

**Minutes of DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, September 8, 2008**

*A Brief Guide to Acronyms:*

CAPP	=	Committee on Academic Policy and Planning
COA	=	Committee on Administration
COF	=	Committee on Faculty
FDC	=	Faculty Development Committee
MAO	=	Committee on Management of Academic Operations
RAS	=	Resource Allocation Subcommittee (of CAPP)
SLAAC	=	Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee

*Call to Order:*

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 PM by the Chair of the Faculty.

*Announcement of Quorum Requirements:*

The Vice President for Academic Affairs announced that there are 245 voting faculty members. Accounting for various leaves, the quorum for the fall semester is 86.

*Verification of Quorum:*

The quorum for the meeting was verified. At the time of verification, approximately 115 voting faculty members were present. 154 pre-prepared ballots in total were distributed to voting faculty members as they entered the meeting, so at least 154 voting faculty members attended at least part of the meeting.

*Moment of Silence:*

A moment of silence was observed to honor colleagues that have recently passed away. The colleagues so honored were:

Stanley Irwin, Professor of Voice in the School of Music, served DePauw from 1975 - 2008. Stan passed away on May 31, 2008.

Robert Loring, Professor Emeritus of Geology and Geography, served DePauw from 1948 - 1989. Bob passed away on July 15, 2008.

Gordon Walters, Professor Emeritus of Modern Languages (French), served DePauw from 1968 - 2001. Gordon passed away on May 4, 2008.

See the appendix to these minutes for full tributes.

*Approval of Previous Minutes:*

There were no corrections to the May 2008 minutes, which were approved as distributed.

***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

A complete committee membership list is available by clicking on "Committees" from the web site <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/>.

*Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

MAO brought forth a motion that the faculty approve the following revision to the multiple exam policy (Academic Handbook: Academic Policies, Section IX). Previous notice of this motion was provided at the May 2008 faculty meeting. In this revision, additions are in bold.

*Multiple **or Conflicting** Exam Policy. No student may be required to take more than two in-class final exams on the same day **or choose between exams offered at the same time.** Any student with three final exams in one day is responsible for trying to reach a solution by talking with the professors involved at least two weeks before the beginning of the final exam period. If none of the professors involved voluntarily agrees to give the student his/her exam on another day, the professor whose exam is scheduled second in the day will offer an alternative date for the exam. The student should obtain a multiple exam form from the Registrar's Office (or on the Web) to provide written verification to the professors involved that three final exams are actually scheduled and being given on the same day. **When a student is in two courses whose designated final examination periods conflict, the student is responsible for trying to reach a solution by talking with the professors involved at least two weeks before the beginning of the final exam period. If neither of the professors involved voluntarily agrees to give the student his/her exam on another day or time, the professor whose course carries the lesser credit will offer an alternative time for the exam. If both courses carry the same credit, then the professor of the course that meets later in the week will offer an alternative time for the exam.***

The chair of MAO explained that the motion is needed to account for the unlikely but possible conflict of final exam times, particularly with the new time bank schedules. Since this motion came from a standing committee, it needed no second.

A faculty member asked if this rewording disambiguates all the possibilities for conflicts. The chair of MAO elaborated that the intent was that, in case of a conflict, the class that meets for the first time later in the week would be required to offer the alternative time.

Another faculty member offered a change in wording to the last sentence: "...the professor of the course whose first meeting falls later in the week...". This amendment was accepted by the chair of MAO as a friendly amendment.

No further discussion followed, and the amended motion passed. With the amendment, the version that passed was:

*Multiple **or Conflicting** Exam Policy. No student may be required to take more than two in-class final exams on the same day **or choose between exams offered at the same time.** Any student with three final exams in one day is responsible for trying to reach a solution by talking with the professors involved at least two weeks before the beginning of the final exam period. If none of the professors involved voluntarily agrees to give the student his/her exam on another day, the professor whose exam is scheduled second in the day will offer an alternative date for the exam. The student should obtain a multiple exam form from the Registrar's Office (or on the Web) to provide written verification to the*

*professors involved that three final exams are actually scheduled and being given on the same day. **When a student is in two courses whose designated final examination periods conflict, the student is responsible for trying to reach a solution by talking with the professors involved at least two weeks before the beginning of the final exam period. If neither of the professors involved voluntarily agrees to give the student his/her exam on another day or time, the professor whose course carries the lesser credit will offer an alternative time for the exam. If both courses carry the same credit, then the professor of the course whose first meeting falls later in the week will offer an alternative time for the exam.***

MAO brought forth a motion that the faculty approve the following new courses:

- *ENG 265: Asian-American Literature, 1 credit, Group 3 Literature*  
This course is designed to introduce students to the cultural diversity of Asian-American writing. Through a broadly structured anthology (as opposed to anthologies focusing on specific ethnic communities) showcasing enduring works of prose, poetry, and drama, supplemented by a collection of short fiction, a novel, a play and a collection of poems, this course will hopefully develop a deeper understanding of the diverse works of Asian-American writers, poets and playwrights. Since Asian-American literature is typically presented from the perspective of race, our topics will focus on cultural identity, immigration experience, displacement, gender identities, and language. The goal of this course is not to suggest a cohesive tradition of Asian American communities, but instead explore the different histories and origins of Asian American writers and how their background inform their work. The poet and scholar, Shirley Geok-lin Lim has edited a useful anthology which subscribes to this notion of articulating the varied experiences of Asians in America. She writes: ‘... the varying immigration histories of authors from different national-origin communities give rise to writings that reflect distinctive cross-generational concerns and styles... Such heterogeneous representations help to overturn stereotypes of inscrutable Asian-Americans.’
- *ENG 266: Native American Literature, 1 credit, Group 3 Literature*  
This course surveys a range of American Indian oral and written literatures within the context of Euro-American colonization, conflict, and assimilation. We will assess the problems facing early Native writers working within an alien culture and examine the ways the more recent writers of the Native American Renaissance have redefined Indian identity as a compromise between traditional Native culture and contemporary American society. Reading may include creation myths and trickster stories, Native autobiographical writing, fiction, and poetry.
- *EDUC 305: The American High School: Anatomy of an Educational Institution, 1 credit, Group 2*  
This course is designed to examine the American high school, a school that has been described as the 'icon' of American education (William W. Cutler, 1989, p. 1), as an institution within the American educational system. As such, we will be examining the American high school from the multiple perspectives: architectural, historical, institutional, organizational and as a reform element in American education. In addition, students will be conducting a major research project involving the life story of a current, mid-career high school teacher. This engagement with a current high school teacher will provide a personalized context that will help frame our examination of the American high school as an institution.

- *EDUC 405: John Dewey and Progressive Education, 1 credit, Group 4*  
This course examines the major writing and impact of America's foremost educational philosopher and the educational reform that has come to be known as Progressive Education. Roughly set in the period 1890-1920, which is also known as the Progressive Era in American history, this examination will focus on the transformation of American schools from traditional enclaves of narrow curriculum offerings and formulaic teaching to classrooms that focused upon experimental curriculum and child-centered teaching characterized by student action and engagement. The course will focus upon John Dewey's role in this transformation and especially his major writing on the subject, the major curriculum reforms that characterized progressive education, and the transformation of classroom teaching and learning through the examination of original texts and other major interpretive sources.
- *EDUC 410: Historical Perspectives on American Curriculum Reform, 1 credit, Group 4*  
This course is designed to examine the historical development of school curriculum within American public education. The course focuses upon major curriculum reform efforts in the United States and historical interpretations of these reform efforts through the examination of original documents and other interpretive sources.

Since this motion came from a standing committee, it needed no second. There was no discussion or questions about the motion, and the motion passed.

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- The following is a change in course number, title, and description:  
*PHYS 350: Engineering Mechanics, 1 credit*  
A theoretical treatment of forces acting on rigid bodies including: analysis of force systems on rigid bodies, equilibrium requirements, stresses in frames and trusses, forces in beams and cables, friction, centroids, moments of inertia, the motion of particles and rigid bodies, studies of energy and momentum, kinematics, curvilinear motion and central forces.

