

Would not go into personnel files.

Speaking against the motion: too much detail, not necessary, can be gamed.

Vote: motion defeated by a majority vote.

11. New Business

Selection of organizer for Crimmel Colloquium (Neal Abraham)

Reminder that Jim Benedix is organizer for next year. Richard Cameron (Philosophy) was selected to organize the colloquium in 2007.

12. Announcements

Look for an email announcing a special election for several vacancies on faculty committees.

Meetings with committees on Monday, September 29th at 4:00 PM for further AQIP discussions; email forthcoming.

Mark Kannowski for the Q-Program

The Q-Program completed its self-study last year. Newly qualified Q faculty are Matthew Balensuela (School of Music), Rahim Elghanmi (Mathematics), Andrew Ellett (Mathematics), Tim Good (Communications), Erik Lindland (Philosophy), Rich Martoglio (Chemistry), Jamie Song (Mathematics), Kelly Van Busum (Computer Science) and Rebecca Upton (Sociology and Anthropology). Thanks to those who helped with the workshop this summer. Several faculty attended a workshop on Q-reasoning at Macalester College in June, returning with ideas to share with departments.

13. Adjournment at 5:36 PM.

Appendix

Rationale for Integrity Initiative, Fall 2005 September 12, 2005

During fall semester 2005, members of the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC), the First-Year Seminar Committee, Academic Affairs, and Student Services have joined together to introduce new students to the principles of academic integrity.

Here are a few of the reasons why we have decided to do this work with first-year students:

1. **A liberal arts education is not just about finding the right answer**, but about thinking critically and making wise use of ideas and information from a variety of sources, including scholarly books and articles, scientific studies, interviews, lectures, films, archives, and websites. It is important to learn how to analyze other people's ideas and how to distinguish clearly between one's own ideas and the ideas of others. In a more practical way, it's important to learn how use the citation styles required by courses in different disciplines.

2. **Students must develop the skills of accurate paraphrase, quotation, and citation early in their years at DePauw.** Most classes ask students to incorporate information and ideas from readings into written and oral assignments. Knowing how to do this well benefits students in many ways. Conversely, not knowing how to paraphrase accurately or how to give credit for ideas may land a student in serious academic trouble.

3. **Casual sorts of plagiarism are on the rise, both at DePauw and nationally.** Some students fall into the habit of copying swatches of material from the web without fully digesting the information they have found and without giving adequate credit to their sources. These students are taking unacceptable shortcuts.

4. **The laptop initiative gives us extra impetus** to address problems of "cut and paste" plagiarism this fall. The web allows easy access to information on virtually every topic, and material from the web can be copied with just a few strokes on the keyboard. This makes certain kinds of plagiarism tempting. Faculty and administrative staff members want make sure students understand DePauw's academic integrity policy, know the mechanics of correct citation, and know why integrity is considered centrally important within the academic community.

October 10th, 2005

1. Call to Order – 4:11 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Verification of Quorum - Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum of 88.
3. Approval of Minutes from September 2005 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the September 2005 meeting were approved by faculty consent.

4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

Motion (to be voted on) for the faculty to enter into an informal consideration of the following proposed addition to Section IV.A.5 (Academic Organization and Operations) of the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty, limited to a period of 20 minutes in length. The purpose of this is for discussion only, to assist CAPP in its work.

The following proposed language to the faculty by-laws is meant to specify who in a department is eligible and required to serve on the departmental group making full-time position requests to RAS (for tenure-track slots) and to the VPAA (for term positions). The language is parallel to two other departmental formulations: for Search Committees, and for Departmental Personnel Committees.

Below is 'core language' developed by CAPP, followed by two options that could be swapped in for items 1 and 3. Other formulations are possible, and welcome. We simply want to determine whom the faculty thinks should be making full-time position requests, because changes made to the handbook in Fall 2004 did not specify eligibility for this task, and accordingly led to confusion and controversy.

Core language:

c. Full-Time Position Request Committee

The Full-Time Position Request Committee is created solely to request a position, and exists only until the request has been submitted and processed.

1. Membership:

Requests for tenure-track or term faculty positions shall be made by tenure-track faculty members of the department or school; those not tenured or on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. A good faith effort must be made to inform and include in the process all eligible members, whether on leave or not. Membership exclusion based on conflicts of interest applying in the case of the Search Committee also apply here.

2. Chair and Organization:

Normally, the chair of the department or the dean of the school shall serve as the chair of the Full-Time Position Request Committee. In the event that the chair of the department or the dean of the school is unable or ineligible to serve as chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will designate a member of the department or school as the convener of the first meeting. In this case, the members will elect a chair at their first meeting.

3. Function and Duties:

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits requests to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Sub-committee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the committee must either sign the request for staffing, a dissenting opinion, or a statement of abstention.

Debatable options:

Option #1

1. Membership:

Requests for tenure-track or term faculty positions shall be made by tenure-track faculty members of the department or school, except those in their last year of service; those not tenured or on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. A good faith effort must be made to inform and include in the process all eligible members, whether on leave or not. Membership exclusion based on conflicts of interest applying in the case of the Search Committee also apply here.

Option #2

3. Function and Duties:

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits requests to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Sub-committee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the department eligible to participate must either sign the request for staffing or a dissenting opinion [excluded: or a statement of abstention].

Motion passed by a show of hands.

The proposed language is modeled after the existing language for the Search Committee, although membership on the Search Committee excludes a faculty member in his or her first or last year of service. The definition of what "last year of service" means is still up in the air.

Following several questions regarding the core language and debatable options, members of the faculty discussed the proposal from CAPP in small groups and indicated their preferences using a form distributed by CAPP.

Announcements

CAPP is working on the following three items: finalizing its recommendation on searches for new faculty positions in Political Science, reviewing the membership of its subcommittees and Winter Term.

Report from the First-Year Seminar Subcommittee (Sherry Mou)

The subcommittee extended its appreciation to those faculty members who submitted proposals for First-Year seminars. Additional proposals are welcome. The committee will be meeting before Fall break to review proposals.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

Announcements

The deadlines for outside submissions to interim, promotion and spring tenure and promotion decision files were announced.

The committee is reviewing proposals from the Handbook Taskforce for revisions of Sections I, III and IV of the Personnel Policies. Drafts of the proposed revisions were made available and faculty were invited to send comments to COF. The committee plans to bring a motion to table at the November faculty meeting.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michele Villinski)

Motion (to be voted on):

That the faculty approve the following new courses:

- a) Physics 156: Advanced Placement in Physics, 1 credit
- b) Physics 220: Principles of Physics III, 1 credit
- c) Education 510: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment I, 1 credit
- d) Education 511: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment II, 1 credit
- e) Education 520: Elementary: Literacy & Methods in Language Arts, 1 credit
- f) Education 521: Elementary: Methods in Science, Social Studies & Math, 1 credit
- g) Education 530: Secondary: Content Literacy, 1 credit
- h) Education 531: Secondary English Methods, 1 credit
- i) Education 532: Secondary Math Methods, 1 credit
- j) Education 533: Secondary Science Methods, 1 credit
- k) Education 534: Secondary Social Studies Methods, 1 credit
- l) Education 540: Leadership and Reflective Teaching I, 1 credit
- m) Education 541: Leadership and Reflective Teaching II, 1 credit
- n) Education 550: The Learner and the Learning Environment I, 1 credit
- o) Education 551: The Learner and the Learning Environment II, 1 credit
- p) Education 410: Methods of Educational Research, 1 credit, group 2, 1 credit
- q) History 399: Internship in Public History, 0.5 credit
- r) History 332: European Union, 1 credit, group 2
- s) History 121: Introduction to the Middle East, 1 credit, group 4
- t) History 122: Modern Middle East, 1 credit, group 2
- u) History 334: History Beyond the Classroom, 1 credit
- v) History 385: Latin American Revolutions, 1 credit, group 4
- w) Biology 345: Conservation Biology, 1 credit

Question: Are the 500-level courses in Education part of the new MAT program.

Response: Yes

Motion passed on a show of hands.

The following are newly approved experimental courses:

- a) Math EXP: Regression Analysis, experimental course
- b) Math EXP: Analysis of Variation, experimental course
- c) History EXP: History of the Caribbean, 1 credit, group 2

The following courses have a change in title, numbering, and/or other course change:

- a) Math 240: Introduction to Statistics, number and title change from Math 340: Applied Probability and Statistics
- b) Biology 215: Cellular and Molecular Biology, title change to Biology 215: Cells and Genes
- c) Classical Studies 300: Topics: Pompeii, group 3 designation for Spring 2005

- d) Art History 290: Topics: Love and War in Medieval Art and Literature, one-time group 4 designation
- e) Religious Studies 290: Topics: Religion & Catastrophe, one-time group 4 designation
- f) Black Studies 281: History of the Black Experience, title change to Black Studies 281: Africa & Black Diaspora
- g) History 281: History of the Black Experience, title change to History 281: Africa & Black Diaspora

Announcements

The committee invited self-nominations for those willing to serve on the Library Taskforce.

There are now on-line versions of the forms for requesting MAO's consideration of new courses or course changes. Forms submitted by 5:00 PM on the Friday before MAO's regularly scheduled Monday meeting time will be considered at that meeting.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Rebecca Schindler)

Motion (to be tabled) to accept the following revisions to the membership of SLACC as defined in the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty, Section VIII.D.2. Text to be deleted shown with ~~strike~~through; new text in UNDERLINED CAPS.

VIII. Coordinating Committees

D. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (SLACC)

2. Membership. Voting members: the President of the University; the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his or her representative); the Vice President for Student Services (or his or her representative); six elected faculty members (one from each division and no more than one from each department; ~~and two students~~ THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT (OR HIS OR HER REPRESENTATIVE) AND ONE OTHER STUDENT TO BE DESIGNATED BY STUDENT CONGRESS).

Ex-officio members (without vote): the Dean of Students, the Dean of the School of Music, ~~the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, the President of the Student Body, and~~ TWO other studentS to be designated by the Student Congress by virtue of the office ~~she or he~~ THEY holds.

Motion passed by a show of hands.

Motion (to be tabled) to accept the following changes to section G of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Student Handbook. Text to be deleted shown with ~~strike~~through; new text in UNDERLINE CAPS.

Academic Integrity Policy

G. 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 the associate dean of academic affairs 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 ~~an appointed~~ A CURRENT OR FORMER member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are

chosen by the associate dean of academic affairs from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The associate dean of academic affairs observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

Motion passed by a show of hands.

Announcements

The Presidents of the Interfraternity Council and the Panhellenic Council have requested feedback from the faculty regarding Greek relations.

Bill Tobin has been invited to make a report to SLAAC on trends in GPAs.

Anne Harris is the SLAAC representative to the Coalition for a Responsible Community.

Questions regarding the academic integrity policy can be addressed to Rebecca Schindler or Marnie McInnes.

5. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Kerry Pannell)

Announcements

A brief report was presented on behalf of the team sent to the AQIP retreat at Lisle, IL. Representing DePauw were President Bottoms, Neal Abraham, Ken Kirkpatrick, Cindy Babington, Joe Allen, Kerry Pannell, David Guinee, Gloria Townsend and Vic DeCarlo. The final set of projects for this round of AQIP will be announced soon.

COA plans to examine workload issues and to begin an assessment of the UP/DP programs.

Faculty Development Committee (David Gellman)

Announcements

President Bottoms has made available funds from the President's Discretionary Fund to support the following new FDC awards in the area of ethics: two faculty fellowships for 2006-2009, two timeouts for 2006-2007, four faculty summer awards for each of 2006 and 2007 and two summer student-faculty collaborative research awards in each of 2006 and 2007. Deadlines for applications will be announced shortly. FDC will review and provide advice on these applications in the usual ways. Interested faculty members should follow the usual application procedures.

Admissions Advisory Committee (Caroline Jetton)

Announcements

Members of the committee are Hilary Eppley (representative for CAPP), Caroline Jetton (representative for IEC), Matthew Balensuela (representative for DEC) and Beth Benedix (representative for COA). The committee works to disseminate information to faculty, to answer faculty concerns about admissions, and to provide a voice for the faculty in the Admissions process. Among the agenda items for this year are: identifying faculty to help with the selection of Rector Scholars, briefing the Academic Affairs committee of the Board of Trustees on the quality

and diversity of the student body and examining how faculty can provide Admissions with information about perspective students.

6. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Faculty were reminded of the faculty approved policy regarding the meeting of classes before and after breaks.

An call for requests for term positions will be forthcoming. With the recent changes to the Academic Handbook, all faculty members in a department may participate in preparing requests.

7. Remarks from the President

The final projects for AQIP will be announced after further discussions with the Committee on Administration.

Stephanie Niles reports that there have been large turnouts at admissions receptions.

A report will be forthcoming regarding an incident of hazing at the fraternity Beta Theta Pi. The fraternity is participating in a joint investigation with the national office. The fraternity will be proposing sanctions to the national office. The University will review the proposed sanctions and determine if additional sanctions are necessary.

8. Old Business

There was no old business.

9. New Business

Motion (to be voted on) – That the faculty approve the results of faculty elections to fill the following vacancies on committees:

- a) COA: at-large replacement for Beth Benedix in spring 2006 – Istvan Csicsery-Ronay
- b) Division III Grievance Committee Alternates (2/1/06-1/31/07) – Bridget Gourley and Richard Smock
- c) Division III replacement for International Education – Sergei Markov
- d) Division IV representative to Faculty Development Committee – Mary Dixon
- e) Division IV Grievance Committee (2/1/05-1/31/06) – Ophelia Goma
- f) Division IV Grievance Committee Alternate (2/1/05-1/31/06) – Srimati Basu
- g) Division IV Grievance Committee Alternates (2/1/06-1/31/07) – Marcelle McVorrán and Bruce Stinebrickner
- h) Division IV replacement for Rebecca Upton on SLACC in spring 2006 – Julia Bruggemann

Motion seconded. Motion passed by a show of hands.

10. Announcements

Meryl Altman: Mellon Grant Deadlines

Deadlines were announced for two categories of Mellon grants. Proposals for Dyad grants (with Dennison) are due by October 26th. Proposals for Cluster grants (with Denison, Furman, Harvey

Mudd, Middlebury, Rhodes, Scripps and Vassar) are due by November 2nd. Cluster grants may involve local initiatives and inter-institutional initiatives. Additional details will be forthcoming.

11. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 5:14 PM.

Appendices

[Proposed changes to Section I of the Personnel Policies.](#)

[Proposed changes to Sections III and IV of the Personnel Policies.](#)

November 7, 2005

1. Call to Order – 4:10 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Verification of Quorum - Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum of 88.
3. Remembrance of Professor Jim Elrod – Read by Steve Timm

I'd like to say a few words about Jim Elrod, who taught at DePauw University from 1957 to 1995. I suspect that most of you never met Jim, though for the ten years after his retirement he could occasionally be seen in the Performing Arts Center doing his morning walk. That he would continue to "hang around" the PAC long after his retirement seems appropriate for a man who gave so much of his time to students and colleagues.

Jim had much to do with the current shape of the department and our integrated approach to the study of theatre, rhetoric, interpersonal and cultural communication, and media studies with radio, television and film. In fact, finding those intersections between the various forms of media was, for Jim, the rule, rather than the exception.

Jim developed the first Acting for the Camera course, augmenting his knowledge of the craft by spending a sabbatical on the sets of soap operas in New York studying the relationships between actor, camera and director.

Student television at DePauw began with Jim Elrod. Bob Weiss reflects that for many years, he and Jim would meet on Locust Street at 6am every Saturday morning: Bob loading students and luggage for debate trips, and Jim loading students and equipment for a weekly, live student broadcast about events at DePauw on Channel 10 out of Terre Haute.

For many years, Jim taught the only course offered in Public Relations.

Two of our colleagues, Jeff McCall and Geoff Klinger, both DePauw graduates, received their lowest grades while students of Professor Elrod. For years, Jeff McCall pestered Jim to change his oral interpretation grade, making a final plea during Jim's retirement ceremony, which Jim appropriately rejected.

While at DePauw, Professor Elrod directed nearly sixty full length stage plays. These efforts were in addition to the plays he directed at the Putnam County Playhouse, which he co-founded, and in addition to the many radio plays he directed at WGRE.