This course replaces this course:

*PHYS 351: Dynamics (1 credit)*

A theoretical treatment of the physical laws governing the motion of particles and rigid bodies, including studies of energy and momentum, kinematics, curvilinear motion and central forces. Prerequisite: PHYS 130.

It also incorporates material from the following dropped course:

*PHYS 230: Statics (1 credit)*

Mathematical methods for analysis of force systems for rigid bodies, including equilibrium requirements, stresses in frames and trusses, forces in beams and cables, friction, centroids and moments of inertia. Prerequisite: PHYS 120.

- The following is a one-time group designation for Fall 2008:  
*REL 290: Topics: Gnosticism, 1 credit, Group 4*

The chair of MAO stated that MAO's agenda for the following year includes the following:

- Working with the registrar to review catalog copy describing majors and minors
- Discussing the way that prerequisites are handled

- Looking at a scheme whereby possible conflicts in prerequisites are made obvious, at least for advising purposes

MAO will not be changing the timebanks this year. MAO plans to collect formal feedback later in the year about the new timebanks. Informal feedback is welcomed at any time to any member of MAO.

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

All faculty members should have received the outcome from last year's RAS meeting. Because of special circumstances, CAPP has asked RAS to consider a late proposal for a new tenure-track position in the School of Music to replace Stanley Irwin. RAS will consider the proposal and report to CAPP before CAPP makes its proposal to the President. CAPP reminds interdisciplinary programs that they may make proposals to RAS just as departments may.

CAPP's agenda for the year is full, and includes discussions about admissions and winter term. A faculty member pointed out that last spring two interdisciplinary programs applied to RAS for tenure-track positions (as CAPP had invited), and neither was awarded a position. This faculty member stated that RAS's feedback included a statement that RAS was uncertain how to handle a proposal from an interdisciplinary program and would ask CAPP for further clarification of how to handle a proposal that is not linked to a specific department. The faculty member asked CAPP what they were planning to do so that RAS might have a better understanding of their authority to address these interdisciplinary proposals. The faculty member noted that to invite proposals but not to have a structure to approve them was at cross-purposes and would result in frustration on both the parts of the interdisciplinary program and RAS.

The chair of CAPP replied that CAPP has included this issue on its agenda for the year, and will discuss ways to provide clear feedback to interdisciplinary programs about their proposals. CAPP will also be reviewing self-studies to prepare RAS to review proposals.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- If you have not yet provided feedback to COF on
  - The current draft of the conflict of interest policy, or
  - The COA memo about decision file size, or
  - The COA memo about promotion linked to tenure, or
  - The new student opinion form (particularly if you tested it for COF)
 please do so. COF can do its best work when it has heard from a broad spectrum of the community.
- Promotion nominations are due on Wednesday, September 10.
- Please be mindful of the many review deadlines, the complete list can be found as the top link of the COF webpage, <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/COFFiles/COF.asp>.
- Department chairs, please arrange pairings for class visits for our untenured colleagues. Please remind all about the appropriate procedures and the importance of talking face to face with the colleague both before and after the visit in addition to providing the written summary. A link to the peer observation policy can be found on the COF web page.

- Departments with chair reviews, please work with the COF team meeting with everyone in your department individually. It can be a scheduling challenge and is important that all voices get heard.
- Known agenda items for COF this year:
  - Tenure, term, interim, promotion and chair reviews
  - Finalizing the conflict of interest policy
  - Addressing the COA memo about decision file size
  - Addressing the COA memo about promotion linked to tenure
  - Continuing our work on the student opinion surveys, in particular, analyzing the result of new form that some faculty trialed in spring 2008
  - Reviewing search procedure and corresponding documentation (annual COF task)
  - Loose ends that COF has been unable to address in recent years due to review load

The chair of COF asked everyone to look over the announcements and act appropriately. COF will work this year to finalize the conflict of interest policy, address COA's memo about decision file size, address COA's memo about linking promotion to tenure, discuss the new student opinion survey form, and any other intellectual life issues that come up.

A faculty member who had been on leave asked the chair of COF to elaborate on the new student opinion forms. The chair of COF responded that COF has been working for the past two years on tweaking the student opinion form to elicit more rich feedback from the students. The student opinion forms are all administered on-line, for various reasons, including to provide more anonymity for the students. In the spring, some faculty volunteers tried out a new form – COF will be looking at feedback from those volunteers to see how well the forms worked.

The faculty member then suggested, given the new climate of intellectual growth at the university, COF (and perhaps COA and CAPP) should consider altering the forms at least in part to focus less on assessment of professorial performance and more on student learning outcomes.

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The following announcement was not read in the meeting, but was provided in the meeting's agenda.

- SLAAC invites faculty members to serve on occasional academic and judicial hearing boards, either as a member of the University Review Committee (URC) or the Community Standards Council (CSC). Please email [gschwipps@depauw.edu](mailto:gschwipps@depauw.edu) if you are interested.

The chair of SLAAC stated that their first meeting would be on Thursday, September 11. On the agenda for the first meeting are discussions about student health, and an open dialog about international students at DePauw. Also, a lot of the conversations begun at the Faculty Institute will be continued in SLAAC.

***Reports from Other Committees***

A complete committee membership list is available by clicking on "Committees" from the web site <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/>.

*Report from the Faculty Development Committee (Chair: John Schlotterbeck)*

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- There have been the following changes in Faculty Development programs and procedures since last year:
  - PDF grants of \$500 or less no longer require a report.
  - Fisher Time-Outs now may be used for preparation of a complete proposal for a significant external grant award or fellowship.
  - For Summer Stipends for “Course Development and Renewal,” priority is given to proposals that support University-wide institutional goals and initiatives, such as multicultural diversity, interdisciplinarity, and first-year seminars. These proposals should go beyond the normal course revisions and creation of new courses that are expected of all faculty members.
  - A reminder that Faculty Fellowships include a new category, service projects, under which one project has now been funded. Service projects involve a substantive idea that would improve an existing program, create something new at DePauw, and/or provide a needed complement to support faculty members' work.
  - The six-month grace period for turning in reports is suspended. Faculty members with late reports are ineligible for additional faculty development funding until FDC receives and approves outstanding reports. Grant recipients will be reminded of report deadlines and be notified about suspension of future funds until a report is received and approved.
- FDC looks forward to reading your applications for an FDC award this year. Here are dates of fall deadlines.
  - Fisher Fellowship applications are due September 10.
  - Faculty Fellowship applications are due September 17.
  - Sabbatical, Pre-tenure and Pre-retirement leave applications are due October 1.
  - Fisher Time-Out Applications are due October 29.
- Please direct questions about eligibility, remaining Professional Conference Funds, etc., to Terry Bruner ([tbruner@depauw.edu](mailto:tbruner@depauw.edu)). Meryl Altman ([maltman@depauw.edu](mailto:maltman@depauw.edu)) is happy to discuss a project idea or read draft proposals. John can answer general questions about FDC policies and procedures ([jschlot@depauw.edu](mailto:jschlot@depauw.edu)).

The chair of FDC stated that most of their time this year will be devoted to reading, evaluating, and recommending grant proposals for funding. As time permits (usually in the spring), FDC will review faculty development policies and issues that come up during the year.

One goal for FDC this year is to make its work more transparent. The chair called attention to the written announcements which summarize changes in faculty development policies communicated via e-mails over the summer. FDC will be creating a list of frequently asked questions – ideas for items to include on this list should be sent to the chair of FDC.

Finally, the chair of FDC pointed out that this is Meryl Altman's last year as faculty development coordinator. FDC solicits nominations and self-nominations of individuals interested in this position by Thursday, October 9. Details and a formal announcement are forthcoming.

*Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

The chair of COA announced that COA has not yet met – the first meeting will be September 25. There are two certain items on the agenda – the distribution of the raise pool for faculty

salaries and discussions about health insurance. COA plans to review the effects of the recent changes in our health insurance plan by looking at the number of employees who selected the various options. DePauw will consider sending its health insurance plan out for bids from other companies as well as CIGNA this year. Faculty members are urged to send items for COA to consider to the chair of COA.

*Report of the Library Advisory Committee (Chair: Julia Bruggemann)*

The following announcement was not read during the meeting, but was provided in the meeting's agenda.

- The Library Advisory committee is interested in hearing what faculty members think the committee should talk about this fall. Input may be sent to any of the committee members.

There was no other report.

***Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs (VPAA)***

The VPAA reported on the demographics of the faculty. He has not quite completed his analysis of the data, but will share it in an e-mail shortly. There are 200 faculty members on the tenure track (either tenured or pre-tenure) out of a total of 225 full-time faculty members. Assuming current searches are successful, we will start next year with 205 faculty members on the tenure track. The long-term goal is about 220 full-time faculty members. Fifteen would be just about the fewest term positions available to replace critical positions when leaves arise.

18% of the faculty members on the tenure track are persons of color. Of those on the tenure track that are not yet tenured, 37% are persons of color.

Given the varying number of new hires in past years, there are still some large fluctuations in the number of faculty members scheduled to be on leave in any given year. The VPAA will be having conversations with some colleagues to see if they would adjust their sabbatical leave schedules, moving them either earlier or later, in an effort to balance the number of leaves each year.

There were no questions or discussion.

***Remarks from the President***

The President opened with some announcements:

- All faculty members at the meeting are invited to the President's home for a reception after the meeting concludes.
- The President's inauguration is scheduled for October 10. The University is canceling about 20 minutes of classes for this event; unfortunately, this was the only weekend available that did not conflict with other events or holidays. The President asked faculty members to encourage students to attend the inauguration – this day is meant to be a celebration of DePauw's history and future, and he wants students to be a part of it.
- The President thanked the faculty members for the opening convocation – having the faculty there to greet the incoming students, celebrating and cheering, meant a great deal to him.



- The Campus Climate Task Force has issued its final report – the report is available on the web (<http://www.depauw.edu/univ/cctf/>). The President has met with the committee and other faculty members, and will meet with them again. He hopes to respond to the report in October. A faculty member later asked if this report was the same report made available in the spring. The President responded that the spring version was the “executive summary,” and the current version is the full report.
- Some institutions have signed a national sustainability pledge. The President will take this up with other members of the administration to decide if this is something that DePauw wishes to do. The pledge would essentially be a statement of DePauw’s goals regarding sustainability along with a plan to publicly measure itself against those goals.
- There has been some discussion of the Amethyst Initiative. This initiative seeks to reduce the drinking age to 18 in an effort to encourage responsible drinking and discourage clandestine drinking. The President is asking the Dean of Students and others to work with him to determine how to respond to this initiative. He wants to think about the issue, get some data, and have an informed debate about how to proceed. The faculty should look for announcements about this.

The President then began a discussion about the Faculty Institute. He thanked everyone who participated, as well as everyone who facilitated the small breakout groups. Reports from each group are available on the web now ([https://www.depauw.edu/e/faculty/faculty\\_institute/intellectual\\_life.asp](https://www.depauw.edu/e/faculty/faculty_institute/intellectual_life.asp)).

The President met last week with the Faculty Governance Steering Committee, which is considering the issues that were raised at the Faculty Institute. He is looking for ways to ground the discussion through faculty governance, as well as through meeting with departments to get their feedback on these issues. He has begun meeting with departments already, beginning with the Political Science department.

The President is aware that the issues raised at the Faculty Institute go beyond faculty governance; for example, they include infrastructure, admissions, and alumni relations. The University will need to coordinate how each group address these issues; he intends for the faculty to go first in their discussions.

The President reported that four major themes emerged from the reports by the breakout groups:

- There is a need for more meaningful intellectual connections across campus and across disciplines.
- There is a concern about the amount of time and “oxygen” we allow into our intellectual culture.
- There are questions about the quality and character of our social spaces, the social order of the university, and the university’s relationship with the community.
- DePauw does not present a clear, strong image of itself to the world and to potential students.

The President elaborated that the need for more meaningful intellectual connections is expressed by a faculty desire to interact more with colleagues outside of their department. This desire for interdisciplinarity includes interactions with students as well. There is a desire to provide more common intellectual experiences for students, including those experiences with social components. Common readings and common experiences bond the students together

and give them a common intellectual point of reference. A success in this area at DePauw is the first-year seminar program; we should mine this program for successful ideas.

The President believes that faculty members are concerned about the amount of regulation required at DePauw, including regulation of faculty members and our students. This intense regulation stifles intellectual culture; students have too many boxes to check off and requirements to fulfill to gain intellectually from the collective experience. A student can have two majors, can have multiple minors, must fulfill six group requirements, can complete a program of distinction, and must complete three winter term projects. A success in limiting over-regulation is DePauw year.one, which creates a space for the students to enter into; we should investigate why this program is working and use those successes elsewhere.

In addition to all of this, the President reported that students are also affected by the requirements on the faculty – too much faculty time spent on committees and reports leads to tired and overworked faculty members. He is starting to work with the VPAA on reducing these requirements.

The President reported that the questions about the social space and social order included mentions of Greek life on campus. For example, participants wondered if we can connect intellectual life with the way that students array themselves socially? Greek life is very good at creating communities, creating rituals, and creating markers of identity; can DePauw do this on a bigger scale? We are under-invested in all these areas, and need to improve.

The President stated that DePauw needs to seriously consider its image in the world; we do not present a strong and clear image of ourselves to the world, and particularly to potential students. Our website will be upgraded and improved; the beta version will be unveiled to the faculty when it is complete. It will include pictures of what we do here, and help establish our identity. Are we a small pre-professional school? A combination of a liberal arts college and a small university? Or simply a liberal arts college? We need to determine what image we will present.

The President concluded his remarks by listing the next steps in the process. The four topics mentioned previously will be put on the web page with the Faculty Institute reports. The President will be meeting with the Faculty Governance Steering Committee to discuss how to continue with the process. CAPP, MAO, and SLAAC will be engaged with these issues, as well as all the various academic departments. We will develop a method for all of us to communicate about this; we will develop a plan to move forward on this. DePauw will rise or fall on the strength of its academic enterprise.

The floor was then opened for questions.

A faculty member asked about the President's understanding of our interdisciplinary programs – where do they fit into the scheme of meeting with departments, and where do they fit into his understanding of the intellectual life of the university? The President replied that he attended the chairs' meeting (which includes heads of interdisciplinary programs) last week. There is a lot of exciting work happening in these programs, and they will clearly be part of the conversation.

A faculty member asked for some reflections on a 3/2 teaching load – it seemed that the faculty was split on this issue. The President replied that there is an intersection between the faculty development program and teaching load; we don't want to destroy a healthy faculty development program to move to a 3/2 load. However, we will consider the possibility; he firmly

believes that faculty members with more time will do more here at DePauw. He has rarely met a faculty more committed to students.

The President continued by noting that movements like this, however, do not come without institutional costs. If we choose to move to a 3/2 teaching load, then what can we not do somewhere else? Will there be negative consequences for the students (for example, larger course sizes)? This issue needs some study and work; every choice has a tradeoff. He invited COA to consider the issue.

A faculty member pointed out that faculty members can have difficulty speaking up and having conversations in the faculty meeting; will there be opportunities for smaller breakout meetings for conversations? The President replied that he and the Chair of the Faculty will be working on this. He feels that it is deeply important to keep the avenues of discussion open. DePauw is at an important moment in history – there are strong elements on the campus: an expanded faculty and new facilities to name two. But the world is getting complicated, and the market for new students is competitive. DePauw needs to understand what it is intellectually to survive in the world.

A faculty member pointed out that many things might make him happy, but the most helpful thing would be to make Greencastle a more attractive place to live for current and potential faculty members and students. This would solve a lot of the problems that we have been talking about. The President replied that we need a true campus plan. We need to engage the campus in campus planning exercises (bringing in a third party to lead such sessions). These sessions have to include representatives from Greencastle. He has met with the mayor of Greencastle, and the city will be at that table for campus planning. Faculty discussions needed to go first, then the social and campus planning will follow. He plans to bring it up with the board, and ask them to provide the campus planning and Greencastle planning environment.