One has to admire his choice of plays and the range of styles and challenges he brought to students and audiences. He chose difficult plays, plays with political, philosophical and social teeth: Sarte's No Exit, Anouilh's The Lark, William's The Glass Menagerie, O'Neill's The Great God Brown, Euripedes' Medea, Rashomon, Osbourne's Luther, Ibsen's Ghosts, Somerset Maugham's The Circle, Bernard Shaw's Arms and the Man, and Albee's Who's Afraid of Virginia Wolfe?

Jim's choice of plays were always strategic and relevant. According to a senior colleague, the social implications of a specific choice often took precedence over a play's theatricality. For example, Jim directed the first play in the new Performing Arts Center in March of 1976. Jason Miller's That Championship Season, according to critic Clive Barnes, is an "indictment of a society, which opens with an ironic playing of the National Anthem and then lacerates the sickness of small-town America full of bigotry, double-dealing, racism and hate." While we can't

know with any certainty who Jim specifically targeted the play toward, The DePauw reviewer noted that two top administrators, apparently agitated, left after the first act.

Jim's casting decisions were equally strategic. He often cast students with little or no experience in major roles, having seen some quality in the auditionee that he thought would work. He cast local children and members of the community. During his last DePauw production of A Few Good Men, he cast student Aaron Marx as Lance Cpl. Harold W. Dawson. Aaron, a student athlete and member of SAE, carried himself with a military demeanor that invited typecasting. Late in the rehearsal process Jim worried aloud, specifically in front of Aaron, that more men were needed for the trial jury. Aaron immediately marched over to SAE and informed the new pledges, in no uncertain terms, that they had just been cast in a play.

Kent Menzel remembers of A Few Good Men that he was "thoroughly impressed by his artistic vision. He had cast a character that did not match my expectation carried over from the film. But, by the end of the production, Jim's 'Colonel Jessup' became my new standard for the role...The casting decision took insight, vision, and 'directing' to pull off, and Jim certainly pulled it off!"

I have two specific memories of working with Jim. The first was lugging benches out of East College one afternoon for A Few Good Men. I asked Jim who I should thank in the program for lending us the furniture and he replied, "Well, I never really determined who to ask in the first place..."

Second, one night after a rehearsal, I sat in the booth writing light cues for Jim's production of Steel Magnolias. About 1:30am, I heard the auditorium door open, and Jim entered with two large bags of plastic foliage. He spent the next hour and a half dressing and redressing the set in careful, meticulous detail. I thought at the time how his students would, in all likelihood, never know the detail and attention he put into his art.

As a colleague, Jim was caring and considerate. After Sheryl Tremblay successfully defended her dissertation, it was Jim who took it upon himself to decorate her office door. Jim was known for buying gifts, then finding the right person to fit to gift. Such was the case of an Empire Penguin Jim purchased, then bestowed on Sheryl's son Mark.

His impact on his students is lasting. Former student Geoff Klinger writes that Jim "gave me a deeper appreciation of theatre and life. He was always challenging, always smiling (ever so subtly beneath his famous mustache), and always committed to enriching the lives of his community."

Finally, Jim was a first rate story teller, whether in the formal aspects of a theatrical presentation, in the classroom, or in the hallways in and around the PAC. His stories were his gifts to us, and I, like my colleagues, feel fortunate to have been a willing recipient. We will miss him.

4. Approval of Minutes from October 2005 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the October 2005 meeting were approved by faculty consent.

5. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Vic DeCarlo)

Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the following addition to the Section IV.A.5 in the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty, under 'Committees' for 'Schools, Departments and the Library' (all text is new; there are no changes to sections 5a or 5b).

c. Full-Time Position Request Committee

The Full-Time Position Request Committee is created solely to request a position, and exists only until the request has been submitted and processed.

1. Membership:

Requests for a tenure-track or term faculty position shall be made by tenure-track faculty members of the department or school, except those ineligible to participate in the ensuing search. Those not tenured or who are on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. A good faith effort must be made to inform and include in the process all eligible members, whether on leave or not. At the request of the Full-Time Position Request Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with the approval of the Committee on Faculty, may appoint additional faculty members from the department to serve on the committee. Membership exclusion based on conflicts of interest applying in the case of the Search Committee also apply here.

2. Chair and Organization:

Normally, the chair of the department or the dean of the school shall serve as the chair of the Full-Time Position Request Committee. In the event that the chair of the department or the dean of the school is unable or ineligible to serve as chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will designate a member of the department or school as the convener of the first meeting. In this case, the members will elect a chair at their first meeting.

3. Function and Duties:

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits a request to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the committee must either sign the request for staffing or a separate opinion.

Motion to table passed by a show of hand. CAPP presented a brief explanation of the need for the proposal in the form of a handout (see Appendix 1).

Announcements

President Bottoms has reported to the faculty the process used in reviewing the requests for new positions in Political Science and that two positions have been approved for this year.

CAPP currently is reviewing proposals for majors in Film Studies and in Latin American Studies.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

Motion (to be tabled) to approve changes to Sections III and IV of the Personnel Policies (text of motion included as Appendix 2).

Motion to table passed by a show of hands. COF encouraged faculty members to share with the committee any concerns about the motion prior to the next faculty meeting.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michele Villinski)

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

- a) Philosophy 221: Leadership and Responsibility, 1 credit
- b) Religion 275: Religion and Film, 1 credit, group 3 (non-literature)

Following a request for a description of Religion 275, the motion passed by a show of hands.

Announcements

MAO has made the following appointments to the Library Task Force: Martha Rainbolt (chair), Sherri Parker, Kathryn Millis, Caroline Gilson, Anne Harris, Scott Spiegelberg, Wade Hazel and Inge Aures (MAO representative). The student member is Mike Beeman, and the administrative representatives are Neal Abraham (VPAA) and Dennis Trinkle (LIS representative). The Task Force will be meeting weekly.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Rebecca Schindler)

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) to accept the following revisions to the membership of SLACC as defined in Section VIII.D.2 of the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty. Text to be deleted shown with ~~striketrough~~; new text in UNDERLINED CAPS.

VIII. Coordinating Committees

D. Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (SLAAC)

2. Membership. Voting members: the President of the University; the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his or her representative); the Vice President for Student Services (or his or her representative); six elected faculty members (one from each division and no more than one from each department; ~~and two students~~ THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT (OR HIS OR HER REPRESENTATIVE) AND ONE OTHER STUDENT TO BE DESIGNATED BY STUDENT CONGRESS).

Ex-officio members (without vote): the Dean of Students, the Dean of the School of Music, ~~the Director of the Office of Institutional Research, the President of the Student Body,~~ and TWO other studentS to be designated by the Student Congress by virtue of the office ~~she or he~~ THEY holds.

SLAAC explained that this motion reflects recent practice in which the Director of the Office of Institutional Research has met with the committee only when needed and the desire of Student Congress to redefine their membership. The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands. The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) to accept the following changes to section G of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Student Handbook. Text to be deleted shown with ~~striketrough~~; new text in UNDERLINE CAPS.

Academic Integrity Policy

G. 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 the associate dean of academic affairs 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 ~~an appointed~~ A CURRENT OR FORMER member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by the associate dean of academic affairs from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The associate dean of academic affairs observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands. SLAAC explained that the proposed changes are needed to provide for a chair of the URC in cases where the sitting members of SLAAC have conflicts of interest that prevent them from serving as chair.

Question: Why is the associate dean given the authority to select the chair of the URC?

Answer: This is necessary to preserve the confidentiality of the student involved in the hearing.

A concern was expressed that the current and proposed language states that the URC is convened by the associate dean of academic affairs when no such position currently exists. After some discussion, there was a motion from the floor to refer the proposal back to the committee for further work. The motion to commit was seconded.

Those speaking against the motion to commit reminded faculty that the proposed change, which address who will chair the URC, needs to be made now as there will be Academic Integrity Hearings before new language can be brought to the faculty for approval. Without this change the University is at risk. It was suggested that the proposal be passed in its present form and that SLAAC return to the faculty with additional language to address the title of the individual convening the URC.

The motion to commit was defeated by a show of hands.

The motion to approve the original proposal was passed by a show of hands.

A motion was made to table the following proposed change to section G of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Student Handbook. The underlined text is to be updated to reflect changes in the titles of those serving in Academic Affairs.

G. 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 the associate dean of academic affairs 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 current or former member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by the associate dean of academic affairs from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The associate dean of academic affairs observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

The motion to table was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

Announcements

SLAAC will meet with representatives from Panhel and IFC at the committee's next meeting.

6. Reports from Other Committees

Faculty Development Committee (David Gellman)

Announcements

There are no more deadlines for this semester. FDC currently is looking at Mellon proposals and conducting interviews for the next Faculty Development Coordinator.

The following Faculty Fellowship Awards have been made for the 2006-2007 to 2008-2009 academic years:

Teaching Projects/Curricular Development

Karin Ahlm (Professor of Psychology) – “Course Development and Enrichment with Personality/Social Neuroscience”

Terri Bonebright (Associate Professor of Psychology) – “Cognitive Psychology: Development of a Laboratory, Technology Enhancement, and General Course Renewal”

Dana Dudle (Associate Professor of Biology) – “Using Local Case Studies and Student-Designed Projects in Campus Natural Areas to Teach Plant Biology and Conservation Biology”

Kevin Kinney (Associate Professor of Biology) – “Development of Case Studies in Immunology and Physiology”

Scholarly/Creative Projects

Inge Aures (Associate Professor of Modern Languages) – “Translation of Berel Lang’s Holocaust Representation”

Masha Belyavski-Frank (Professor of Modern Languages/Russian Studies) – “Sevdalinke – Translation of Bosnian Folk Poetry”

Marthe Chandler (Professor of Philosophy) – “Studies in Comparative Aesthetics: Western and Chinese Conceptions of Order”

Tom Chiarella (Professor of English) – “Things I Already Know in a Language I Don’t Understand”

Eugene Gloria (Associate Professor of English) – “Rumor of Tranquility: A Collection of Poems”

Scott Ross (Associate Professor of Psychology) – “Parsing the Construct: Validation of a Three-Component Model of Psychopathy”

Michael Sinowitz (Associate Professor of English) – “Body Politics: History, Genre, and the Body in Patrick O’Brian’s Aubrey-Maturin Series”

There were no combined applications for Faculty Fellowships in the category of Teaching Projects/Curriculum Development and Scholarly/Creative Projects.

The Fisher Fellowship for the 2006-2007 academic year was awarded to Wade Hazel (Professor of Biology) for the project “Preparation of Research Results for Publication.”

The following Fisher Time-Out awards were made for the fall 2006 semester:

Jason Fuller (Assistant Professor of Religious Studies) “Translation Project – Bhaktivinoda Thakura’s Svalikhita Jivani”

Deborah Geis (Associate Professor of English) – “Digging(up) History: The Drama of Suzan-Lori Parks”

Wayne Glausser (Professor of English) – “Interpreting Psychedelia (Essay Related to Longer Project)”

Matt Hertenstein (Assistant Professor of Psychology) – “A Theoretical Review of Emotional Development in Infancy”

William Little (Associate Professor of English) – “All Crossed Up: Stray Thoughts on Gus Van Sant’s Elephant”

The following Fisher Time-Out award was made for the spring 2007 semester:

Hiroko Chiba (Assistant Professor of Modern Languages) – “Translating Japanese Science Fiction Short Stories”

Admissions Advisory Committee (Hilary Eppley)

Announcements

The committee welcomes nominations of faculty to interview candidates for Rector scholarships on Programs of Distinction day.

The Admissions staff is seeking ideas for the upcoming open houses for admitted students.

The committee is working to develop a form that faculty members can use to provide Admissions with feedback on prospective students who visit classes, or whom they interview.

The committee will be meeting with the Lawlor group when they conduct a site visit with the Office of Admissions.

7. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The VPAA called attention to a handout describing proposed changes to Section I of the Personnel Policies (see Appendix 3). These changes were made in consultation with the Handbook Task Force. Because this section of the Personnel Policies is written by the administration, these changes do not need approval by the faculty. Comments, however, are welcome.

A call for proposals for full-time terms positions and part-time positions will be announced soon. As a reminder, the operating language in the Handbook states that the responsibility for requesting positions rests with the department. Proposals for full-time term positions, therefore, must come with the endorsement of all members of the department. Requests for part-time positions come from the chair or director, following consultation with the department.

FDC is extending the deadline for the two Faculty Fellowships to support work related to the Janet Prindle Institute of Ethics.

8. Remarks from the President

The President announced the following AQIP projects: academic engagement, wellness, diversity/internationalization, and ethics.

Public Safety continues to investigate the vandalism to the sculpture Fits and Start. They have identified five students of interest and are in the process of seeking a financial assessment and discussing possible charges with the local prosecutor's office.

At the recent Board of Trustee's meeting a gift from Judson and Joyce Green was announced; this gift will allow the University to begin renovations of the Performing Arts Center. The Board also authorized continuation of the renovation of residence halls for fire safety and air conditioning. The Board also approved the issuing of bonds that will allow renovations of East College and Asbury Hall.

Faculty were reminded of DePauw University's United Way campaign.

9. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

10. New Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

11. Announcements

Bruce Stinebrickner announced that the Indiana Court of Appeals will be holding oral argument on an appeal in a criminal case on Thursday, November 10th at 10 AM in the Emerson Room of the Walden Inn.

12. Adjournment at 5:08

[Appendix 1 – CAPP's rationale for proposed addition to Section IV.A.5 in the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty.](#)

[Appendix 2 – text of COF's motion for changes to Sections III and IV of the Personnel Policies](#)

[Appendix 3 – text of proposed administrative changes to Section I of the Personnel Policies](#)

December 5, 2005

1. Call to Order – 4:13 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building

Attendance at the beginning of the meeting was less than the required quorum of 88 members. The Chair announced a change in the order of business, with the meeting beginning with “Reports from Other Committees” and continuing from there until all announcements were completed or a quorum was reached.

2. Reports from Other Committees

Faculty Development Committee (David Gellman)

Fisher Time-Outs in the area of ethics have been awarded to Lori Miles for the fall 2005 semester and to Raymonda Burgman for the spring 2006 semester. The committee currently is reviewing applications for Faculty Fellowships in the area of ethics.

The committee completed its review of applications for the position of Faculty Development Coordinator and shared its thoughts on the appointment with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The new Faculty Development Coordinator for 2005/06 – 2008/09 is Meryl Altman.

Admissions Advisory Committee (Hilary Eppley)

Nominations (self- or otherwise) of faculty to interview prospective students for Rector Scholarships during the Programs of Distinction weekend are due by Thursday, Dec 8.

The committee is continuing to work on a form that will give faculty a means for providing Admissions with information about a prospective student’s ability to contribute to the academic atmosphere at DePauw.

At a recent Chair’s meeting the committee discussed the possibility of replacing the panel discussion at the Admitted Student Open House with an informational fair for departments, which would provide better opportunities for a more personal interaction between prospective students, current students and faculty members.

The committee heard reports from discussions on international recruiting at a recent informational dinner and at the GLCA Academic Council Meeting. During the upcoming semester the committee will be discussing ways that faculty can help with efforts to improve the recruitment of international students.

First-Year Seminar Committee (Sherry Mou)

The committee extended its appreciation to first-year seminar instructors and first-year advisors for their work this semester and asked that concerns or suggestions be forwarded to the committee.

Two workshops are planned for the spring semester.

Once departmental staffing plans are complete, the committee will announce the first-year seminars for the fall 2006 semester.

Library Task Force (Martha Rainbolt)

The members of the task force were announced; they are: Martha Rainbolt (chair), Sherri Parker, Caroline Gilson, Kathryn Millis, Scott Spiegelberg, Inge Aures, Anne Harris, Wade Hazel, Dennis Trinkle, Neal Abraham and Natalie Holtzinger (student).

The committee has been learning about the structure and the organization of the DePauw libraries by reviewing organization charts (both new and old), the 1999 and 2004 external reviews of the library, and area and department updates since 1999. Information has been obtained from faculty and librarians at similar institutions about the structure of each institution's library, including its mission, organization, space and branch libraries. The task force is now looking at statistical comparisons with the 42 member Oberlin group.

Next on the agenda for the task force is to compare the job descriptions of the Chief Information Officer and Associate Chief Information Officer to that of the Director of Libraries in the library's previous administrative structure. The task force expects to hold open meetings for all interested groups in February, with the agenda to include a description of the sequence of changes that resulted in the present organizational structure and some suggested models or alternatives for that structure and the accompanying job descriptions.

3. Verification of Quorum – Upon achieving a quorum, the meeting returned to the normal order of business.

4. Approval of Minutes from November 2005 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the November Faculty Meeting were approved by faculty consent.

5. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the following addition to the Section IV.A.5 in the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty, under 'Committees' for 'Schools, Departments and the Library' (all text is new; there are no changes to sections 5a or 5b).

c. Full-Time Position Request Committee

The Full-Time Position Request Committee is created solely to request a position, and exists only until the request has been submitted and processed.

1. Membership:

Requests for a tenure-track or term faculty position shall be made by tenure-track faculty members of the department or school, except those ineligible to participate in the ensuing search. Those not tenured or who are on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. A good faith effort must be made to inform and include in the process all eligible members, whether on leave or not. At the request of the Full-Time Position Request Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with the approval of the Committee on Faculty, may appoint additional faculty members from the department to serve on the committee. Membership exclusion based on conflicts of interest applying in the case of the Search Committee also apply here.

2. Chair and Organization:

Normally, the chair of the department or the dean of the school shall serve as the chair of the

Full-Time Position Request Committee. In the event that the chair of the department or the dean of the school is unable or ineligible to serve as chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will designate a member of the department or school as the convener of the first meeting. In this case, the members will elect a chair at their first meeting.

3. Function and Duties:

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits a request to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the committee must either sign the request for staffing or a separate opinion.

The motion to remove from the table passed by a show of hands. Following a brief explanation of the rationale for the motion (see Appendix One), the motion passed by a show of hands.

Announcements

The committee currently is working on proposals for majors, discussing the Winter Term program, and reviewing the make-up of sub-committees reporting to CAPP, including the Resource Allocation Subcommittee. CAPP also is considering a white paper from Student Congress on Group 6 credit for athletes.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) to approve changes to Sections III and IV of the Personnel Policies.

The motion to remove from the table passed by a show of hands.

A motion was made to amend the motion by adding the following statement to the first paragraph of Section IV.B (to be inserted after the sentence ending "...not available to the Personnel Committee.");

The candidate will be afforded an opportunity to view all materials added to the buffer file and provide a response to them in a reasonable period of time.

The committee accepted this as a friendly amendment without objection from the faculty.

The motion, as amended, passed by a show of hands (text of final motion as amended attached as Appendix Two).

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michele Villinski)

Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the elimination of the KINS Aquatics minor.

The motion to table passed by a show of hands.

Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the elimination of the KINS Sports and Exercise Science minor.

The motion to table passed by a show of hands.

Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the following permanent group designations:

- a) HIST 334: History Beyond the Classroom, permanent group 2 designation
- b) PHYS 250: Optics, permanent group 1 w/lab designation

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Announcements of changes in title, numbering and other course changes:

- a) ML 295: Topics: Great Italian Writers, one-time group 3 literature designation
- b) ML 390a: Topics: Voces de tradición y cambio [Voices of Tradition and Change], one-time group 3 literature designation
- c) ML 390b: Topics: Literatura contemporánea caribeña [Contemporary Caribbean Literature], one-time group 3 literature designation
- d) MUS 290b: Topics: Film Music, one-time group 3 designation.
- e) KINS/ED 440: Motor Development and Adapted Physical Education number changed to KINS/ED 250.
- f) BIO 490: Research Problems changed from 0.5 credit to variable credit (0.5-1).

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Rebecca Schindler)

Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the following changes to section G of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Student Handbook. Text to be deleted shown with ~~strike through~~; new text in UNDERLINE CAPS.

Academic Integrity Policy

G. 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 ~~the associate dean of academic affairs~~ AN ACADEMIC DEAN 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 current or former member of SLAAC, who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by the ~~associate dean of academic affairs~~ CONVENER from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The ~~associate dean of academic affairs~~ CONVENER observes and records the hearing, but does not participate in committee deliberations.

The motion to remove from the table was approved by a show of hands. The motion passed by a show of a hands.

Announcements

The committee met with representatives of the Interfraternity Council and Panhel to discuss a variety of issues. A letter will be forthcoming from Panhel and the Interfraternity Council informing faculty that rush will occur during the first week of the spring semester.

At its next meeting, the committee will meet with the Director of Institutional Research, Bill Tobin, to discuss grade distributions and GPA trends.

The chair of SLAAC called upon Marnie McInness to present a report on academic integrity cases for the fall semester (see Appendix Three).

6. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

With Meryl Altman's appointment as Faculty Development Coordinator for 2006-2008 there is a need to select a new director of Women's Studies for that period of time. The VPAA will be seeking advice from the Women's Studies Committee and other interested faculty members by way of interviews conducted by COF.

With the slightly larger number of faculty members on leave next year, chairs are being asked to work with the faculty members in their departments and programs to see if the University can increase the average class size by one.

Each year DePauw University, through the support of the Crane Distinguished Teaching Fund, and the General Board of Higher Education of the United Methodist Church sponsors an award to recognize a faculty member at DePauw for his or her teaching. Faculty members receiving the "Exemplary Teaching Award" 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. The recipients this year are John Schlotterbeck and Anne Harris.

7. Remarks from the President

Nominations for honorary degrees are welcome. The Board of Trustees' Committee on Honorary Degrees will consider nominations at its meeting in January.

The Board of Trustees will be discussing two areas of emphasis at its January meeting: the internationalization of DePauw and ethics.

Funding has been obtained for a building to house the Ethics Institute. Funding is still being sought to support Visiting Professorships and Faculty Fellowships associated with the ethics initiative.

8. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

9. New Business

Ken Kirkpatrick offered the following motion:

That the faculty authorize the Board of Trustees to confer degrees on candidates eligible for graduation at the conclusion of the semester ending in December 2005.

The motion was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

David Smith – Report on the Janet Prindle Ethics Institute

The formation of three faculty reading groups was announced (see Appendix Four).

An ad-hoc group has prepared a draft mission statement for the Janet Prindle Ethics Institute, which was shared with the faculty (see Appendix Five).

Faculty were encouraged to become involved in the Institute's planning.

Plans for the building to house the Janet Prindle Ethics Institute, which will be located in the DePauw Nature Park, were discussed.

10. Announcements

Pam Propsom made a request to the faculty for assistance with a student-faculty research project on alcohol use and perceptions. Faculty were asked to consider providing five minutes of class time for students to complete a survey, probably during the first full week of March.

11. Adjournment at 5:43 PM.

Appendix One – CAPP's rationale for the "Full-Time Position Request Committee"

Purpose:

After changes to the handbook in November 2004, confusion arose over rules of eligibility for departmental or school faculty members to serve on the group that makes requests for full-time positions, such as the requests in late spring for tenure-track positions to the Resource Allocation Subcommittee and request for term positions made in the fall to the VPAA. At the time, governing language was left undefined; making position requests was simply left up to the 'department', which by current definition would include all members of the department who are eligible to vote at the faculty meeting, including those in their first year, and those in their last year who were previously excluded from participating in making such requests. In order to address the lack of governing language and articulate clearly the eligibility for this task, CAPP drew up the following motion, based on feedback provided by the faculty members at the October faculty meeting. The salient features of this motion are:

under Membership:

- all tenure-track (both tenured and untenured) members of the department serve except as specified below.
- faculty members not eligible to serve on a search committee resulting from a successful position request are ineligible to be part of the Full-Time Position Request Committee that requests that position.
- untenured faculty members, and those on-leave, may excuse themselves from serving, but they must be notified of any position requests being generated by the department so they have the opportunity to serve if they so choose.
- tenure-track members of the department in their first year of service are eligible to participate in tenure-track proposals (which are composed in Spring for searches the following Fall), but not in term searches (which are composed in the Fall for searches the same academic year). The reason for the latter is that departmental members in their first year of service are ineligible to be on a departmental Search Committee.
- faculty members on term appointments are excluded from serving on the committee requesting a full-time position because they have not been hired to participate in the department or the University for the long term.

under Function and Duties:

- every member of the committee must either sign the request for staffing (which is generated in most cases by the departmental chair), or submit a separate opinion. In other words, everyone on the committee must participate and render their opinion. To provide some protection for untenured faculty members, however, beyond their option to excuse themselves at the outset, it is intended that the 'separate opinion' could be a statement declining commitment to any other majority or minority opinions generated by departmental members,
- a principal point of this language is to prove to RAS (and CAPP) and the VPAA that indeed every eligible member of a department has been properly notified and offered the ability to participate in the process. Current RAS practice developed when the requesting committee was the personnel committee requires all members of the personnel committee to sign the request for staffing.

Appendix Two – Final Text of the COF Motion for Changes to Sections III and IV of the Personnel Policies

III. Guidelines for Term, Interim, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

(Article mutually agreed to by the administration and faculty)

A. Reviews shall serve the programs and purposes of the University as well as the particular missions of the various departments and schools within it.

B. Criteria, particularly in regard to tenure, shall be regarded as long-term standards, and changes in the criteria may be made only after full discussion, agreement between the Faculty and the President, and ample time for adjustments.

C. Those who would otherwise be eligible to participate in reviews shall recuse themselves from participation when they have a conflict of interest, such as a family relationship. A faculty member may not serve on the Committee on Faculty or the Grievance Committee for cases involving a member of their department or school.

D. Each review shall be considered first by the Personnel Committee of the school or department (membership of the Personnel Committee is described in By-Laws Art. IV.A.5) and second by the Committee on Faculty and Vice-President for Academic Affairs (procedures for Personnel Committees and the Committee on Faculty are defined in Sections IV.C and IV.D, respectively). Final decisions for term, interim and tenure appointments and for promotions rest with the President.

E. All term, interim, tenure and promotion recommendations and decisions shall be based entirely and exclusively upon material in the candidate's decision file (as defined in Section IV.B) with respect to the criteria stated in Section V and only those additional criteria clearly stated in the job description and the initial letter of appointment or established later by mutual consent.

F. The reliability and credibility of those submitting information to a decision file shall be tested or capable of being tested in a procedure which preserves the maximum possible openness of evidence consistent with the need to maintain the confidentiality of the deliberative process. In the interest of protecting this confidentiality, each member of a Personnel Committee and the Committee on Faculty shall agree, by virtue of his or her service, to honor the confidentiality of the process and not to breach the obligation of confidentiality absent a legal obligation to do so.

1. Each individual or committee placing a document in the decision file must be identified in order for that document to be considered.
2. Each individual submitting a letter to the decision file must sign the letter.
3. Personnel Committees and the Committee on Faculty may redact the names of interviewees from the record placed in the decision file (but not from the Personnel Committee or Committee on Faculty minutes). Such interviews must be recorded via an audio or video recording device in a manner specified by the Committee on Faculty. The committee conducting the interview will place the evidence or a summary of the evidence in the decision file and forward the recording of the interview to the Coordinator of the Committee on Faculty for storage until the case is resolved.

G. The candidate shall have opportunity, prior to the recommendation of the committees considering the evidence, to respond in person and in writing to all testimony and evidence present in the decision file. If a candidate submits a written request for an interview with the Personnel Committee or the Committee on Faculty by the published deadline to respond to the

testimony and evidence, that committee must honor the request prior to making its recommendation.

H. Candidates have the right to appeal recommendations of the Committee on Faculty as defined in Section IX.

IV. Procedures for Term, Interim, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Preliminary Steps

1. By no later than the third week of April the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will notify the chair of the Committee on Faculty of all candidates scheduled for term, interim and tenure reviews during the following academic year. In addition, for tenure reviews the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will indicate whether the candidate is eligible for timely promotion as defined in Section I.E.2.
2. In August the chair of the Committee on Faculty will call for nominations for promotion to be considered during the upcoming academic year. Any faculty member may nominate a colleague for promotion; self-nominations also are acceptable.
3. The chair of the Committee on Faculty and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall meet with candidates preparing decision files to explain the process, to provide a schedule of deadlines and to answer questions. This meeting must occur no later than 20 in-session days before the close of the decision file, according to the schedule of deadlines provided to the candidate (see Section IX.J.1 for an explanation of in-session days).
4. Candidates for tenure may petition COF for a change in deadlines no later than the last day of the semester preceding the semester in which the review is originally scheduled. Exceptions may be made to the deadlines for such requests only in extraordinary circumstances.
5. The chair of the Committee on Faculty shall make known to the University community the names of persons being considered for term, interim and tenure reviews and those who have accepted nomination for promotion and request that those with relevant information submit letters to the decision files.

B. Preparation of Decision File

A decision file is constructed for each personnel case according to the stated procedures of the Committee of Faculty. These procedures shall be distributed to candidates and chairs of departmental or school Personnel Committees, in accordance with scheduled deadlines provided by the Chair of the Committee on Faculty and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs as explained in Section IV.A.3 above. With the exception of materials generated during investigative mode (as defined in C.2 and D.4), materials submitted to the decision file after the established deadlines are placed in a buffer file which is not available to the Personnel Committee. The candidate will be afforded an opportunity to view all materials added to the buffer file and provide a response to them in a reasonable period of time. The following persons or committees may submit materials to the decision file subject to the published deadlines:

1. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs may transfer to the decision file materials from the candidate's personnel file deemed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to be relevant to the review as stipulated in Section III E. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file the following required materials for the review of faculty members not holding tenure as specified in Section II: the faculty member's annual reports, the chair's or dean's responses to the annual reports, peer observations, and student evaluation (opinion) forms.
2. Individuals with knowledge of the candidate's performance in the areas under review may submit to the decision file information about and evaluation of the candidate's performance. Faculty members who so desire may also request, in writing to the Chair of the Personnel Committee, an interview with the departmental or school Personnel Committee. The Personnel

Committee will notify the Chair of the Committee on Faculty of the request and conduct the interview as described in Section III.F.2.

3. The departmental or school Personnel Committee may solicit other relevant information to be included in the decision file from the following:

(a) a representative sample of students who have direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching effectiveness,

(b) colleagues in the University whom Personnel Committee members consider qualified to judge the candidate's teaching effectiveness, professional competence, or service, and

(c) persons outside the University whom Personnel Committee members consider qualified to judge an appropriate aspect of the decision file. The Personnel Committee must notify the candidate that it intends to seek letters from persons outside the University. The committee must limit its solicitation to external evaluators agreeable to both the candidate and the committee.

4. The candidate should provide documentation to be placed in the decision file according to the criteria stipulated in Section III.E.

5. The Committee on Faculty or the Personnel Committee in investigative mode may add material to the decision file.

C. Personnel Committee Procedure

The Personnel Committee shall follow a standard procedure approved by the Committee on Faculty, the administration, and the faculty. It shall include the following steps.

1. All members of the Personnel Committee shall read the entire decision file before reaching a recommendation and preparing a report.

2. The Personnel Committee shall meet as a group and discuss the evidence in the decision file prior to arriving at its recommendation.

3. If the Personnel Committee finds that it cannot reach a recommendation based on the contents of the decision file it may request to enter investigative mode. Such requests must be addressed to the chair of the Committee on Faculty and must state the specific information needed to reach a recommendation, the anticipated source(s) of that information and why the Personnel Committee believes investigative mode is appropriate to obtain that information. The chair of the Committee on Faculty will determine if the request is appropriate within the context of the review and make a decision as to whether to authorize such an investigation. The Personnel Committee may appeal the chair's decision to the Committee on Faculty, whose decision will then be final. If an investigative mode is approved, following procedures and a schedule provided by the Chair of the Committee on Faculty the Personnel Committee will

(a) suspend its evaluation of the decision file,

(b) gather the requested information and place the evidence or a summary of the evidence in the decision file,

(c) allow the candidate to respond to the material added to the decision file, and

(d) recommence its evaluation of the decision file.

4. In preparing its report the Personnel Committee shall detail its procedures, including actions taken to place evidence in the decision file prior to its closure and any investigations completed during investigative mode. In addition, the Personnel Committee will:

(a) In the case of a term review, make an assessment about the evidenced strengths and concerns of the candidate and a recommendation regarding an extension of the term, subject to the needs of the department or school.

(b) In the case of an interim review, make an assessment about the evidenced strengths and concerns of the candidate, clearly stating areas of desirable or necessary improvement.

(c) In the case of tenure or promotion, make a recommendation, stating clearly the evidence and the reasons for the recommendation.