A faculty member stated that she was disappointed that we couldn't think outside the box more. There are so many interrelated things, where should faculty members start? What does the President need most from the faculty? The President replied that he would be working with the Chair of the Faculty on a series of charges for the faculty. He is using the Faculty Governance Steering Committee as a clearinghouse – it gives him quick access to speak with the faculty. This committee will handle the “easy” stuff – broad issues will go to the entire faculty. We will be creating venues for people to react to the planning stage.

### ***Old Business***

There was no old business.

### ***New Business***

A faculty member rose to speak against the new policy of not celebrating the lives of our faculty members who have passed away. He believes that it is not too burdensome to spend five minutes celebrating their lives in the faculty meeting. He then made a motion:

***Motion to reinstate the spoken tributes for deceased faculty members at the faculty meeting.***

This motion was seconded. Discussion was opened on this motion.

A faculty member stated that she recognized the feelings on both sides of the issue. She suggested that we only recognize one faculty member per meeting. This was offered as a friendly amendment, which was accepted.

A faculty member stated that there should be a time limit for the tributes. The faculty member making the motion agreed that five minutes seemed reasonable, and this was added as a friendly amendment.

A faculty member asked the Chair of the Faculty to share his reasons for making the changes, but the Chair of the Faculty declined to speak either in favor of or against the motion.

A faculty member noted that placing a time limit on the tribute places the Chair of the Faculty in a very awkward position if the person reading the tribute goes over that time limit. Asking a colleague to cut short a tribute could make both people uncomfortable.

A faculty member noted that it would be better to do the tributes at the end of the year at the faculty recognition dinner instead of at the monthly faculty meeting.

A faculty member was in favor of the motion, but did not want to attempt to rewrite the motion on the floor of the faculty meeting. She would like the Faculty Governance Steering Committee to consider this issue, but appreciates the value of the spoken words.

A faculty member made a motion to send the issue to the Faculty Governance Steering Committee. It was noted that this was a motion to refer to a committee, and needed a second. The motion was seconded, and the question was called on this motion.

The motion to refer this issue to the Faculty Governance Steering Committee carried by show of hands.

### ***Announcements***

The following announcement was not read during the meeting, but was provided in the meeting's agenda.

- Special elections were held at the start of the semester to fill several vacant positions. The results of these elections are as follows:
  - COA Division Four Representative, David Gellman
  - COF one-year replacement for Division One Representative, Sheryl Tremblay
  - Third member of Division Three Nominating Committee, John Caraher
  - Third Member of Division Four Nominating Committee, Barbara Whitehead

Valerie Ziegler (Religious Studies) announced that there will be a tribute to Stan Irwin at the football game on Saturday (September 13), including the pep band playing "A Toast to DePauw."

Martha Rainbolt (English) announced that in addition to programs initiated at the Prindle Institute, the Institute has some funds (under \$10,000) to help support other ethics programming at DePauw. Martha would appreciate hearing from departments and programs about ethics programming being considered for the fall and the spring. In order to receive full consideration,

turn proposals in to Sharon Crary or Linda Clute by October 6. Please include a tentative budget, including other possible sources of funding. The Prindle Institute is willing to consider proposals after that date, if there are still funds available.

Matthew Balensuela (School of Music) announced that the School of Music is hosting a mini-workshop this weekend (September 13 and 14) on teaching music history. The workshop is free and open to all faculty; there is a link on the School of Music website about the workshop. Workshop participants will be discussing ways to strategize teaching this subject.

Leslie James (Religious Studies and Black Studies) announced an invitation to the Boswell Symposium. The keynote speaker is Cornel West from Princeton University, who speaks on Sunday, September 14, in Meharry Hall at 7:30 PM.

Jim Benedix (Biology) announced that a group has been formed to plan for Darwin Days. They are planning an extended celebration since it is the 200<sup>th</sup> birthday of Darwin and the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of *On the Origin of Species*. Jim stated that they want to get as many people involved as possible. The coordinating person is Tavia Pigg; Jim encourages anyone interested to become involved.

Marthe Chandler (Philosophy) announced the Moon Festival, which is taking place on Saturday (September 13<sup>th</sup>) from 8-10 PM at McKim Observatory.

### ***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 PM.

### **Appendix: Tributes to Deceased Faculty Members**

#### **Remembering Stanley R. Irwin, Professor of Music (Voice) January 23, 1941 - May 31, 2008 Submitted by Caroline Jetton, Dean of the School of Music**

The start of the 2008-2009 academic year is a sad time for faculty, staff, and students in the School of Music because our beloved voice professor, Dr. Stanley R. Irwin, is not with us. Dr. Irwin entered into rest on May 31<sup>st</sup>. He was on the School of Music faculty for 33 years (1975-2008) and genuinely loved DePauw University and the School of Music. Professor Irwin showed his love by investing himself fully in all things "School of Music."

To us in the School of Music, Stan was a thoughtful colleague, superb performer, caring teacher, and kind man who changed our lives for the better. His musical career as an acclaimed bass-baritone was long and distinguished. I remember the first time I heard him perform at a Music Overnight Faculty Showcase Recital. His performance was electrifying and it gave me chills all over. I was completely awe-struck. Campus-wide we all affectionately remember his leading of "The Toast to DePauw" at Opening Convocation and Commencement each year. As a voice teacher and conductor of the University Chorus and Century Singers, he was an "institution" at DePauw. I also remember him as a man of great character, dignity, and integrity. Around Stan, chivalry was not dead as he opened doors for ladies and walked curbside so that we would be protected. Walking back to the Performing Arts Center after a

Music Overnight Dinner, he kept stepping behind me and trying to move by my side so that he could be next to the curb. I had no idea what he was doing and, I must admit, it took me a while to figure out what dance we were supposed to be doing. Then, it hit me; he is a true Southern gentleman, born and raised in Texas!

Not only was he known by the Greencastle and DePauw communities, he was known by people all across the country and world. Stan was highly praised as a vocal performer and choral conductor. As a performer and conductor, he appeared in numerous prestigious venues, such as Barbican Center in London, Avery Fisher Hall, Carnegie Hall, Hohenems Palace, Klagenfurt Stadttheater in Austria, as well as with the Zurich Opera, Dallas Symphony, Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra, Indianapolis Chamber Orchestra, and the Philharmonia Orchestra of London. As the 1987 winner of the World Wide Voice Competition in New York City, he was awarded contracts to perform Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony* at Lincoln Center and the Brahms *Requiem* with the Philharmonia Orchestra in London. He recorded two compact discs that will continue to be enjoyed for years to come: "*Irwin Sings Gershwin*" and "*Night and Day*."

I would like to take a moment to reminisce about Dr. Irwin, especially for those who did not have the privilege of knowing him.

- He felt equally at home performing on a concert stage and teaching on a college campus.
- He is remembered for performing brilliantly on Faculty Showcase Recitals, solo recitals, and as a soloist in large vocal and orchestral works.
- He had very high expectations for himself and his students.
- He wanted the very best for music students and always had students' best interests at heart.
- He loved to witness a student's spark of enthusiasm turn into fireworks.
- He was very proud of all music students' accomplishments regardless of their primary instrument or degree program.

I fondly recall one of our last conversations when he told me how invigorated he was by his teaching and performing and how much he was truly enjoying himself. He was passionate about life and loving every minute of it. For that, I am truly grateful.

For those of us who knew Dr. Irwin well, we find that with his passing, a part of each of us dies and goes with him. Wherever he goes, we also go. He is not alone and we are not alone. We have a guardian angel looking down on us. There is no way to avoid missing him and grieving, but, from what I know of Dr. Irwin, he would want us to carry a piece of him in our hearts as we move on to a life without him. One cannot help but wonder what he would want to impart to others if he had been given that opportunity.

I think he would share the following:

- I enjoyed a wonderful career as a performer, teacher, and conductor. I thoroughly loved working with voice and choral students.
- Even from my humble beginnings, I was able to live out my dreams. Anything is possible. Give yourself permission to dream big and work hard to achieve your dreams. If you can dream it, you can do it. It's all about how you lead your life. If you lead your life the right way, the dreams will come to you.
- Continue to enable the dreams of your students and colleagues.
- We can never fully pay back others for what they have done for us, so pay it forward. Go and do for others what someone did for you.

- Always do your best.
- Live your life so that you have no regrets.
- People are more important than things.
- Appreciate one another and tell them you appreciate them.
- Find something nice to say. If you cannot say something nice, don't say anything.
- Remember the Golden Rule: Do unto others, as you would have them do unto you.

**In Memory of Robert D. Loring**  
**Professor Emeritus, Department of Geology and Geography**

Robert D. Loring, Professor Emeritus of Geology and Geography at DePauw University, passed away on July 15, 2008 in Colorado Springs. Loring, who served on the University's faculty for 41 years, was 85 years old.

Born in the Bronx, New York City on July 8, 1923, Bob Loring enrolled at Ohio University in the fall of 1940. After enlisting in the U.S. Army, which disrupted his education, he graduated from Ohio U. in 1947 and received his Masters degree from Indiana University in 1948.

In September of 1948, Loring joined the DePauw faculty and served until his retirement in 1989. At that time, he received a DePauw University citation "*in recognition of distinguished services as a teacher, scholar, counselor of youth, and loyal administrator, which have contributed greatly to the cause of higher education and to DePauw University.*"

During his career, Loring was a member of the Indiana Governor's Commission on Secondary Education; served as a visiting professor at Indiana, Purdue and Case-Western Reserve Universities and at University College in Dublin. He was also a visiting scientist for the American Chemical Society and co-directed STEP (Science Training Enrichment Program) for high school students in West Central Indiana. In 1985, Loring was a member of an exchange team in chemical education that traveled to the People's Republic of China, and two years later consulted the U.S. Department of Defense in the use of instrumentation to teach high school laboratory in Munich, Germany.

Loring was published in the Journal of American Chemistry, Science, the Journal of Geography and the Journal of Organic Chemistry, among others. He served on the board of directors of the Indiana Academy of Social Scientists and was a member of the American Chemical Society and Indiana Academy of Science, which he served as treasurer.

In 1997, Professor Loring was made an honorary inductee of the DePauw Athletic Hall of Fame by virtue of his long association and service to the athletic programs of the University. He served as a member of the Athletic Board for 25 years and was its chairman for 23 years. He was faculty representative to the Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference and the Indiana Collegiate Conference. Active in the NCAA, he served as the faculty representative from DePauw to that association for 23 years and was a member of the post-graduate scholarship committee. In 1969, he received the NCAA College Football Centennial Award given to faculty representatives. Loring also operated the football scoreboard clock at Blackstock Stadium for 36 years, was official scorer for home basketball games from 1965-80 and assisted Coach Charlie Erdmann as a volunteer baseball coach. He served as a member of the DePauw Athletic Hall of Fame Board of Directors from its inception until his retirement.

Bob Loring was active in Greencastle civic activities, serving as a member of the City Planning Commission for 17 years and a member and chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals for 10 years. He served as a deacon and elder of the Greencastle Presbyterian Church for many years.

A memorial service was held on Saturday, July 19, at Faith Presbyterian Church, 1529 N. Circle Drive, Colorado Springs.

Faculty members in the Department of Geosciences sincerely wish to thank Ken Owen, DePauw University's Executive Director of Media Relations for compiling this tribute to Robert Loring. This article was originally published on the DePauw website on July 16, 2008. <http://www.depauw.edu/news/index.asp?id=22030>

### **In Memory of Gordon Walters Professor Emeritus, Modern Languages (French)**

Gordon B. Walters, longtime professor of French at DePauw (1968-2001), passed away in May 2008.

Gordon, a native of Cincinnati, received his B.A. from the University of Cincinnati, his M.A. from Cornell University, and his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina. He served as co-chair of the former Romance Languages department (1982-1984), and later the sole chair (1984-1991).

Gordon's scholarly interest was in the 18<sup>th</sup> century French *encyclopédistes*, especially Diderot. However, in addition to French language and literature his lively mind often generated classes which were a long way from that subject, in areas such as film, newswriting, and contemporary American literature. He was also among the first to teach French literature in translation. But no matter the subject, he always approached everything he taught with enthusiasm and academic rigor.

He was one of the pioneers at DePauw in teaching film studies as a serious academic subject, at a time when some DePauw faculty members thought that it just involved "watching movies." For many years Gordon offered a two-semester sequence in the history of film, divided at 1940. He also offered many film-centered Winter Term projects, such as "The Films of Alfred Hitchcock," "American Film Comedy," "The Western Film," and "The Horror Film: Issues and Answers." Gordon was also the first person from our department to participate in the Honor Scholar program, and was in the first group of DePauw faculty to offer First Year Seminars.

Other Winter Term projects included titles as wide-ranging as "The Marquis de Sade," "The Novels of John Fowles," "Van Gogh and Gauguin: Post Impressionism," "The Theatre of the Absurd," "The Poet as Seer: the French Impressionists," "The Fiction of Anne Tyler and Raymond Carver," and the wonderfully-named "Hard-Boiled: The American Detective Novel in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century."

Gordon became a film critic, writing for the *DePauw*, the *Banner-Graphic* and the *Terre Haute Tribune-Star*. One interesting story which illustrates Gordon's intellectual integrity was that the owners (at that time) of the Ashley Square Cinema complained to the *Banner-Graphic* about



several negative reviews which Gordon authored. As a result, the newspaper asked that he only write positive reviews, so he quit rather than compromise his standards.

Gordon was a passionate hobbyist, and his interests ranged from African violets, to books on the American West, to antique fountain pens, to the Grateful Dead, to the memorabilia of his beloved Cincinnati Reds. He also played a pretty mean guitar, and was a painter.

**Minutes of the DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, October 6, 2008**

*Call to Order:*

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:06 PM.

*Verification of Quorum:*

The required quorum for this semester is 86 voting faculty members. The quorum for the meeting was verified. 118 pre-prepared ballots were distributed to voting faculty members as they entered the meeting, so at least 118 voting faculty members attended at least part of the meeting.

*Approval of Previous Minutes:*

There were no corrections to the September 2008 minutes, which were approved as distributed.

***Remarks from the President***

Before speaking, the President invited Mary Dixon to speak about the upcoming inauguration. Mary announced that the inauguration is on Friday, October 10. Everyone is invited and expected to participate in the procession. This is a formal ceremony, and thus the faculty will be lining up in rank order – we will not be using our typical informal ordering as we do in other processions. It is important to follow the particular order, given the complicated structure of seating. Faculty members need to inform Mary Dixon as soon as possible if you will not be able to participate. There are many other events planned in addition to the procession and inauguration – check DePauw’s web site for more information about them.

The President returned to the podium, and made the following remarks:

Good afternoon. I have been at DePauw for a little over three months. One season, a summer into fall. During those three months, I have met with you as a faculty three times: first at the Faculty Institute, second at our first faculty meeting in September, and now, today, our third time gathered.

I wanted today to introduce the questions on Intellectual Life that have emerged through my conversations with the Faculty Governance Steering Committee. But I also wanted to give a voice to the pressing issues regarding our intellectual life that must be discussed. In a few days at the inauguration I will be offering an address to a larger audience. The temptation is to discuss DePauw’s Intellectual Life Initiative at that moment, but there may be little patience at that event to have that discussion. So, this is the time I have to speak to you, the faculty, about these issues.

I have met with many academic departments over the past few months. In each meeting, in a very short time frame, I wanted to hear about the pressing issues in each department. I also wanted to get a sense of how each department thinks of our intellectual life. In these meetings I have learned several things.

The first being that it is exceedingly difficult – though not impossible – to have a meaningful conversation in one hour over lunch. But these first meetings have been helpful to me, in countless ways.