(d) The Personnel Committee may make a recommendation for early tenure or promotion even though the candidate has not been nominated in accordance with the procedure given in Section IV.A.2.

A consensus recommendation is strongly encouraged. However, if after prolonged discussion the Personnel Committee is unable to reach consensus, then the members will write and sign two or more separate reports, each stating the reason(s) for their recommendation. All members of the Personnel Committee shall have access to all reports, which together comprise the Personnel Committee's report.

5. The Personnel Committee's report shall be sent to the Committee on Faculty and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs who will release it to the candidate.

D. Committee on Faculty Procedure

The Committee on Faculty shall meet with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and make a recommendation to the President for each candidate reviewed. In reaching its recommendation the Committee on Faculty shall follow a standard procedure that includes the following steps.

1. The Committee on Faculty will interview any faculty member who has requested such an interview in a signed writing to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty according to the established schedule. The committee will complete the interview as described in Section III.F.2 and provide the candidate with a summary of the interview and an opportunity to respond.
2. All members of the Committee on Faculty will read the report from the Personnel Committee and any response from the candidate. All members of the Committee on Faculty will read the entire decision file before making recommendations.
3. If the Committee on Faculty finds that it cannot make a recommendation it may proceed into investigative mode during which it can request information from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, conduct interviews with any member of the university community whom the Committee on Faculty believes to have relevant information, request an evaluation by a person outside the university who is qualified to judge an appropriate aspect of the decision file (such individuals must be acceptable to both the candidate and the Committee on Faculty) or collect additional documentation from the candidate, other individuals or University offices. The Committee on Faculty will place the additional evidence or summary of the evidence into the decision file and provide the candidate with an opportunity to respond before resuming deliberations.
4. The Committee on Faculty and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs will present their tentative conclusions to each other and discuss their respective reasons with openness to any opposing points of view.
5. Before reaching a final recommendation, the Committee on Faculty will examine the contents of the buffer file. Materials deemed relevant to the case will be transferred to the decision file.
6. In preparing its report the following options are available to the Committee on Faculty.
 - (a) If the report of the Personnel Committee is judged inadequate, the Personnel Committee may be asked to reconsider and resubmit its report, at which time deliberation and decision recommence.
 - (b) If the consensus recommendation from a Personnel Committee is judged valid, the Committee on Faculty shall prepare a report endorsing the Personnel Committee's recommendation.
 - (c) If the report from a Personnel Committee contains two or more separate recommendations, the Committee on Faculty shall determine which recommendation is valid (if either) and prepare a report endorsing that recommendation.
 - (d) If the Committee on Faculty does not concur with the Personnel Committee's recommendation(s) it shall state its reasons and cite evidence in the decision file to support its own recommendation.
 - (e) The Committee on Faculty may make a recommendation for early tenure or promotion even though the candidate has not been nominated in accordance with the procedures described in Section IV.A.2.
7. The chair of the Committee on Faculty shall communicate the action of the Committee on Faculty to the President, who may meet with the Committee on Faculty for further clarification.
8. If the President is considering a decision against the recommendation of the Committee on Faculty, he or she shall communicate this fact and the underlying reasons to the Committee on

Faculty. The Committee on Faculty shall respond to the President regarding the President's tentative decision and reasoning.

9. The President shall inform the candidate of the decision and reasoning in writing and share with the candidate the Committee on Faculty's recommendation.

Appendix Three – Academic Integrity Report

So far this semester, 6 reports of academic dishonesty have been turned in to Academic Affairs. These involved two first-year students, two sophomores, and two seniors. Five out of six of these cases have been resolved; the students signed a settlement form acknowledging what happened and accepted the grade penalty determined by the instructor (zero on the assignment and in most cases a further lowering of the final grade in the course).

Although not all of this fall's reports are in, the number of violations, 6 so far, is low compared to figures from the past two fall semesters:

- 19 in Fall and Winter Term 2004-05, 10 of which involved first-year students. In academic year 2004-05, 51 violations of the integrity policy were reported.
- 21 in Fall and Winter Term 2003-04, 4 of which involved first-year students.

In the cases this fall, two students borrowed and rewrote papers belonging to friends after asking to see how the friend "organized the paper." One student copied someone else's computer files. The three other cases involved mosaic plagiarism: copying words and ideas from sources without adequate citation and presenting these as one's own.

In October and November, the University Review Committee held three hearings on cases left over from spring 2005: one charge was dismissed; one charge was upheld; and one second violation led to the further sanction of a one-semester suspension.

The URC also met to hear one grade grievance this fall. The faculty member's original grade was confirmed.

Thanks go to the members of SLAAC and the other faculty members and students who served on these often very difficult committees.

Please note that multiple copies remain of [Doing Honest Work in College](#) by Charles Lipson. Anyone who would like a copy is welcome to ask for one from Academic Affairs (x 4359).

Appendix Four – Janet Prindle Ethics Institute faculty reading groups

Each group will meet three or four times in the course of the semester. There will be a chapter or article length reading for each meeting; the meetings will be later afternoon and last no more than 90 minutes. They will be in a private home close to campus, and modest refreshments will be served. Members of each group will select the readings to be considered.

Marthe Chandler, Sharon Crary, Jason Fuller, Marcia McKelligan, Martha Rainbolt, and Eric Silverman have agreed to convene or co-convene these groups. Like the bad penny David Smith hopes to show up in all.

Ethics and Teaching

The ethics and teaching group will read about and discuss moral questions connected with university teaching. What we focus on will depend on the interests of members of the group, but our topics might include advocacy in the classroom, relationships between students and teachers, fairness in grading, the tenure system, and the responsibilities of universities. We might also focus on particular dilemmas those of us in the group have faced. Each of us will choose one of the readings for the group.

Ethics between the Generations in non-Anglo-American Literature

This group will read stories, plays or poems from four different cultures, all of them non- Anglo-American, focusing on the patterns and practices of behaviors between the generations: mothers and daughters, fathers and sons, multi-generational families. Then we will discuss the ethical issues and principles arising from these texts. The readings will be short, limited to 30 to 40 pages per session. We might begin with a couple of stories from Jhumpa Lahiri's INTERPRETER OF MALADIES or the fiction of Laura Esquivel, Bharati Mukherjee or Abe Akira.

Research Ethics

The research ethics discussion group will focus on learning about teaching research ethics to our students. We will be studying how to teach about research ethics, how this teaching can possibly fit into our already packed curriculum, and what range of topics we, as scientists, should be involved in teaching our students. Our group will initially study published methods for teaching students to reason through ethical dilemmas in research. The dilemmas we choose to discuss may range from practical issues such as authorship and data collection or even funding sources, to more esoteric issues such as types and means of research.

Multi-cultural Ethics and Human Rights

Cultural relativism seems to conflict with conceptions of individual human rights to which many Americans are deeply committed, for example the rights of women and children. Working out a middle ground between extremes, a position many of us would like to occupy, has proven difficult. We will explore the question of human rights in a multi-cultural world paying special attention to issues of group rights, individualism, duties to strangers, and universalism.

Organizational Plan

We will meet briefly on Tuesday December 13 at 11:45 in Asbury 114 for an organizational and scheduling meeting. Pizza and soft drinks will be served.

For further information, or to join a group, contact David Smith at dsmith@depauw.edu

Appendix Five – Draft mission statement for the Janet Prindle Ethics Institute

Background

The “Goals and Aims of DePauw” statement stresses “an intentional commitment to an examination of values, a pursuit of heightened aptitude in critical thinking, and the establishment of a sufficiently broad base of general learning to constitute a foundation for living with meaning as well as making a living.” The aim of the Institute, in its broadest terms, is to provide a structure to help DePauw do a better job than it already does in living up to this goal.

Assumptions

1. While pluralism in ethical perspectives is to be celebrated, radical ethical relativism is false. Sometimes a crisp moral verdict can be pronounced; more often things are complex, and reasonable people will disagree. Still, ethics is among the subjects that can be reasoned about constructively. Often some options can be ruled out as morally wrong.
2. Responsible teaching of ethics will always introduce students to more than one perspective on the issues under discussion.
3. The curriculum should not treat any one religious tradition or any one philosophy as above criticism. Some courses may treat traditions comparatively; others may work within a broad cultural framework, e.g. Western philosophy and religion, Chinese religion.
4. The DePauw faculty already includes persons who have heavily invested their professional lives in the study of ethics and values. They are to be found in many departments. A main task of the Institute is organizing and assisting faculty who find it important to devote more time to the study and teaching of ethics.
5. Ethics is more than an academic subject. We hope DePauw graduates will be persons of integrity, with strength of character and moral courage. The best way for a university to nurture those qualities in students, difficult to measure as it may be, is to provide a campus environment in which moral questions are taken seriously, and controversies are explored, analyzed and debated with energy and sophistication. High quality teaching about ethics is a key means to that end.

The Statement

Leading a moral life has never been easy; problems of deciding what to do, of inability to do the good things that one knows one should, and of failures of courage or resolve are not new. What is new is the freedom from want and power over nature that our students will have in the years ahead. Students who graduate from DePauw in the 21st century will face moral opportunities and challenges that their parents or grandparents could never have contemplated. Ethical issues in the early 21st century are complex; the stakes are high.

In this context the Institute seeks to foster sophisticated, thoughtful and interdisciplinary reflection on moral issues including questions of justice and policy, character, duty and responsibility. Its central objective is enriching the quality of moral discussion that goes on in the DePauw community of students and faculty. This will entail sponsoring seminars for students and faculty as well as hosting conferences and lectures on topics of moral concern. Although the first priority of the Institute is the teaching and discussion of ethics on campus, ongoing commitment to effective teaching will be greatly helped by support for faculty and student research on questions of ethics as well as involvement of alumni, the local community, and leading citizens of the state and nation.

February 6th, 2006

1. Call to Order – 4:11 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building

Due to the lack of a quorum, faculty meeting was canceled.

Faculty members in attendance were invited to listen to remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the President and the Library Task Force.

Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The resignation of Dennis Trinkle, Chief Information Officer, provides an opportunity to consider the reorganization of the Library and Information Services.

Information regarding faculty compensation was distributed and discussed.

Information regarding the faculty's participation in Faculty Development and other recognition programs was distributed and discussed.

Progress in meeting the University's previous strategic planning goals for academic areas was discussed.

Terri Bonebright, Vanessa Dickerson and Masha Belyavski-Frank have been named University Professors for 2006-2010.

Mary Dixon, Caroline Smith and Barbara Whitehead have been named recipients of the Distinguished Professor Awards for 2006-2008.

David Berque and Bob Hershberger have been named the Tenzer Family University Professors in Instructional Technology for 2006-2011.

Remarks from the President

The President encouraged faculty members to attend the special faculty meeting to be called later in the week for the purpose of considering candidates for honorary degrees.

Report from the Library Task Force (Martha Rainbolt)

The task force reviewed its charge and reported on its progress in evaluating the perceived needs for the library's resources and leadership, and described three possible models for the library's organization and management. A survey was distributed to help the task force gather information from the faculty about these topics.

February 10, 2006

1. Call to Order – 3:20 PM; Meharry Hall

2. Statement of Quorum (Neal Abraham) and Verification of Quorum

The quorum for the spring semester is 88 faculty members. Attendance when the meeting was called to order was 95.

3. Executive Session to Consider Candidates for Honorary Degrees

4. Adjournment – 3:30 PM

March 6, 2006

1. Call to Order – 4:05 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Verification of Quorum – Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum of 88 voting members of the faculty.
3. Approval of Minutes from the December 2005 and February 2006 Faculty Meetings

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the December 2005 and the February 2006 faculty meetings were approved by faculty consent.

4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

This spring CAPP has worked on or is working on the following:

1. Acting in the capacity of RAS, CAPP is considering the last of the proposals for the three instrumentalist positions that were granted last year to the School of Music.
2. The committee is taking a comprehensive look at Interdisciplinary Programs, including their structure, administration, funding and staffing. The committee's intent is to find ways to help these programs operate better within a university structure that is geared toward departmental operations. The committee is considering several requests for new or expanded interdisciplinary programs and is looking at existing programs as well. The committee has spoken with, or will speak with, the directors of these programs this semester as it develops recommendations for Interdisciplinary Programs.
3. CAPP is examining the guidelines for Winter Term, including equity and diversity in the selection process for off-campus programs and the structure and operation of the on-campus experience.
4. The committee is examining the guidelines for how nominees for subcommittees appointed by CAPP are formed with the goal of strengthening the faculty's role in this process.
5. CAPP has begun preliminary work on the RAS process for 2006. As reported to the faculty in an email from the VPAA, requests for tenure-track positions to begin in 2007-2008 are due Monday, April 24, 2006. This deadline is a bit earlier than in previous years.
6. The committee considered a white paper from Student Congress on granting Group 6 credit for participation in varsity athletics. CAPP felt that any such suggestion would open up a more general discussion of Group 6 and did not feel that there is sufficient time to consider the issue this semester. The committee moved this to a list of suggested agenda items for the next academic year.

Question: Regarding the guidelines for Winter Term, will there be a discussion of this with the faculty?

Answer: CAPP will be considering this issue at its meeting on March 21st. Faculty members were encouraged to forward to the chair of CAPP their thoughts on this issue.

Committee on Faculty (Jim Mills)

The committee is continuing its review of personnel cases.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michael Sinowitz)

A. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the elimination of the KINS Aquatics minor.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands. The motion was approved by a show of hands.

B. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the elimination of the KINS Sports and Exercise minor.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands. The motion was approved by a show of hands.

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

- a) PSY 252: Drugs, Brain, and Behavior; 1 credit
- b) PSY 370: Emotions Across the Lifespan; 1 credit; Group 1
- c) PSY 371: Emotions Across the Lifespan with Lab; 1 credit; Group 1 (lab)
- d) PSY 353: Intelligence and Creativity; 0.5 credit
- e) PSY 261: Social Psychology with Lab; 1 credit; Group 1 (lab)
- f) PSY 253: Health Psychology; 0.5 credit
- g) PSY 331: Human Perception with Lab; 1 credit; Group 1 (lab)
- h) PSY 381: Learning and Comparative Cognition with Lab; 1 credit; Group 1 (lab)
- i) CLST 310: Topics in Mediterranean Archeology; 1 credit; approved without Group 3 designation
- j) CLST 256: The Impact of Empire: Augustus to Constantine; 1 credit; Group 4
- k) CHEM 310: Enzyme Mechanisms; 1 credit
- l) ITAL 271: Intermediate Italian; 1 credit; Group 5
- m) ECON 450: Econometrics; 1 credit

Question: Why is the course Emotions Across the Lifespan being offered both without a lab (PSY 370) and with a lab (PSY 371)? Why not just offer the course with lab.

Answer: Psychology is now requiring majors to complete two additional courses with lab. Offering the same course both with and without lab allows students some choice in which lab courses they choose to take. PSY 261, PSY 331 and PSY 381, which also are on the list of new courses, already have corresponding no-lab versions in PSY 260, PSY 330 and PSY 380.

Question: Have the changes to the major been approved by MAO?

Answer: Yes.

Question: In the course with lab, what class content has been removed to make the two classes equal in terms of expectations for students?

Answer: The classroom portion of the two courses are the same. The course with lab covers the same class material and includes a separate laboratory.

The faculty engaged in a lengthy discussion of the merits of offering equal credit to two courses, such as PSY 370 and 371, that cover the same course content, but that differ in whether or not they include a lab. Those speaking in favor of this arrangement noted that there already are courses that can be offered for the same credit with and without lab [editorial note: BIO 320 and 440 are listed as "normally includes laboratory"] and that lab courses traditionally place greater demands on a student's time. In addition, one of the announced changes to an existing course in this agenda, an action not requiring a vote from the faculty, includes the addition of a lab to an

existing course in Geosciences without a change in credit. Those speaking in opposition to this arrangement noted that a similar proposal from Biology was turned down by MAO several years ago and that in a course system all courses should require a similar effort of students.

Question: Will this affect teaching loads?

Answer: Yes. A faculty member teaching the course with lab will receive six hours of teaching credit, whereas a faculty member teaching the course without lab will earn four hours of teaching credit.

Question: What constitutes a lab?

Answer: MAO asked this question of the faculty a couple of years ago, but was unable to develop an answer.