The second important lesson learned in these departmental meetings is that, in department after department, amongst the faculty gathered in such clusters, there is a profound and deep commitment to education. I mean this quite seriously. In department after department, you can hear faculty engaged in rather serious debate about the requirements of the majors sponsored by departments, what it means to be a faculty member and a scholar here, and what it means to engage the students we attract to DePauw.

The third point I learned is that faculty gain enormous satisfaction working with the students who are here at DePauw. You speak about our students with great respect and affection. To a department, you seem proud of those students who have committed to your program.

Finally, I felt a true sense of ambition for DePauw to become – more so than it is today – one of the great liberal arts colleges in this country, as we understand it. We will have many debates about what exactly it means to be a great liberal arts college. There are many inherent tensions and issues involved in this form of an institution. We will discuss these soon.

But I also want to note that in these department meetings, I heard strong echoes of the issues and concerns raised in the Faculty Institute. As a faculty, many of you feel overwhelmed by the bureaucracy that surrounds your professional lives. It seems as if you have more committee meetings than discussions, you write more reports than articles, and your daily calendars are filled with the quotidian rather than the profound. For many of you, it seems harder now to innovate and develop intellectually – for yourselves and for your students – than just a few years ago because of the time and other burdens on your schedule.

I heard that you are concerned that this burden is keeping you from applying your energy to your teaching and your writing, thinking, research and creative work. A few weeks ago I received an email from a well-regarded member of this faculty who writes that:

*“We shouldn't be afraid to re-invent ourselves in a thoughtful way. Change for change's sake is dumb, but it seems to me that many faculty members realize that some kind of comprehensive overhaul would be healthy. Part of that ought to be a reduction in the bureaucratic-ness – it is reasonable to ask us to account for ourselves, but we end up spending way too much time doing that, and not doing the teaching and research that represent our calling. I think we all ought to trust each other more to do our jobs. Some might fear that this would abdicate faculty power, but it isn't really 'power'; it's the semblance. If we spent our service time on issues that really mattered, trusting the fewer faculty that we elected to those major committees to handle those issues, and letting the administration do its jobs on others, I think it would be a great relief. In other words, if we really want to breathe, we have to stop smothering ourselves with our own pillows.”*

Another quite junior faculty member wrote to me the following message the other day:

*"I am a tenure-track Assistant Professor. I thought I would take you at your word and attempt some direct communication about what I see as a serious problem impeding the intellectual life of this university. . . . Since graduate school, I have taught in full-time positions [at other major research universities]. In my brief time at DePauw I've enjoyed the company of my colleagues, and their general spirits of goodwill and excitement, and I find the students engaged and receptive, some of the best I've ever taught. However, in my first month at DePauw I have been required to attend more meetings, both in committees and one-on-one, than I ever attended in an entire year anywhere else."*

We need to address this.

In the department meetings I have heard that there is concern that we have not obtained a comfortable understanding of the ways to balance, and understand, one's contributions to scholarship and one's contributions to the teaching enterprise. This concern comes up in numerous ways, from the ways we think of faculty development, annual reports, winter term obligations, and in a hundred more oblique ways including our bureaucratic culture.

There is concern about the structure of our curriculum. You are proud of the first year seminar program, and you point out that it has developed over the years into a meaningful common experience for our students. But you think it could be extended to a year, or that it could be a model for more such courses.

Winter term gets mixed reviews. Some point out that winter term can provide very important intellectual experience for many of our students. Others have doubts. No one, though, seems to be able to confidently state why it is that we require the three winter term experiences we require now and how these requirements enrich our student's intellectual lives, and ours.

Many of you believe that you need more conducive space for interaction with each other and with students. Those departments that have places for students to interact comfortably with each other – and with faculty – report a deeper level of intellectual engagement than those without such spaces. These are not necessarily fancy places. Just places where students can be, and can be as young scholars.

There is an acknowledgement that it is time to review our Programs of Distinction. I remain concerned about how we think about our programs of distinction. They seem, to me, to be all over the map. Some are curricular, some are co-curricular, some seem to bring the students out into the world too quickly or too much at the expense of what they might do here on campus. Many of you point out that these programs seem to be the way in which we attract our best students. I would counter that we can take care of Admissions best if we had a more coherent structure by which we connect the real world to a traditional liberal arts education.

You have before you now a group of six questions to consider. With the help of Dave Berque and the Faculty Governance Steering Committee we have developed these questions and a proposed way to speak of them on this campus. These are not perfect questions. And if I, or any of you, had much more time, we probably could generate six, or ten, better questions. By necessity they take the large topic of intellectual life and divide them into smaller questions about process, requirements, and regulations. But I believe that these questions open up the larger topics that we need to discuss about our intellectual life, the lives of our students, and your lives as teachers and scholars here.

What am I asking you to do? I am asking you to take what we have in the form of resources, our faculty, and our students and imagine that we can, together, ensure that we become one of the finest liberal arts colleges in the country. A place of profound intellectual excitement in accordance with our form. I am asking you to begin resolving some of the tensions inherent in our form, in a way that is appropriate for DePauw. How should we create an intellectual life marked by all the characteristics of a true liberal arts education – and by that I mean a willingness to debate, a respect for inquiry and discovery, an emphasis on critical skills – with an awareness of the need to educate our students for the world they face now. This is the most important conversation we will have at DePauw now and for the next few years.

After I finish speaking today, we will hear how this conversation will continue. My hope is that by January we will have some good thoughts on each of the six questions on intellectual life put before you. I will then bring these conclusions to the Board of Trustees so they can hear of our thoughts. What I am hoping for is that you think boldly. Now I know it's October. And you're busy. You may even be tired. Very tired.

I also must note that we are potentially facing a difficult financial period. We have some extraordinary pressures on our operating budget, on our endowment, and on the complex financial structure that supports this institution. From the vantage point of my review of the finances, and the work we will conduct with the Board of Trustees – which will meet this week – we cannot anticipate a period of significant financial expansion. I plan on speaking with you more directly, and with more detail, after we meet with the Board of Trustees this weekend.

But if we are to be one of the truly great liberal arts colleges... we have to take advantage of this moment. I know that we have used the tag line “uncommon success” in the past, and in some ways, still today. I know it has complicated associations. I am asking for you to, then, help me to transcend this phrase.

Cornel West was here a few weeks ago. Due to a conflict – as was widely reported – I missed his lecture. But the students I spoke to about the lecture reported that one of the thoughts offered by Professor West was that we should commit our lives toward the attainment not of success but of greatness. I think I'd prefer having significance be the goal. Either way, I am asking for your input and your help.

The intellectual life of the campus is in your hands. The way we speak of DePauw, the way we will attract students, the way I will begin my work of raising funds for this institution's future, will depend on your work this winter.

Thank you.

There were no questions or comments for the President.

A member of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC) announced that the President had given the FGSC the topics and questions for discussion, and the FGSC assigned them to the relevant committees:

<b>Issue Description</b>	<b>Leading Committee</b>	<b>Committee Chair</b>
Faculty Time and Faculty Engagement	COA	Marcia McKelligan
Balance between the Traditional Liberal Arts and Career Preparation	CAPP	Rebecca Upton
Winter Term	CAPP	Rebecca Upton
Student Requirements	MAO*	Brian Howard
Building a Common Experience	CAPP	Rebecca Upton
Social Spaces that Encourage the Life of the Mind outside the Classroom	SLAAC	Greg Schwipps

\*MAO considers and reports to CAPP

The FGSC also created a timeline for discussions:

- October is intended to be used to collect broad input, trying to be open in our dialogue and discussions.
- November is intended to be used for more focused discussions.
- December is intended to be used to outline and refine our positions.
- The President will present the results at the Board of Trustees meeting in January.
- The discussions will continue into the spring.

A handout about these matters was distributed at the meeting. The FGSC has tried to set up broad ways to participate, and the committee offers a variety of different formats for gathering input. An electronic survey will be distributed by the Chair of the Faculty to give faculty members a chance to comment on these issues. The survey does not have to be completed all at once. The committees will assimilate the ideas generated at the meetings and give the FGSC items to react to in November.