The VPAA offered two points for the faculty to consider. First, the Handbook defines a faculty member's workload in terms of 12 contact hours and those duties necessary to support those hours, not in terms of courses taught. In the absence of any clear policy regarding "What is a lab?" it is left to the VPAA to determine how to determine the workload credit for special teaching circumstances, such as labs. Different arrangements have been made with the faculty in the sciences, studio music, physical education and art.

Second, the faculty recently adopted a policy that students should expect that the work for their courses to be equivalent to a full-time job of 40-50 hours, but the faculty defeated a suggested policy that a course should be equivalent to 10-12 hours of work on the part of students.

Question: Did CAPP look at this proposal as this seems to be a significant change in the Psychology major?

Answer: No. It did not seem to MAO that adding a lab requirement represents a significant change to the major.

Motion: That the list of courses to be approved be divided by department. The motion was seconded. The motion was amended to divide the list of courses to be approved into those from Psychology and all others. The motion was seconded. The motion passed on a show of hands.

Following a brief discussion covering the same issues noted above, the following motion was made and seconded: That the faculty table the request to approve the new courses in Psychology and that MAO and CAPP further review the proposal.

The motion was defeated by a show of hands.

The original motion to approve the courses in Psychology was called, seconded and passed by a show of hands.

The motion to approve the new courses in Psychology passed by a show of hands.

It was suggested that CAPP revisit the question of what constitutes a lab. The chair of CAPP indicated that the agenda for this spring is already full, but that it will be added to the list of suggested agenda items for next year's committee.

The motion for approving the new courses in Classical Studies, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Italian and Economics passed by a show of hands.

D. Announcement of changes in title, numbering and other changes to courses:

- a) REL 290A: Topics: Religion and Film, approval for one-time group 3 (non-lit) designation
- b) PSY 215 Research Methods (change from PSY 220)
- c) PSY 214 Statistics for Behavioral Sciences (change from PSY 210)
- d) PSY 232 Abnormal Psychology (change from PSY 390)
- e) PSY 493 Senior Thesis (change in title and from PSY 450)
- f) PSY 330 Human Perception (change in title; change in description; change from PSY 385)
- g) PSY 246 Topics in Psychology (change from PSY 240)
- h) PSY 280 Cognitive Psychology (change in description)
- i) PSY 346 Topics in Psychology (change in description; change from PSY 340)
- j) PSY 300 Physical Psychology (change from PSY 401)
- k) PSY 375 Directed Research (change from PSY 440 and to variable credit from 0.25 to 1)
- l) PSY 290 Developmental Psychology (change in description)
- m) PSY 350 Evolutionary Psychology (change from PSY 358)
- n) PSY 360 Psychology of Personality (change from PSY 411)
- o) PSY 495 Empirical Senior Thesis I (change in title and from PSY 451)
- p) PSY 496 Empirical Senior Thesis II (change in title and from PSY 452)
- q) PSY 254 Consumer Psychology (change from PSY 320)
- r) PSY 352 Psychotherapy and Behavioral Change (change from PSY 415)
- s) PSY 305 History of Psychology (change from PSY 406)
- t) PSY 364 Industrial and Organizational Psychology (change from PSY 310)
- u) PSY 380 Learning and Comparative Cognition (change in title and from PSY 420)
- v) GEOG 105 Earthquakes and Volcanoes (this course change is the addition of a lab)

E. Report from the Library Task Force (Martha Rainbolt)

The Library Task Force shared its final report (see Appendix One) and noted that there had been broad participation from the community in the form of responses to surveys and attendance at the luncheon and open forum. The task force presented two models for leadership of the library and information services and emphasized the importance of timing a search to maximize the possibility of hiring the best person(s).

A majority of the task force recommended the appointment of one person to serve as University Librarian and Chief Information Officer and there was unanimous agreement amongst all task force members that, if this model is chosen, there should be a national search to fill the position. A minority of the task force felt that there too many responsibilities for one person to oversee and recommended the appointment of a University Librarian or Dean of the Library and a Director of Information Services. The task force was evenly split on the need for conducting a national search for the top library position in this structure.

The task force reported that a majority of faculty members responding to the meetings and surveys support a national search. The task force also recommended that any national search be timed so that the best pool of candidates is available.

Question: Why do some on the task force believe that there might be too many responsibilities for a single person to handle?

Answer: The concern is that the growth in technology will consume too much of the individual's time. These members of the task force believed that there needs to be one person whose sole focus is the library.

Question: How does this report intersect with planned renovations for the library?

Answer: The task force was divided about whether renovations should take place before or after the hiring of a new head of the libraries.

Question: What happens next?

The chair of the task force called upon the VPAA to address this.

The VPAA reported that it is now necessary to examine the financial situation, particularly with the upcoming end to the e-learning grant from Lilly. The institution will need to consider the ideal management structure in light of the finances, including the how this position will affect other administrative positions. The Library Advisory Committee and Academic Technology Advising Committee will provide advice on any restructuring necessary following the end of the e-learning grant. The VPAA plans to attend a national conference on "Integrating Library and Computing Services" (at Kenyon College, March 15-16) to learn about what the market is like for leadership positions in library and information services. The goal is to have in place by spring break plans for the next 18 months.

The faculty expressed its appreciation to the task force for its work.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Peter Graham)

A. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the following changes to Section II of the Academic Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text to be deleted is shown with ~~strikethrough~~; text to be inserted is underlined.

The motion to table was passed by a show of hands. The purpose of this motion is to bring the language in this section in line with the recently approved changes to the language in the Academic Integrity Policy. The full text of the motion is:

Section II. Student-Initiated Grievance on Grading and Other Forms of Evaluation by Faculty

The normal presumption at DePauw is that the faculty member alone is qualified to evaluate and assign grades to the academic work of students in his or her courses. For this reason, questions regarding a faculty member's grades are not normally subject to review. The following procedure is for exceptional cases only.

At all levels of the procedure outlined below, those who hear grade grievances are to be concerned only with whether the faculty member acted in a fair, reasonable manner and whether the faculty member used the same methods of evaluation for all students in the class.

In addressing a grievance:

1. The student must first attempt to meet with the faculty member involved, thus permitting an opportunity for an informal resolution of the case.
2. If the situation is not settled, then either the student or the faculty member may ask the chair of the department (or ~~dean of the school~~ director of program) in which the course is taught to try to resolve the issue. The student, faculty member, and department chair may consult with ~~the associate~~ an academic dean for academic affairs to ask questions about procedure and to discuss the issues involved.
3. At the request of the student or faculty member, or on the chair's initiative, the chair may appoint and preside over a special departmental committee, which will recommend a resolution to the grievance.

4. Either the student or the faculty member may decide to appeal the departmental recommendation to the University Review Committee (URC). Such appeals must be made within two weeks after the departmental recommendation has been given. Arrangements for a hearing before the URC are made through ~~the associate~~ an academic dean ~~for academic affairs~~.

The URC consists of an appointed member of the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC), who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by ~~the associate~~ an academic dean ~~of academic affairs~~ from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The associate dean of academic affairs 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 and administrative alternates are also designated for the committee. Either party can ask the ~~associate dean for academic affairs~~ to replace a committee member because of bias or conflict of interest. The ~~associate~~ dean 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.

5. The decision reached by the URC is final. Appeals of the committee's decision, on procedural grounds only, may be made to the vice president of academic affairs.

6. Further information, including details about the hearing procedures, is available in the Academic Affairs Office, 305 Harrison Hall. Hearing procedures are established and periodically reviewed by SLAAC in consultation with the vice president for academic affairs.

Time Line:

1. Neither a departmental review committee nor the University Review Committee may be convened to hear a grievance until after the student's full semester of work has been completed and a final course grade has been given.
2. A student who has a grievance should talk to the faculty member as soon as possible after the disputed grade has been given, and no later than the last week of the first full semester following the disputed evaluation.
3. The student must present an unresolved grievance to the department chair or associate dean within the first full semester following the disputed evaluation.
4. Appeals of the departmental decision to the URC by either the student or faculty member must be made within two weeks of receiving a written decision from the department chair.
5. After a hearing, the decision of the URC will be delivered in writing to the student's mailbox (or home address if the semester is over) and to the faculty member within two working days after the committee has met.
6. A student or faculty member who wishes to appeal the URC decision on procedural grounds must do so in writing to the vice president ~~of for~~ academic affairs within ~~two weeks~~ three business days of receiving the decision from the committee.

B. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the following changes to Section D of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Academic Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text to be deleted is shown with ~~strike through~~; text to be inserted is underlined.

The motion to table was passed by a show of hands. The purpose of this motion is to clarify the policy. The full text of the motion is:

Section D. 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 meet with the student. If suspected violations occur at the end of the semester, the instructor may assign a grade of Incomplete and arrange to confer with the student at the start of the following semester. Reports must be made before the end of the semester following the 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:

1. The instructor arranges to ~~confer meet~~ 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 and present to him or her a ~~written statement of the charge, the evidence supporting it, and a 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).

2. 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. ~~the dean of students, the dean of academic services, the associate dean of academic affairs, a faculty member, or an 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.

3. 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 ~~the associate dean of academic affairs~~ 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. A hold is placed on the student's transcript until the charge has been settled.

SLAAC currently is discussing the student social center and time banks. The committee also is beginning its work on the AQIP project on wellness in the areas of fitness, stress management and nutrition. The committee will be looking for input from the community in the form of a survey and open forums, and hopes to appoint some task forces by the end of the semester.

It was suggested to the committee that it might contact the human resources personnel at local companies as they often have wellness initiatives already in place.

5. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Kerry Pannell)

Two COA members, Nancy Davis and Kerry Pannell, represented the committee at the Board of Trustees retreat in January where the focus this year was on internationalization and ethics. Faculty members Nancy Davis, Carrie Klaus and Cleve Johnson, and alum Sally Cowal made a

presentation to the Board on internationalization. In general, the trustees were very supportive of the internationalization issue.

Faculty members Kerry Pannell, Raymonda Burgman, Richard Cameron and John Roth (to be a visiting professor in 2007) made a presentation to the Board on ethics. An architect from the company designing the Ethics Institute gave a presentation on the building itself, which will be located at the nature park.

The committee continues to work on a policy on intellectual property rights.

The committee has been reviewing the Emeriti health care program. With this program, DePauw will make monthly indexed contributions for a period of 25 years to an individual health savings account that an emeriti faculty member can use for his or her health care needs during retirement. Thus far, the program has been fairly successful despite a few early problems with how emeriti faculty were charged. COA is asking staff from Human Resources to provide workshops for current faculty members interested in understanding how the new Emeriti program works. COA will continue to serve in an advisory role regarding transition issues for those retiring in less than 25 years.

COA also is continuing with its review of the supplemental pay programs, including the University Professor and Distinguished Professor program. The committee plans to interview those faculty members who have held these positions.

Faculty Development Committee (David Gellman)

The deadline for applications to the Student/Faculty Summer Research Fund, is Wednesday, March 8th.

The chair of FDC invited Meryl Altman to report on the Mellon Fund.

Meryl Altman reported that the Mellon Fund is nearing the end of its cycle. A final call was made for proposals in the category of "Strengthening Intellectual Communities." The due date for applications is April 12th for projects to be carried out in fall 2006 and/or spring 2007. Faculty members interested in submitting a proposal can contact Meryl Altman or Terri Bonebright for further information. Further information and forms also are available at the Faculty Development website.

Admissions Advisory Committee (Hilary Eppley)

The committee is continuing to work with Admissions on its brochures. At present the committee is looking at the initial contact brochure and one for the School of Music.

Admissions is still looking for faculty members who are willing to contact prospective students. Nominations of students to serve as tour guides are due as soon as possible to Anna Logan so that students can apply by Friday, March 10th.

Admissions will be holding an admitted student open house on April 8th. Faculty members and student volunteers are needed for the academic interest fair. Faculty members with an interest in serving as contacts for "undecided" students at the fair are especially welcome.

GLCA Representative (Hilary Eppley)

The faculty's two GLCA representatives, Jim Rambo and Hilary Eppley, attended the Academic Council meeting in November. One item discussed at the meeting was the creation of a data base of faculty research interests that could be used as a resource for speakers, external evaluators and temporary faculty positions. DePauw is part of a small trial group testing this resource. The Academic Council also discussed ways to encourage inter-institutional initiatives.

The GLCA Board will be discussing at its next meeting the possibility of adding institutions in the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) to the tuition reimbursement program.

Advising Committee (Carrie Klaus)

Faculty were reminded of the upcoming visit of Tom Brown, who will be conducting an advising workshop on March 16th.

Faculty Governance Steering Committee (David Harvey)

Last fall the faculty approved the creation of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee with the charge is "to oversee the faculty governance system, to engage in or delegate strategic planning matters for the faculty and to assist the administration in directing its inquiries and requests for input to the appropriate faculty committee."

Last semester the FGSC meet several times to coordinate the faculty's input to the planning for AQIP. Following the open meetings in September, we summarized the response from the faculty to the AQIP steering committee. We also meet several times to discuss the emerging projects and met with Ken Kirkpatrick to offer further advice and perspective to the AQIP steering committee.

So far this semester, the committee has met twice. The primary issues on our agenda are revisiting the "faculty sanity" issue that emerged in the AQIP process, but that did not end up among the final AQIP projects, and examining the state and health of faculty governance.

6. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The VPAA noted that process of selecting AQIP projects was a good test of the usefulness of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee.

The VPAA also noted that the broader consultations about the AQIP projects might create confusion about the new strategic plan and its relationship to the AQIP project. The strategic plan recently adopted by the Trustees is the governing document and the AQIP projects serve the objectives and initiative of that plan. Further details on each aspect of the strategic plan will be available soon. We will have to discuss the best way to communicate about the strategic plan, perhaps using a website similar to the AQIP website.

With the recent changes to the Academic Handbook almost complete, Academic Affairs will be preparing for the printing of hard copies for the faculty. If there are any additional changes to the Handbook, it would be helpful if they could be bought as motions to be tabled at the April faculty meeting so that they can be considered at the May faculty meeting.

The VPAA expressed his thanks to Martha Rainbolt for her work as chair of the Library Task Force as well as her past work as chair of the Handbook Task Force and the Chair of the Faculty. The faculty joined the VPAA in this recognition.

7. Remarks from the President

The President reported that the Board of Trustees, at its January meeting, approved the university's long-range plans for the next five years. The Board indicated its continued support for academic excellence and remains committed to maintaining faculty compensation at a level consistent with current benchmarks, maintaining a student-faculty ratio of 10:1 and maintaining the merit scholarship program. In addition the Board remains committed to ensuring that the university has the resources to keep technology up-to-date and to a vibrant arts community.

The Board also expressed its support for efforts in internationalization and broadening global perspectives as a means for preparing DePauw's students to make a difference in a diverse world.

The Board also continues its support for the ethics initiative.

The President reported that Srimati Basu, David Guinee and Brett O'Bannon made a presentation to the Board of Visitors on the impact of international students at DePauw.

The President also reported on his recent trip to India where he explored the possibilities of recruiting students, establishing internships and programs for faculty.

The President plans to hold an open forum on April 5th to follow up on many of these topics.

8. Old Business

There was no new business to come before the faculty.

9. New Business

David Harvey: Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the deletion of Article II.G of the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text of the article is:

G. Evaluation of Faculty Members in Full-Time Temporary Appointments

Such faculty shall be evaluated according to requirements for periodic evaluation applicable to faculty members in tenurable positions. Those having been reappointed for a second year shall prepare for an interim evaluation, to take place in their third year.

The motion was seconded and tabled by a show of hands.

Explanation for motion: With the administration's changes to Article I of the Personnel Policies, the faculty positions identified as full-time temporary appointments no longer exist; thus, there no longer is a need for this part of Article II.

10. Announcements

David Harvey – editorial corrections to the Academic Handbook

One responsibility assigned to the Chair of the Faculty is maintenance of the Academic Handbook. Now that the faculty has nearly completed its revisions to the Handbook, there is a need to read through the Handbook with an editorial eye. If there is no objection from the faculty, then the following editorial corrections will be made:

- a. update all internal cross-references
- b. provide consistency in the use of the terms Article and Section
- c. update the titles of administrative titles identified in the Handbook
- d. update the section headings in Article II of the Personnel Policy so that they match the definition of faculty positions as given by the Administration in Article I

If there is an objection to or concern with these corrections then they can be brought to the faculty at the April meeting as a formal motion.