A faculty member asked for clarification about the four sets of concurrent open meetings during the week of October 27 through 31. The FGSC representative stated that the sets of meetings would be scheduled for a variety of days and times that hopefully will allow most individuals to participate at one of the times. Each meeting will be held in six rooms at once, one for each question.

Another faculty member asked if the electronic survey would be anonymous. The FGSC representative stated that it would be anonymous unless a faculty member chooses to add his or her name.

## **Reports from Coordinating Committees**

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/).

*Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

MAO brought forth a motion that the faculty approve the following revision to the major in Education Studies, effective for incoming students beginning in the fall of 2009, and available as an option for current students. Additions are in **bold**, and deletions are in ~~strike through~~:

*Total courses required: Ten ~~(including two associated courses from another discipline)~~*

*Core courses: EDUC 170, EDUC 222, EDUC 223, EDUC 480, EDUC 490*

*Other required courses: ~~Three~~ **Five** additional courses in Education Studies, ~~two~~ **three** of which must be at the 300-level, ~~and two courses from another discipline (such as Sociology/Anthropology, Women's Studies, etc.) at the 200-level or above. The courses from the associated discipline should, along with the Education Studies courses, provide a basis for student's seminar research and must be approved by a student's advisor.~~*

*# 300 and 400 level courses: ~~Four~~ **Five***

*Senior requirement: The senior requirement consists of successful completion of the following: EDUC 480: Methods of Educational Research and EDUC 490: Senior Seminar in Education Studies.*

MAO notes that the effect of this revision is to drop the requirement that two of the major courses come from outside the department, and to increase the number of 300 and 400 level courses for the major by one.

Since this motion came from a standing committee, it needed no second. There were no questions and no comments. The motion passed.

MAO brought forth a motion that the faculty approve the following new courses:

### **ARTH 340: Love and War in Medieval Art and Literature, 1 credit, Group 3 Lit**

*"Love is a kind of war, and no assignment for cowards." Thus spoke Ovid in c. 2 B.C.E. with great pertinence to love and war in the Middle Ages and to the endeavors of this class. I propose to work with you through three forms of vernacular writing and imagery: war epic poems, Arthurian romances, and allegorical love poetry. All three of these forms were articulated in the incredibly rich 12th-14th centuries, though often they refer to much earlier periods. All three of these forms flourished outside the purview (and approval) of the Church. And all three of these forms interacted with that most troublesome (because uncontrolled) of all entities: the secular image. Both the texts and images of medieval love and war existed without the sanction or authority of sacred text (i.e. the Bible in its many medieval manifestations). This "unmoored" quality*

*resulted in an especially productive, volatile and fascinating interaction between orality, memory, writing, and transmission. The course seeks to be aware of how “timeless” stories move between various verbal and visual forms, what the impacts of those forms are on the stories, and on what happens to them in our modern era (where they are still consistently translated into film and further fiction).*

**CLST 200: Topics in Classical Studies, 1 credit**

*A study of a specific topic in Mediterranean civilizations or literature. May be repeated for credit with different topics.*

**MATH 423: Advanced Topics in Operations Research, 1 credit**

*Math 422 (Operations Research) is a prerequisite for this course. The topics to be covered are: Advanced topics in linear programming, Integer programming, Nonlinear programming, Game Theory, Markov Chains, and Dynamic programming.*

Since this motion came from a standing committee, it needed no second. There were no questions and no comments. The motion passed.

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting’s agenda.

- Announcement of change in course number, title, and description

**ARTH 226: Contemporary Art & Theory, 1 credit**

*This course will be focused on art from the late 1960s to the present. This is the tradition in art which rejects many of the basic principles and qualities of Modernism; that is, it rejects an exclusive focus on oil painting and pedestal-based sculpture, the autonomy of the artwork from the wider world, and the ideal of the artist as a larger-than-life person who reaches a level of personal emotional or spiritual insight, turning that insight into a cultural achievement, in painting or sculpture, beyond the abilities of ordinary mortals. We will examine how this new tradition, critical of the earlier era of Modernism, emerged and developed, and how it still essentially defines the agenda of today’s art world. We will address the crucial question: Is the rejection of those earlier ideals and goals in contemporary art a liberation or a defeat? We will also address the situation in contemporary art, the direct result of that rejection, in which art takes on a bewildering array of materials, methods, procedures, goals, and modes of self-presentation; rarely does one see in contemporary art exhibitions a simple framed painting, hanging on the wall, unless it is presented with exquisite irony and ambivalence.*

This course replaces the following:

**ARTH 342, Art Theory and Criticism, 1 credit**

*Art criticism is a challenging literary genre. It seeks to put into language something which is inherently non-verbal, and leaves meaning open and unfixed. We discuss the idea of art theory (“aesthetics”), and some art-theoretical texts which have been foundational for Modernist and contemporary art; we discuss art criticism as a very particular kind of creative writing; we look at some central examples which distinguish themselves by having a theory of art underpinning them; we read and discuss contemporary art criticism; and we write some art criticism of our own.*



- Announcement of one-time group designation for Spring 2009
  - PHIL 206A Topics: Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche, 1 credit, Group 4
  - PHIL 307C Topics: Constitutional Interpretation, 1 credit, Group 4
  - GER 412 Topics: The German Democratic Republic, a 40-year Experiment, 1 credit, Group 3 Lit

The chair of MAO reported that the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), which reports to MAO, has taken on the charge of gathering faculty input and providing faculty perspective on ways to improve the web site. They will be sending out an email after their meeting on October 14 to outline their goals and to solicit faculty input regarding the website. Any faculty input before then can be directed to the chair of ATAC, Scott Wilkerson ([mswilke@depauw.edu](mailto:mswilke@depauw.edu)).

The chair of MAO then reported that as part of the response to the President's challenge on "Enriching Intellectual Life at DePauw," MAO, in association with the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP), will be gathering input and developing options for the request to "examine the current set of student requirements and recommend any desirable changes to allow time and opportunity for greater intellectual exploration."

There were no comments or questions for the chair of MAO.

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

The chair of CAPP reported that there was no CAPP business to report at this time. The committee has, however, asked its sub-committees to attend a regular CAPP meeting in the near future. This is both to provide an update of ongoing sub-committee work and to begin discussions of the Faculty Institute questions from President Casey in order to stay connected to the larger campus-wide conversations this year as outlined by the handout distributed at the faculty meeting.

There were no questions or comments for the chair of CAPP.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

There was no oral report from COF. The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- COF has made strong progress in their work on chair interviews for those Departments where the term as chair ends with this academic year.
- COF discussed, incorporated feedback, revised and has sent the Conflict of Interest Policy back to University council for what we hope is a final review. Notice will likely be given at the November faculty meeting for vote at the December faculty meeting as to the changes required in the handbook to officially establish the policy.
- COF continues to discuss
  - the COA memo about file size/structure
  - the COA memo about promotion linked to tenure
  - the new Student Opinion form

If you have not yet provided feedback and are interested in doing so, doing so quickly is important before COF makes decisions and moves on to other issues.

- Promotion nominations have come in and candidates who accepted nominations have been published. Please be mindful of the many review deadlines, particularly with regard to spring reviews and promotion reviews. The complete list can be found as the top link of the COF webpage, <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/COFFiles/COF.asp>.
- Once again COF reminds department chairs to please arrange class visits for our untenured colleagues so they aren't all done during the last week of the semester. Everyone should keep in mind the importance of talking face to face with the colleague both before and after the visit in addition to providing the written summary. Just like for our students, feedback is most valuable when it is timely. A link to the peer observation policy can be found on the COF web page.

There were no questions or comments for the chair of COF.