11. The meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM.

Appendix One – Report from the Library Task Force

Library Task Force Report to MAO, the Faculty, LIS and the Administration

1. Things Learned:

- Library has made good strides over the last 5 years exploring and integrating technology-based sources and services that support the academic mission of the university.
- Some faculty members are concerned that this has come at the expense of more traditional library services/materials.
- Budgets have increased, especially in information services within and outside of the library, but not at the expense of hard copy acquisitions.
- Coordination of library and information technology is pervasive at schools similar to ours. What varies among schools is the extent and the structure of the integration.
- The efficacy of communication between librarians and faculty members (individually and in department or program groups) varies across the university. It is not clear where the fault lies when the communication has been ineffective, but the removal of hard copy material from the library is a persistently cited example in the affected departments and programs. Some faculty members feel that they have no influence on collection development. In areas where the communication is considered effective, there are compliments on collection development, reference and instruction services and resource prioritization.
- In terms of the library liaison program, some library liaisons feel that they have not been able to get a response from their faculty colleagues, while some faculty members feel that librarians have not been responsive to them. On the other hand, some faculty members, in music and science, for example, applaud the liaison program and think it has been very successful.
- DePauw faculty members (and Library, IT and IS staff) vary considerably in their opinions on the structure of authority, although a majority seem to favor some form of administrative coordination among the library, information technology support, and instructional services.
- There is some support among all groups that one of the qualifications for the role of a coordinator of these areas is a strong background/training in professional library service and administration. Support for this credential is strong among faculty members.
- The Library Task Force regards the current administrative structure of the library as adequate to the task of providing leadership and vision for a stronger library system.

2. Recommendation: Two Possible Models

A. One position -- combination of University Librarian and Chief Information Officer

A majority of Library Task Force members favor this recommendation; there is unanimous agreement on the Task Force that, if this model is chosen, there should be a national search to fill the position. This person should continue to be a part of Cabinet.

B. Two positions:

--University Librarian or Dean of the Libraries

--Director of Information Services

The Director of Information Services would oversee the work of Instructional Services and Support Services. In this model these two persons must work closely together and coordinate their responsibilities in an effective way.

Some think that the Instructional Services sector of LIS has greater affinity to Library collection development and reference and instruction services and thus might report to the University Librarian.

A minority of the Library Task Force favors this recommendation, and the Task Force is evenly divided on the issue of whether or not this librarian position must be filled by a national search.

General Comments: The majority of the faculty members who responded to the surveys and attended the forums support a national search for the top level library position.

Whoever is hired in the senior position -- or these positions -- should provide the leadership for the rest of the process. Any further restructuring within the staff and programs of the LIS division should be decided internally, led by the University Librarian/CIO, with broad and sustained consultation with the LIS staff and with faculty members who would be affected by the changes.

Timing: The Library Task Force would like the search process to be timed to maximize the chances of hiring the best qualified person and minimize the disruption of staffing in LIS.

3. Qualifications for Senior Position(s) with responsibility for the Library:

- Expertise in Libraries and in IS: Must have advanced degree from ALA accredited library school. Needs experience in both the library and the Information services sectors of an academic community.
- Vision: a clear but flexible image of what a first-rate liberal arts college library system should be, in terms of policies, practices and use of space, and how to move toward making that dream a reality, (make the library the "Julian" of the humanities and the social sciences).
- Understanding of national trends: good connections to the liberal arts college library community which permit a broad and deep understanding of the evolution of this sector of higher education.
- Personnel management skills: ability to create cooperation and integration between and among different groups of people; a desire to help each person in the system develop professionally; and the commitment to and ability to work for meaningful change in an atmosphere of trust and cooperation.
- Organizational management skills: Experience and skill in managing budgets and schedules, equipment and technology, and all the nuts and bolts of running a complex organization.
- Effective communication skills: Including good listening skills, responsiveness to faculty members and to students, engagement with the academic community as a whole.
- Ability to work well with and convince senior university officers of the benefits of implementing the vision and to work with them to convince trustees and donors of this vision as needed.

4. Some areas which are working well and might serve as models for future planning

- Web-based access to library services such as E-reserves, ILL, acquisitions, and the staff who work behind the scenes on these and other services.
- Electronic access to library resources such as JSTOR, references and other databases: Provides convenient access to resources.
- Library information sessions: Fosters cooperation since they involve students, faculty members, and librarians.
- Increased access to Archival resources: Collaboration between Archives and staff and several areas of LIS to digitize, index, and provide wider access to its unique resources.
- Collection development: Meetings with new faculty members and support for new courses strengthens holdings in new and existing areas.
- Reference and research assistance: Good assistance to meet student needs while teaching

research skills one on one.

- Technology workshops and individual projects: FITS, START, ITAP. Good cooperation between faculty members and IT staff working on course related projects.
- Collaboration within LIS: Improved communication because of combined departments
- Branch Libraries: Branch librarian “living” with faculty in buildings leads to more engagement between librarians and faculty members.
- Strong service ethic and commitment among LIS staff to meet the needs of faculty members and students.

5. Vision for DePauw Libraries:

DePauw needs a strong central campus library and branch libraries (including excellent collections, technologies, facilities, staff) for support of teaching and learning, for support of student and faculty research, and for instruction in finding information and assessing that information for classes and individuals. We need librarians and library professionals who are skilled at working with students and faculty members, expert in library resources and technologies, and actively engaged in their fields to keep abreast of trends and advances in best practices.

DePauw Libraries should:

- Identify, acquire, organize, preserve and provide access to pertinent recorded knowledge to support teaching, research and creative activities. This will lead to strong, balanced library collections, including books, journals, and visual and audio collections.
- Offer innovative library services which ensure easy and rapid access to information resources, whether locally or remotely held (regardless of format).
- Teach students and faculty members how to find, evaluate and use information. Teach students and faculty members to be knowledgeable in the processes of information seeking and impart the skills necessary for lifelong learning.
- Provide opportunities to understand the organization of information, appropriate search strategies and to develop critical research skills.
- Be engaged in professional development, professional advancement, and leadership in the field of library science.
- Engage in appropriate partnerships with other campus departments to enhance library resources and services.
- Consult regularly with faculty members and faculty committees in the development of policies, programs, collections, courses, and other initiatives.

A Cooperative partner that interacts with DePauw Libraries is Information Services. Proposed considerations for IS Vision:

Vision for Information Services:

- Provide convenient, reliable internet access and other computing resources to students, faculty and staff.
- Provide information technology support services which serve teaching and learning, as well as research needs.
- Provide leadership and management of campus facilities and infrastructure to support the teaching and research needs of students, faculty and staff.
- Provide adequate desktop computing resources leadership and vision for the development of both library and information services/IT to serve needs of the future.
- Provide leadership and management of support services and technical support staff.
- Use pre-existing technologies as well as designing new appropriate technologies for retrieving and manipulating information.
- Consult regularly with faculty members and faculty committees in the development of policies, programs, collections, courses, and other initiatives.

Regarding leadership and vision, DePauw needs:

- Highly credentialed and broadly experienced leaders in libraries and also in information technology management, who can communicate with faculty members to ascertain their instructional and research needs, keep them apprised of developments in resources and technologies, and provide vision for the continuing development of resources, facilities and services.

6. Other suggestions made to the Library Task Force; perhaps should be considered by the appropriate committees, faculty members, and administrators. [Note: The Library Task Force has discussed some, but not all, of these suggestions. The listing here is not necessarily an endorsement of the idea; these are ideas which we received in surveys, forums and individual meetings, and we encourage the groups listed to discuss their merits.]

*** For Faculty Library Advisory Committee**

- Report regularly on its agenda and the progress of its meetings to all faculty members, perhaps at faculty meetings.
- Post minutes of all discussions on the faculty governance website and share emails about highlights.
- Meet regularly to review policies, future programs, and resource allocation priorities.
- Ensure that policies are clearly stated and shared with all faculty members.
- Regularly meet with representatives of all groups within the library staff.
- Consult regularly with ATAC.

*** For Academic Technology Advisory Committee**

- Report regularly on its agenda and the progress of its meetings to all faculty members, perhaps at faculty meetings.
- Post minutes of all discussions on the faculty governance website and share emails about highlights.
- Meet regularly to review policies, future programs, and resource allocation priorities.
- Ensure that policies are clearly stated and shared with all faculty members.
- Regularly meet with members of the information services staff, as appropriate.
- Consult regularly with FLAC.

***For Library management, librarians, and staff**

- Report regularly on trends and progress to all faculty members.
- Ensure there are regular consultative visits to faculty members in departmental and program groups.
- Provide regular summary reports of library programs.
- Listen carefully to broad advice from faculty members and students.
- Strengthen librarian liaison system for departments and programs: seek ways to increase the depth and quality of interaction with those departments.
- Add faculty members to library working committees.
- Routinely review the de-selection policy with FLAC and then share this policy with the faculty at large, perhaps at the start of each academic year.
- In consultation with FLAC, develop a system that allows all faculty members to respond before important materials are discarded.

***For IS management and personnel**

- Report regularly on trends and progress to all faculty members, perhaps with something like a weekly newsletter.
- Report regularly on developments in hardware, software, and instructional uses of technology.
- Ensure there are regular consultative visits to faculty members in departmental and program groups.
- Provide regular summary reports of library programs.
- Listen carefully to broad advice from faculty members and students.
- Make sure that technical equipment is working in a reliable way, especially in the tech classrooms.

*** For Faculty Members**

- Just as the library has assigned a liaison to each department, each department or program or

school needs to assign a liaison or liaisons to the library who would regularly consult with their counterparts.

- Invite library staff liaisons to departmental or program meetings.
- Invite library and information services representatives to faculty committees such as MAO, Advising, and First-year Seminars, among others.
- Add senior Librarian as ex-officio member of CAPP.
- Treat library staff members and information services staff members as colleagues.
- Take an active role when invited to participate in recruiting and review of librarians and instructional services staff members.

***For senior administrators**

- Consult more broadly before reaching strategic decisions.
- Announce pending issues before decisions are made.
- Report decisions clearly to all affected constituencies.
- Recognize and reward collaboration, cooperation, and other achievement and growth.
- Especially seek ways to recognize individuals or groups whose work is traditionally not acknowledged as visibly.

April 3, 2006

1. Call to Order – 4:07 PM; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Verification of Quorum – Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum of 88 voting members of the faculty.
3. Approval of Minutes from the March 2006 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the March 2006 faculty meeting were approved by faculty consent.

4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

- A. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve a major in film studies.

The motion to table was passed by a show of hands. A copy of the proposal is included as Appendix One.

- B. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty approve the following change in Section 2 of the Graduation Requirements, with deleted language indicated by strikethrough. The effect of this motion is to permit first-year students to participate in off-campus study projects or internships.

The motion to table was passed by a show of hands. The full text of the motion is:

Winter Term Graduation Requirements

Every DePauw student must complete three Winter Term projects with a satisfactory grade. (Winter Term projects are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.) ~~First-year students are required to participate in and complete an on-campus course; upperclass students may take part in any type of Winter Term project. First-year students who receive unsatisfactory grades during Winter Term will be required to participate again in an on-campus course during the next Winter Term.~~ 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 [www.depauw.edu/admin/winterterm] <
<http://www.depauw.edu/admin/winterterm>> .

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. ~~First-year mid-year transfer students must complete the on-campus requirement and are encouraged to do so immediately.~~

C. Announcements

At its meeting on Tuesday, April 4th, CAPP will be finishing up its 'advice to RAS' concerning those departments or programs intending to submit RAS proposals. The deadline for RAS proposals for tenure-track lines is Monday, April 24th; see the Academic Affairs website for information on the procedure for RAS proposals.

CAPP is meeting on Tuesday, April 11th with the heads of interdisciplinary programs as part of an ongoing discussion of issues concerning these programs.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

COF continues its work on tenure, promotion and interim reviews.

The VPAA will be bringing to the faculty a proposed change to Article I of the Personnel Policies with regard to the time in rank for a timely promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. At the request of the VPAA, COF provided its advice and endorses the proposed changes.

Based on requests from several faculty members, COF currently is discussing possible changes to the student opinion forms. For this semester there will be two minor changes: shifting the location of questions five and six in order to give more space for the written responses to other questions and adding a scale for the answer to the question on a student's effort. COF is discussing whether to include comparative data as part of the statistical summary. Questions and concerns about the student opinion forms can be directed to members of the committee.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michael Sinowitz)

A. Motion (to be tabled) that the faculty give MAO the authority to implement a rational timebank system after a thorough consultation with the faculty and after investigating the timebanks at comparable liberal arts institutions.

The motion to table was passed by a show of hands. An explanation of the reasons for the motion was distributed and is attached as Appendix Two.

Question. Will there be open meetings to gather input from the faculty?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If the motion is passed, will MAO bring a proposed timebank to the faculty for an up or down vote?

Answer. No. The intention of this proposal is for the faculty to give MAO the authority to implement a timebank system without bringing it to the faculty for an up or down vote.

Faculty were reminded that the faculty gave MAO just this sort of authority with respect to setting the academic calendar.

B. Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approved the following new course:

MUS 104 Introduction to Music Theory; 1 credit; Group 3 (non-lit) designation

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

C. Announcement of changes in title, numbering and other changes to courses:

- a. BIO 325: Bioinformatics (change is to include a lab)
- b. ML 500F: Teaching of French (adding 500-level to existing 400-level)
- c. ML 500G: Teaching of German (adding 500-level to existing 400-level)
- d. ML 500S: Teaching of Spanish (adding 500-level to existing 400-level)

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Peter Graham)

A. Motion (to be removed from the table and vote on) that the faculty approve the following changes to Section II of the Academic Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text to be deleted is shown with ~~strike through~~; text to be inserted is underlined.

Section II. Student-Initiated Grievance on Grading and Other Forms of Evaluation by Faculty

The normal presumption at DePauw is that the faculty member alone is qualified to evaluate and assign grades to the academic work of students in his or her courses. For this reason, questions regarding a faculty member's grades are not normally subject to review. The following procedure is for exceptional cases only.

At all levels of the procedure outlined below, those who hear grade grievances are to be concerned only with whether the faculty member acted in a fair, reasonable manner and whether the faculty member used the same methods of evaluation for all students in the class.

In addressing a grievance:

1. The student must first attempt to meet with the faculty member involved, thus permitting an opportunity for an informal resolution of the case.
2. If the situation is not settled, then either the student or the faculty member may ask the chair of the department (or ~~dean of the school~~ director of program) in which the course is taught to try to resolve the issue. The student, faculty member, and department chair may consult with ~~the associate an academic dean for academic affairs~~ an academic dean to ask questions about procedure and to discuss the issues involved.
3. At the request of the student or faculty member, or on the chair's initiative, the chair may appoint and preside over a special departmental committee, which will recommend a resolution to the grievance.
4. Either the student or the faculty member may decide to appeal the departmental recommendation to the University Review Committee (URC). Such appeals must be made within two weeks after the departmental recommendation has been given. Arrangements for a hearing before the URC are made through ~~the associate an academic dean for academic affairs~~ an academic dean.

The URC consists of an appointed member of the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (SLAAC), who will chair the hearing, two teaching faculty members, and two students. Faculty and student members are chosen by ~~the associate an academic dean of academic affairs~~

from a pool of volunteers identified by SLAAC. The ~~associate dean of academic affairs~~ 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 and administrative alternates are also designated for the committee. Either party can ask the ~~associate dean for academic affairs~~ to replace a committee member because of bias or conflict of interest. The ~~associate dean~~ 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.

5. The decision reached by the URC is final. Appeals of the committee's decision, on procedural grounds only, may be made to the vice president of academic affairs.

6. Further information, including details about the hearing procedures, is available in the Academic Affairs Office, 305 Harrison Hall. Hearing procedures are established and periodically reviewed by SLAAC in consultation with the vice president for academic affairs.

Time Line:

1. Neither a departmental review committee nor the University Review Committee may be convened to hear a grievance until after the student's full semester of work has been completed and a final course grade has been given.

2. A student who has a grievance should talk to the faculty member as soon as possible after the disputed grade has been given, and no later than the last week of the first full semester following the disputed evaluation.

3. The student must present an unresolved grievance to the department chair or ~~associate dean~~ within the first full semester following the disputed evaluation.

4. Appeals of the departmental decision to the URC by either the student or faculty member must be made within two weeks of receiving a written decision from the department chair.

5. After a hearing, the decision of the URC will be delivered in writing to the student's mailbox (or home address if the semester is over) and to the faculty member within two working days after the committee has met.

6. A student or faculty member who wishes to appeal the URC decision on procedural grounds must do so in writing to the vice president of for academic affairs within ~~two weeks~~ three business days of receiving the decision from the committee.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands.

Question: Why has the time for appealing a decision by the URC been changed from two weeks to three business days?

Answer: This change is to bring this policy in line with the Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Community Conduct Council.

Question: What is the definition of a business day?

Answer: There is no simple answer. When a student receives the URC's decision, the student is given a deadline by which to file an appeal.

Question: Who are the academic deans who might oversee this process?

Answer: The current academic deans are Marnie McInnes, Kelley Hall and Jeff Hollander.

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

B. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the following changes to Section D of the Academic Integrity Policy as published in the Academic Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text to be deleted is shown with ~~strike through~~; text to be inserted is underlined.

Section D. 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 meet with the student. If suspected violations occur at the end of the semester, the instructor may assign a grade of Incomplete and arrange to confer with the student at the start of the following semester. Reports must be made before the end of the semester following the 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:

1. The instructor arranges to confer ~~meet~~ 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 and present to him or her a written statement of the charge, the evidence supporting it, and a 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).
2. 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. ~~the dean of students, the dean of academic services, the associate dean of academic affairs, a faculty member, or an 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.
3. 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 ~~the associate dean of academic affairs~~ 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. A hold is placed on the student's transcript until the charge has been settled.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands.

Question: Does the change from "meet with the student" to "confer with the student" imply that faculty can do this by email or phone?

Answer: Yes. This provides the faculty member with greater flexibility for contacting the student.

Question: When a suspected violation of academic integrity occurs at the end of the semester and the student receives a grade of incomplete, will he or she be in the dark about the reason for this grade?

Answer: That is not the intention of the policy. The goal here is to maintain flexibility when there is a suspicion of academic integrity at the end of the semester.

Question: When a student receives a grade of incomplete, does the Registrar's office provide the student with a reason for the grade?

Answer: No. In all other circumstances the grade of incomplete is supposed to result from a contract between the student and the faculty member. If a student did contact the Registrar's office, the reason would be given.

Question: When a student receives a grade of incomplete, doesn't that grade remain on his or her transcript?

Answer: Yes. However, we are looking into not retaining the grade of I in this case.

The faculty had a brief discussion about alternative options for assigning a grade in this circumstance. A deferred grade is not appropriate because this grade is used when the final grade depends on work to be completed during the succeeding semester. The Registrar reported that other institutions assign a grade of NG (no grade), AI (academic investigation), NULL and I (incomplete). None of these is a perfect solution.

A suggestion was made to change the wording at the end of the second line of the first paragraph from "meet with" to "contact" to be consistent with wording elsewhere in the motion. The suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The motion, as amended, was approved by a show of hands.

5. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Kerry Pannell)

COA is continuing with its review of the University Professor and Distinguished Professor program. At present, the committee is interviewing past members of the review committees that have reviewed files and made recommendations to the administration.

Several faculty have asked about the availability of the Roth 403B program. Paul Schmitt is looking into this and further details will be forthcoming.

Academic Technology Advisory Committee (Matthew Balensuela)

The purpose of ATAC is to advise the Chief Information Officer on all matters related to technology and associated support services that impact, or have the potential to impact teaching, learning, research, academic advising, and academic professional activities. The current members of the committee are Matthew Balensuela (chair), Bruce Sanders, Harry Brown, Jeffrey Hansen, Michele Villinski, Terri Bonebright, Dennis Trinkle, Carol Smith, Ken Kirkpatrick. The student representative (without vote) is Bryan Helm.

The committee's work this year has included: providing feedback to Dennis Trinkle on David Staley's report on the DePauw 361 program, reviewing for Dennis Trinkle the strategic plan for

the library and information services, and providing comments to the VPAA on the structure of Library and Information Services. Upcoming agenda items include a survey on the use of Blackboard by the university community and meeting with the Vice-President of Student Congress to discuss the topic of student printing balances.

Diversity and Equity Committee (Matthew Balensuela)

The purpose of DEC is to advise the Administration and faculty on matters regarding diversity, inclusiveness and equity. The current faculty members serving on DEC are full-time faculty members Matthew Balensuela (chair), Cynthia Cornell, Tiyi Morris and Jinyu Liu, and part-time faculty member Carla Lane.

The committee's work this year has included: conducting equity and diversity briefings for all tenure-track searches and meeting with Student Services as part of its search for a Director of Greek Affairs. Providing briefings for non-faculty related searches is a new area for DEC and is an opportunity for the committee to broaden its work on campus in this area. Future work includes meeting with Vice-President Speller to discuss the possibility of installing family friendly unisex bathrooms on campus, and discussing the issue of possible bias among students toward non-native speaking faculty and staff. In addition, the VPAA and DEC are discussing ways to streamline meetings with departments undertaking searches. DEC also is exploring ways to streamline DEC briefings. Marnie McInnes has developed a set of Power Point slides to summarize the content of briefings. These slides have been reviewed by the VPAA to coordinate materials presented to search committees. One possibility being considered is to coordinate DEC's briefing with the VPAA's meeting with the search committee.

6. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The VPAA presented a proposed change to Article I of the Personnel Policies, which is written by the administration (see Appendix Three for the full text of the proposed changes). [*Editorial note: the text of Appendix Three includes an editorial change provided by the VPAA during his remarks and, therefore, is slightly different than that in the handout distributed at the meeting.*] The proposed changes result from suggestions by several faculty members and follows consultation with the Committee on Faculty, which reported that it recommended the change. The effect of the proposed change is to shorten the time in rank for a consideration of timely promotion to Associate Professor. The change will go into effect beginning with the next academic year and will change eligibility for some faculty members. Comments from faculty members are welcome. The VPAA will consult with COF about any comments or suggestion about the change before making a final decision.

Question: Are there any changes to the expectations for the tenure and promotion reviews?

Answer: No. The criteria for both tenure and promotion remain unchanged.

Acting on a suggestion from the Chair of the Faculty, the VPAA has compiled a list of faculty service activities that fall outside of the normal committee structure. The VPAA reported that 16 faculty members had lunch with the Board of Trustees in October, four made presentations to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in October, 12 contributed to programs for the Friends of the Arts in November, five taught classes for the Board of Visitors, six spoke to the Board of Trustees in January, 23 contributed to programs for the Media, Management and Science Advisory Boards, seven spoke to or joined members of the Board of Visitors for lunch in March, nine participated in the Rector Scholar interviews, 18 served as outside members on search committees, 17 served on special personnel review committees, 25 contributed to fall Admission events, three contributed to special regional alumni events and five served as

members of the Sculpture Advisory Committee and/or Exhibitions Committee. The full list will be posted on the faculty governance website.

At the request of the Lilly Foundation the University has been working on an analysis of student internships. One interesting fact has emerged. For the two most recent classes, a student who returned for the second year and then completed at least one internship, whether during the summer, Winter Term or a semester, had a 94% graduation rate. Sophomores who did not complete an internship had an 80% graduation rate. It is not clear what is the reason for this difference. There are demographic differences between students pursuing and not pursuing internships including major and ethnicity. Further work is needed to see if these differences are important or if the decision to pursue an internship is simply a matter of individual choice.

As a follow-up to Diversity and Equity Committee's report that it is looking into some concerns regarding the interactions among students and faculty and staff who are non-native speakers, the VPAA reported that 12% of the full-time faculty have birth citizenship outside of the United States, which is a strength we should celebrate.

One of the Diversity and Equity Committee's major roles is to help fulfill the University's mission with respect to diversity. Current practice is to have DEC make presentations to departments at the beginning of the search process. This may not be the optimum time for meetings to address departmental diversity plans (e.g. access, curricular content, goals). The VPAA suggested that there might be better times to address diversity issues not related to a specific search, such as during a self-study.

The VPAA presented a report to the faculty regarding the recommendations from the Library Task Force. A promised elaboration of this report, distributed to the faculty by email, is included in Appendix Four.

7. Remarks from the President

The President announced his decisions on several personnel reviews:

Receiving tenure: Michele Villinski, Brian Howard

Receiving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: Susan Anthony, Jeffrey Gropp Carrie Klaus and Kevin Howley

Receiving promotion to Associate Professor: Leslie James

The President reminded the faculty that he will be holding two open meetings to discuss the strategic plan recently adopted by the Board of Trustees. The sessions will be held at 11:00 a.m. and 5:15 p.m. in the Union Building ballroom.

8. Old Business

David Harvey: Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the deletion of Article II.G of the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook. The text of the article is:

G. Evaluation of Faculty Members in Full-Time Temporary Appointments

Such faculty shall be evaluated according to requirements for periodic evaluation applicable to faculty members in tenurable positions. Those having been reappointed for a second year shall prepare for an interim evaluation, to take place in their third year.

The motion was seconded and removed from the table by a show of hands.

Explanation for motion: With the administration's changes to Article I of the Personnel Policies, the faculty positions identified as full-time temporary appointments no longer exist; thus, there no longer is a need for this part of Article II.

The motion was passed by a show of hands.

9. New Business

David Harvey – Approval of divisional election results (to be distributed at the meeting).

The results of the election of divisional representatives was distributed (see Appendix Five). A motion to approve the elections was made and seconded. The motion passed by a show of hands.

10. Announcements

Madeleine Eagon – Redesign of the DePauw website's home page and portal pages, including navigation tools.

The University is planning a revision to the current home page, portal pages and navigation tools with a goal of having the work complete during the fall semester. The team working on the new design welcomes suggestions from the faculty through an on-line survey (forthcoming) and an open-listening session, to be held on Tuesday, April 25th from 4 – 6 p.m. in the Bartlett House.

Question: Is there anyway that the redesign can be completed this summer so that departments can implement changes to their homepages before the beginning of the new academic year?

Answer: Without knowing the extent of changes, it is too early to know when the changes can be completed.

Robert Dewey – First-Year Seminar Committee

Faculty were reminded that revisions to course descriptions for Fall 2006 first-year seminars are due soon. The First-Year Seminar Committee is holding a discussion session on "Teaching and Advising First-Year Students" to be held on April 26th from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. in the Walden Inn.

11. The meeting adjourned at 5:23 PM.

[Appendix One – Proposal for a Major in Film Studies](#)

[Appendix Two – Rationale for MAO Motion Related to the Timebanks](#)

[Appendix Three – Proposed Administrative Changes to Article I of the Personnel Policies](#)

[Appendix Four – Text of VPAA's E-Mail on Recommendations from the Library Task Force](#)

[Appendix Five – Results of Elections of Divisional Representatives to Faculty Committees](#)

May 1, 2006

1. Call to Order – 4:03 pm; Ballroom of the Union Building
2. Verification of Quorum

Attendance at the beginning of the meeting exceeded the quorum of 88 voting members of the faculty.

3. Approval of Minutes from the April 2006 Faculty Meeting

There were no corrections or additions. The minutes from the April 2006 faculty meeting were approved by faculty consent.

4. Ken Kirkpatrick – Motion (to be voted on) 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 2006.

The motion was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

5. Reports from Coordinating Committees

Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Pedar Foss)

A. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve the following changes to Section 2 of the Graduation Requirements, with deleted language indicated by strikethrough. The effect of this motion is to permit first-year students to participate in off-campus study projects or internships.

Winter Term Graduation Requirements

Every DePauw student must complete three Winter Term projects with a satisfactory grade. (Winter Term projects are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.) ~~First-year students are required to participate in and complete an on-campus course; upperclass students may take part in any type of Winter Term project. First-year students who receive unsatisfactory grades during Winter Term will be required to participate again in an on-campus course during the next Winter Term.~~ 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 [www.depauw.edu/admin/winterterm] <<http://www.depauw.edu/admin/winterterm>> .

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. ~~First year mid-year transfer students must complete the on-campus requirement and are encouraged to do so immediately.~~

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands.

Question: CAPP studied this issue approximately five years ago and decided that it was not a good idea to allow first-year students to go off campus during Winter Term. What are the reasons CAPP reached a different conclusion this time?

Answer: Student Services staff members, the Winter Term Subcommittee, the administration and the faculty members on CAPP all support this motion. The last time CAPP considered this proposal there was a belief that keeping first-year students on campus during Winter Term would provide them with a bonding experience; however, there is no evidence that this happens. One reason for CAPP's support of this motion is that many students find an off-campus program to be a transforming experience and that such an experience can play an important role in influencing a student's academic interests. Not allowing a student to participate in an off-campus Winter Term until his or her second year limits the impact that such programs can have on a student's choice of a major. Allowing students to go off-campus earlier also is consistent with the institution's interest in internationalization.

Question: A previous Winter Term Subcommittee studied this issue and concluded that first-year students have insufficient time to develop a well defined internship. In addition, the students participating in Winter Term In-Service trips are selected during the previous academic year. Doesn't this limit the opportunity for a first-year student to go off-campus during Winter Term?

Answer: Yes. However, once the increased demand for off-campus programs is known it will be possible for faculty members to offer additional off-campus trips to meet that need. This is a good thing for faculty members interested in planning and running off-campus Winter Term trips. Motivated first-year students will be able to arrange for internships.

Question: Taking students who have recently graduated from high school on an off-campus trip is not the same as taking students who have completed one or more years of college. What evidence is there about the maturity of our first-year students? Won't this put too much pressure on first-year students to find off-campus experiences?

Answer: There is no additional burden as first-year students will not be required to go off-campus; they are just being allowed the option of not staying on-campus. The probable impact of the program is, at first, likely to be negligible. Most first-year students are happy to remain on campus during Winter Term and few will have the time to develop an internship or design an independent study program. For the few that can, the choice to do so is a good thing.

Question: If the demand for off-campus trips increases and we offer more such opportunities, will there be an increase in funds to assist students with need?

Answer: One part of the commitment to internationalization is increasing scholarship funds for off-campus opportunities during the semester and Winter Term. We have budgeted for substantial increases in that funding for each of the next few years. There will need to be some planning to get the right distribution of the scholarship funds between Winter Term and off-campus study.

Question: Does this mean that a first-year student may choose to stay home during his or her first Winter Term? How many will do so?

Answer: Yes. The actual number is unknown.

Question: Are there plans for changing the on-campus Winter Term?

Answer: CAPP discussed this. The academic component is working well. There are issues, however, with the non-academic program. Co-curriculars are not working and the students do not like them. Additionally, the co-curricular program was not passed by the faculty. CAPP believes that another strategy is needed.

Question: Why isn't it sufficient to let first-year students petition to go off campus during Winter Term? How many such petitions are there and are any turned down?

Answer: There are a few each year; one such petition was denied this year. However, why should we require first-year students to file petitions instead of giving them choice? There are additional academic benefits to allowing first-year students to go off-campus. For example, there will be opportunities to link first-year seminars to off-campus experiences, which we currently cannot do.

Question: Did CAPP consider the consequence for a student if he or she chooses to opt out of the first Winter Term and then fails a subsequent Winter Term?

Answer: No.

Question: Did CAPP consider bringing the motion to the faculty with a recommendation that it take effect with the 2007/08 academic year in order to provide faculty the time to develop projects?

Answer: This was considered and was the original idea, but the Winter Term office did not feel this was necessary.

Question: Won't this proposal provide more financial problems for some families, making the opportunity to go off-campus during the first year a benefit for wealthier families. Additionally, doesn't this add another burden to the advising process since plans for Winter Term must be completed in the first six weeks?

Answer: These are important concerns; however, adding one additional task to the advising process is not burdensome, and for students who wish to go off-campus the financial concerns will be faced eventually.

The question was called and the motion to cease debate passed by a show of hands.

The motion to approve the changes to Section 2 of the Graduation Requirements was approved by a show of hands with some dissent.

B. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty approve a major in film studies. A copy of the proposal is included as Appendix One.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands.

Question: Why is CAPP bringing this proposal to the faculty when CAPP currently is in the process of examining interdisciplinary programs? What is the process that Film Studies uses to approve courses as part of the major?

Answer: This particular proposal has been in the works for some time. The current proposal represents a substantial revision to a proposal that CAPP considered earlier. CAPP is looking at interdisciplinary programs, but the Film Studies program is in good shape, has strong enrollments and this is a strong proposal. CAPP was not, however, unanimous in its vote to bring this to the faculty and was closely divided.

The criteria for courses in Film Studies are listed at the top of page 6 of the proposal. The steering committee examines course syllabi and there is a requirement that 50% of the content be related to film studies.

Speaking against the motion: A member of CAPP spoke against the motion, noting that it passed out of committee on a 4-3 vote. CAPP had reservations with the film studies curriculum when it was first presented to the committee. Although Film Studies has addressed some of these concerns with this new proposal, the program is not yet ready to come to the faculty for approval as a major.

Speaking for the motion: Film Studies has worked on this proposal for several years and researched comparable programs at other similar institutions.

Speaking against the motion: As a member of CAPP who voted against bringing this motion to the faculty, a significant concern was bringing another interdisciplinary program to the faculty before problems with such programs are solved. There are too many unanswered questions, such as the balance between the number of departments and interdisciplinary programs, registration problems and the lack of sunset clauses for weak interdisciplinary programs, for the faculty to approve this program.

Question: The argument that we should add a program because students want it or because other institutions have one is not convincing. The proposal states that Film Studies will provide students with "the depth, structure and coherence of a major field of study." What gives the faculty teaching in film studies the academic credentials to teach courses that meet this description?

Answer: There are two ways to consider programs in film studies. One view is as a traditional academic discipline with training obtained through a graduate program in film studies. Historically, however, film studies has been an interdisciplinary program so the methodology is similar to that used in departments such as English and Communications. The training of our faculty is adequate.

Answer: In recent searches in English, approximately half of the candidates have had a scholarly interest or training in film.

Question: How many of the courses listed in the proposal currently exist? Are they offered regularly?

Answer: With one or two exceptions, the courses exist and are taught regularly.

Speaking for the motion: There is an increased interest among English majors in pursuing graduate work in Film Studies and they worry about their ability to compete with film studies majors from other institutions for positions in graduate programs.

Question: Are DePauw students actually at a disadvantage if they don't complete a major in film studies?

Answer: They think so.

Speaking for the motion: Film is one of the main records of the 20th-Century and our students are often visual learners. It is important that we offer students opportunities to learn through an examination of film.

A secret ballot was requested. The motion to approve a major in film studies was approved by a vote of 65 yes to 51 no with three abstentions.

C. Announcements

1. Acting upon a recommendation from Education Studies, the Teacher Education Committee agreed to delay the start of the MAT program until the 07-08 academic year instead of the beginning of the 06-07 academic year. The reason for the delay is that there are only 4 or 5 students in the pipeline and faculty resources can be better spent elsewhere.

Question: How many students are eventually expected to be enrolled in the program?

Answer: 15 to 20 students.

Question: Is the University at risk of liability if it does not begin the MAT program as previously announced?

Answer: Because the University has not yet admitted anyone into the program, it probably has not yet incurred liability. The University has not yet begun active recruiting for the program.

2. CAPP will continue to discuss Interdisciplinary Programs at its last two meetings of the year (May 2nd and May 9th).

Question: When will CAPP make a report on Interdisciplinary Programs.

Answer: Soon. Minutes from CAPP's meetings are available on the Faculty Governance website.

3. CAPP announced that it has almost completed its appointments to RAS and gave its thanks to those who made nominations or were willing to serve on the committee.

Committee on Faculty (Susan Hahn)

COF is continuing to work on personnel reviews and hopes to complete its work before the end of finals. Faculty members were reminded that two vacancies remain on COF for next year. Former members of COF were particularly encouraged to consider volunteering for one of these positions.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Michael Sinowitz)

A. Motion (to be removed from the table and voted on) that the faculty give MAO the authority to implement a rational timebank system after a thorough consultation with the faculty and after investigating the timebanks at comparable liberal arts institutions.

The motion was removed from the table by a show of hands.

Speaking for the motion: Past efforts by MAO to construct a timebank system have been made less effective and less useful by amendments on the floor of the faculty. We should place more trust in our committees. Each division has a member on MAO, so there is representation. In addition, MAO will be consulting with the faculty.

Speaking against the motion: Although the current members of MAO may be able to construct a rationale system, previous committees have come up with irrational systems. This motion gives MAO permanent authority, which may be too much power for a small group of faculty members.

Question: A point of clarification – will MAO bring a proposal to the faculty for an up or down vote?

Answer: No. The motion is to authorize MAO to implement a timebank system.

Speaking against the motion: It is dangerous to let MAO implement a timebank system without faculty discussion.

Question: If the faculty grants this right to MAO can it subsequently reverse that decision and take the right back?

Answer: Yes.

Speaking for the motion: The motion requires MAO to consult with the faculty, which means holding discussions with the faculty and taking straw votes. The motion also requires MAO to look at the timebank systems at comparable liberal arts institutions. Trying to make changes to timebank proposals on the floor of the faculty meetings has not worked.

Question: Did MAO consider adding a sunset provision to the motion that would require the faculty to grant continued approval to the timebanks after a couple of years? If the faculty feels that the new timebank system implemented by MAO is flawed, the faculty could let this motion expire.

Answer: MAO did not consider this. The faculty can pass a motion at a later date to take back this authority from MAO.

Question: Doesn't the ability of the faculty to take back the motion create the possibility of abuse? For example, if MAO plans to make a change to the timebanks that some faculty members are unhappy with, why wouldn't they choose to bring a motion to the faculty that requires MAO to bring changes to the faculty for approval? In addition, contrary to an earlier statement, although the motion requires MAO to consult with faculty, it does not require MAO to do so during Faculty Meetings.

Answer: Although someone might choose to do this, they need a majority of the faculty to agree.

Speaking for the motion: Many years ago the faculty used to have long debates about the academic calendar. The faculty finally ceded to MAO the authority to set the calendar and MAO has handled this without problem. On the rare occasion where there has been a concern, the faculty has voiced that concern to MAO. That system has worked and we should trust MAO here as well.

The motion passed by a show of hands with a few dissenting votes.

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

1. ANTH 366: Performing Latin American Culture, 1 credit, Group 3 (non-lit)
2. UNIV 297: Summer Internship, 0 credit
3. EDUC 390: Topics in Education Studies, 1 credit (no group designation)

Question: What is the description for UNIV 297 and what is the rationale for the course?

Answer: This non-credit summer internship is for students participating in an on-campus summer research internship or an individually arranged external internship that is connected to the student's academic program. An internship must involve a minimum of 200 hours at the internship site and must be clearly related to the student's academic program. Enrollment requires approval of a learning contract by a faculty sponsor in the student's academic program and the internship director. The academic component of the internship is detailed in the learning contract, and may include readings, on-site journals or reflections, and a final internship report. Internship categories: A. Health Science; B. Legal/Political; C. Museum/Public History; D. Music Business; E. Business; F. Computer Science/Technology; G. Science Research; H. Education; I. Pastoral; J. Mental Health; K. Mass Media; L. Arts; M. Coaching; N. Sports Science; P. Non-Profit.

The proposed course meets several needs. Some international students on summer internships need to be enrolled in a course in order to remain in the county. Some internship programs also require that students be enrolled in a course, which can entail a significant tuition cost if the course carries academic credit. Having a course also ensures that a student's participation in a summer internship appears on his or her transcript. DePauw anticipates charging a fee of \$300, most of which will go to the faculty sponsor.

Question: Can a student sign up for UNIV 297 and, in a sense, force a faculty member to serve as a sponsor, or is this at the discretion of the faculty member?

Answer: It is the faculty member's choice as to whether he or she wants to sponsor a student.

Question: Some internship programs require that a student receive either academic credit or pay equal to other employees. Does this course make such programs accessible to students?

Answer: For some programs, the answer is yes; for others the answer probably is no.

Question: Will students receive a grade for this course?

Answer: The course will be graded P/F, just as with Winter Term.

Question: Will this count toward the three courses that students can take P/F?

Answer: No.

Following a request that the motion be split to separate the consideration of UNIV 297 from the other courses, the faculty approved ANTH 366 and EDUC 390 by a show of hands. The faculty approved UNIV 297 by a show of hands, with several dissenting votes.

C. Announcements

1. The School of Music, responding to the elimination of a previously required course in the Department of Communications and Theatre (COMM 101), made the following changes to their degree programs, which were approved by MAO:

BM degree: Add one full credit course to the CLA requirements for the degree and require an S course that can be satisfied either in the MUS or CLA area.

BME degree: Replace the COMM 101 requirement with a 0.5 CLA elective. This substitution will be re-examined when the curriculum is restructured.

BMA degree: Replace the COMM 101 requirement with a 0.5 free elective.

2. The Registrar will no longer be keeping an "I" on a transcript after the "I" has been completed.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere (Peter Graham)

SLAAC will be forming a task force to study wellness at DPU, especially nutrition and emotional wellness, but also physical fitness.

SLAAC members--5 faculty, 2 students, and 3 administrators--will act as the core of this task force. If there are other interested people willing to serve, please contact SLAAC.

We will be studying nutrition, counseling, and physical fitness programs at other peer institutions, including the financial viabilities of implementing such programs at DPU. As well, we'll be investigating healthier, tastier, and more locally grown food alternatives in the dining halls and elsewhere on campus.

We believe DPU has an ethical responsibility to feed students the best foods possible and to create an environment that supports the wellness of all people. We are what we eat physically as well as intellectually. Better attention to wellness in general and nutrition and emotion wellness in particular, will attract more international students here as well as students from other less representative groups.

The task force will make recommendations to the faculty, President Bottoms, and Neal Abraham.

6. Reports from Other Committees

Committee on Administration (Kerry Pannell)

COA has endorsed a proposal from Paul Schmitt that provides for no increases in either premiums or co-payments in the University's health care plans.

The committee continues in its review of the Distinguished Professor and University Professor programs and hopes to have soon a recommendation to share with the administration.

DePauw has had a same sex domestic partners policy for several years. COA is looking into the possibility of also having an opposite sex domestic partner policy.

The committee continues with its study of faculty workloads.

Admissions Advisory Committee (Hilary Eppley)

The Admissions Office extended its thanks to the faculty for its assistance during the year.

Admissions will be developing brochures over the summer to highlight study abroad and the accomplishments of alumni. Rebecca Konowicz will be sending out an email soliciting names of

people to highlight in these brochures. Faculty members are urged to think about alumni and current students who would be good to feature. Admissions will want a broad cross-section of people to highlight so faculty members are urged to think about the diversity of their nominees (racial, ethnic, geographic, and majors represented).

Faculty members were encourage to submit feedback forms to Admissions if they have met with prospective students who are current high school juniors.

Faculty Governance Steering Committee (David Harvey)

The September AQIP session on “faculty sanity” focused, in part, on the question of faculty workload. Among the issues raised at that time was the balancing of faculty workload with faculty governance.

The FGSC met several times this semester to discuss faculty committees and examined a variety of data on the faculty’s participation in various aspects of faculty governance; the committee asked that I share this information with the faculty – it is summarized on a handout (see Appendix Two).

Some observations:

- there are a total of 350 positions on which full-time faculty serve; this total does not include departmental service (chair, personnel committees, search committees or other department committees), miscellaneous service activities such as those summarized by the VPAA at the last faculty meeting, or various ad-hoc committees
- elected committees range in size from 3 members to 16 members with an average size of 5.5 members (4.9 if Grievance is not included)
- appointed committees range in size from 1 member to 19 members with an average size of 7.0 members
- the faculty made a total of 379 individual contributions to this service (due to leave replacements, this total exceeds the number of positions)
- a total of 164 individuals participated, which is 76% of eligible faculty (those not on leave for the year)
- of those not participating, 63% were either in their last year of service or had yet to complete a third-year review
- this level of participation is probably as much as we can reasonably expect in any year
- for elected positions that do not require tenure, 67% are held by those without tenure or who did not yet have tenure when elected; this includes most of this year’s membership on CAPP, MAO and SLAAC
- the average number of positions held by those participating this year is 2.3; some individuals may be doing too much service
- 20% of the vacant positions filled during the recent elections were open due to leaves; of these 23 vacancies, 21 are due to a pre-tenure leave or a first sabbatical leave
- turnover on the coordinating committees for next year is high

Some additional information:

- during the last 10 years we have added three new Executive Committees (Library Advisory, ATAC and, perhaps ironically, the FGSC), one new subcommittee (FYS), one new Committee of the Administration (Hartman Center), added three new Interdisciplinary Program steering committees (European Studies, Film Studies and Jewish Studies) and expanded the membership of COA
- together these add 51 positions

- in this same period we have eliminated two committees (Continuing Education and the Chaplain's Advisory)

In discussing this information, the committee considered issues ranging from the number of committees, the size of committees (including the balance between tenured and untenured faculty members and between the faculty, administration and students), the need for committees that rarely meet, the role of advisory committees and the need to insure that the faculty has a voice in decision making. We agreed that our current situation is probably asking too much of the faculty and that this is a good time for the faculty to thoroughly examine its committee structure. We also agreed that CAPP, MAO and SLAAC might begin this process by working with their respective subcommittees and reporting committees and that CAPP might begin working with the steering committees of the Interdisciplinary Programs, Honors and Fellows Programs and Competency Programs.

The committee welcomes input from the faculty in the form of concerns and suggestions.

7. Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The VPAA reminded faculty of the administration's proposed changes to Article I.B.2(e) of the Personnel Policies, which is written by the administration and made a last call for comments before the change is implemented and those newly eligible to apply for timely promotion are notified. This change would reduce the required time in rank as an Assistant Professor before review for promotion to Associate Professor to three years (from the current five years), though promotion could not occur before the tenure review. The VPAA noted that this change in language raises the question of whether those faculty who received delayed timely promotion to Associate Professor under the current language should be granted an equivalent credit toward timely review to Full Professor. This decision will be made in consultation with COF.

Faculty members were reminded of the Awards Convocation scheduled for this evening. The VPAA noted that there had been good news this year with respect to students receiving national awards and that these will be highlighted during the convocation.

The VPAA announced that there are nine proposals forthcoming to RAS from five departments.

Data from the annual AAUP survey of faculty salaries will be available shortly.

8. Remarks from the President

The most recent update on admissions for the next academic year has 540 paid deposits with a goal of 650. There are 770 pending offers to prospective students. Of the paid deposits, 45 are in the School of Music, 81 are from students of color, 20 are from Honor Scholars, 26 are from ITAP students, 36 are from Management Fellows, 20 are from Media Fellows and 13 are from Science Research Fellows.

During its recent meeting the Board of Trustees continued to discuss internationalization. The Board seems to have a better understanding now that internationalization means more than bringing additional international students to DePauw, but that it also includes providing students with more opportunities for off-campus experiences and additions to the curriculum.

The President explained the reasons for his formation of a Greek Fact-Finding Commission, which is to establish a set of unbiased facts about the Greek system at DePauw. Members of the Commission are Lisa Hollander (chair), administrative representatives James Lincoln, Cindy Babington and Stefanie Niles, faculty representatives Jackie Roberts and David Newman,

fraternity representatives Chris Ball and Zach Adams, sorority representatives Emma Brown, Melyna Hernandez and Janelle Beckford, and alumni representatives Dan Hasler and Julie Goodrich. An independent student is yet to be named. Following the Commission's report, the President will take his recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

9. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the faculty.

10. New Business

David Harvey – Motion (to be voted on) that the faculty approve the results of the faculty elections (see Appendix Three).

The motion was moved, seconded and passed by a show of hands. Faculty members were reminded that there will be a run-off election for one position on the Pub Board and of several remaining vacancies, as noted here:

Division I: COF (three-year term)

Division I: MAO (spring replacement) [*editorial note: correction from handout*]

Division III: COF (fall replacement)

Division IV: Grievance Committee (2/1/07 to 1/31/08; alternate)

11. Announcements

David Harvey – Dates of faculty meetings for the 2006-07 academic year.

The dates for faculty meetings are September 11th, October 9th, November 6th, December 4th, February 5th, March 5th, April 9th and May 7th. The meetings in September, October and April are on the second Monday of the months; all other meetings are on the first Monday of the months.

12. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

[Appendix 1 -Proposal for a Major in Film Studies](#)

[Appendix 2 -Some Data on Participation of Full-Time Faculty\(1\) in Faculty Governance\(2\)](#)

[Appendix 3 -Election Results](#)