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- SLAAC elected Dana Dudle and Steve Timm to serve on the Nature Park Advisory Committee.
- SLAAC is currently revising the Disruptive Student Policy, and should have an updated version ready for a faculty vote at the next faculty meeting.
- Mental Health Resources and Strategies for Referrals for Faculty Supporting Students
  - Suicide is the second leading cause of death for college students ages 20-24 years old.
  - More teenagers and young adults die from suicide than from all medical illnesses combined.
  - One in 12 US college students makes a suicide plan.
  - The vast majority of young adults aged 18 and older who are diagnosed with depression do not receive appropriate or any treatment at all.

Not all students who experience stress or emotional challenges are depressed or consider suicide. However, faculty members are often have front line contact with students who do face anxiety and depression and we believe it is imperative that you are provided with information on warning signs of emotional problems, inform you of available resources and recommend strategies for referrals. This information is currently provided during new faculty orientation, early semester mailings, and in semester memos during high stress time from Counseling Services. However, these contacts do not provide an opportunity to ask questions, present specific scenarios and express concerns and anxieties about sensitive topics. Associate Dean of Students Cara Setchell and Associate Dean of Students and Director of Counseling and Health Services Denise Hayes are willing to attend departmental faculty meetings to provide information that will better equip you to address referrals for students who are emotional distressed.

The chair of SLAAC called on Denise Hayes (Associate Dean of Students and Director of Counseling and Health Services) to make a report about students that are in distress.

The Associate Dean reported that she had placed a brochure on the back table entitled, "Helping Students in Distress." She encouraged faculty members to pick up the brochure and store it in the folder which was distributed by the Office of Student Life earlier this year. She then informed the faculty of the following frequently asked questions and their answers:

- **How do I contact a counselor in an emergency?**

*Call x4268 (Counseling Services) or x4261 (Public Safety). If Counseling Services is not available, tell the receptionist or Public Safety dispatcher that you need to speak to a counselor immediately. You can also walk a student to Counseling Services during regular office hours.*

- **What should I do when a parent, another faculty member, or other students express concern about a student?**

*Inform them of how to contact Counseling Services (x4268). Inform the parent, faculty member, or student how to contact Public Safety and Counseling Services in case of an emergency. When contacting Public Safety or Counseling Services, first-hand knowledge is most helpful – i.e., find a person who has interacted with the student in question directly. Contact Cara Setchell (Associate Dean of Students, x4270) to have the student supported through the Student Information Meeting (Mondays) which includes Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, Public Safety, Residence Life and Housing and the Wellness Center.*

- **What should I do if I suggest to a student that they need to go to counseling, but they won't go?**

*Contact Counseling Services and let them know your concerns (be specific with observed behavior), or contact Cara Setchell.*

- **How do I know if a student has gone to counseling?**

*The student will need to sign a release form in order for a counselor to confirm or deny that a student is coming to counseling. Most often, if you have a relationship with a student that allows discussion about counseling, that student will let you know if they are coming. If not, get someone else involved to help monitor the situation.*

- **Are there other ways that Counseling Services can help me?**

*Counseling Services staff, with adequate lead time, will make presentations in your class on topics related to a variety of issues such as: stress and time management, coping with anxiety, transitions and adjustments through the college years, grief, relationships, family issues, and more. The director of Counseling Services will meet with faculty during departmental meetings to discuss specific students or recurrent behavioral trends that your department faces (i.e. disturbing writings, challenges with group discussions, etc.). Counseling Services can provide confidential consultation on individual students via a phone call or meeting.*

The Associate Dean finished by informing the faculty that a group from the Indiana Coalition for Prevention of Suicide would be giving two three-hour presentations on January 12, 2009, from 9-12 and 1-4. Let her know if you are interested in attending.

A faculty member addressed the Associate Dean and stated that a DePauw student died last year shortly after being removed from the University. The faculty member stated that he knows that we can't save everyone, and that some people have problems that we cannot address. However, he asked if we learned anything from this situation?

The Associate Dean responded that when individuals have mental or emotional challenges, there has to be a level of cooperation on that person's part – they have to be willing to participate in the process. Given the confidentiality that frequently surrounds these types of

issues, there may be more going on in the situation than people on the outside might be able to see.

Another faculty member asked about what to do when a student who hasn't been doing well in his course hands him a letter stating that they are being treated for depression. What are the faculty member's responsibilities in this sort of case? What should he do in this situation? Are there special accommodations to be made?

The Associate Dean responded that special accommodations are not issued by Counseling Services. Students may be asking for special permission to avoid an exam or assignment, but faculty members are not required to offer special accommodations simply because a student presents them with a doctor's letter. Kelley Hall (Associate Dean of Academic Affairs) clarified that students are required to give these types of letters to DiAnna Washington (Director of Student Academic Support and Coordinator of Student Disability Services) in 115 Asbury Hall. Faculty members should not and are not required to provide accommodations without the proper documentation and arrangements made through DiAnna Washington and Student Disability Services. Her office handles accommodations and can verify that the letter is an official document.

The chair of SLAAC reported that SLAAC will be mostly addressing the issue of student spaces, but will also revise the disruptive student policy and plans to bring this issue to the faculty at the November meeting. SLAAC plans to get feedback from the faculty via an electronic survey about the social spaces issue.

### ***Reports from Other Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/).

#### *Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

COA has met once to begin to address President Casey's question about faculty time and faculty engagement. The office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs is in the process of collecting data on workloads at colleges in our comparison group, and updating information on the "Released Time Workload Credit Summary" for DePauw. This data will be considered and discussed at our next meeting on October 9. COA will also explore ways to solicit faculty input on issues raised by the workload and engagement question.

A document titled "A Proposal to reduce teaching loads using a Cafeteria system of Compensation and workload" was distributed at the meeting. COA did not produce this document; the chair of COA asked the person who wrote the document to claim authorship – no one did so. The chair of COA stated that COA would consider the document.

A faculty member asked for clarification on a statement made in the document – is it six years teaching, then a sabbatical, or is it seven years teaching, then a sabbatical? The chair of COA, after a brief consultation with the VPAA, stated that it is seven years teaching before the first sabbatical. After the first sabbatical, it is six years teaching between sabbaticals.

Another faculty member asked if we (the faculty) are making a habit of submitting and distributing anonymous documents at the faculty meeting? The Chair of the Faculty responded

that the stack of documents was on the table when he arrived at the meeting. His options were removing the stack or leaving it for distribution, and he chose to leave it there. The FGSC will discuss this issue further.

*Report of the Faculty Development Committee (Meryl Altman reporting for chair John Schlotterbeck)*

The following announcements were partially read during the meeting, and also provided in the meeting's agenda.

- Reports for faculty development awards for the Spring 2008 semester are due on October 15. Because this date is the Wednesday before Fall Break, we have extended the deadline until Monday, October 27. (announced in meeting)
- The deadline for receiving Fisher Time Out applications is October 29.
- A reminder: Faculty members who are late turning in required reports are ineligible for additional FD funding until FDC receives and approves outstanding reports. However, you may apply for Professional Conference Funds but will not be reimbursed until we have received and approved outstanding reports. (announced in meeting)
- Abstract for Bryan Hanson's Fisher Fellowship: Development of an R Software Package for the Chemometric Analysis of Spectra. The objective of this project is to develop an R software package for the chemometric analysis of spectra. "R" is an open-source computing environment designed primarily for graphical analysis and statistics. Chemometrics is the science of interpreting complex sets of chemical measurements, such as collections of NMR and IR spectra, which are obtained from instruments typically found in chemistry laboratories. During my recent sabbatical, which focused on plant metabolomics, I developed proficiency in R and wrote functions to analyze data I was collecting. During my Fisher Fellowship, I will take this nucleus of functions, add features and options, and implement a number of new capabilities. I will also learn the necessary supporting skills of making R packages, version control, and I will extend my statistical background. The final product will be a complete software package for plotting and analyzing sets of spectra such as are typically encountered in metabolomic studies. I will use this package in my metabolomics research and it will be made available to the R community.

The FDC representative stated that the FDC is pleased to announce that Professor Bryan Hanson, Dept. of Chemistry and Biochemistry, received the Fisher Fellowship for fall 2009-10. Bryan will use the Fall 2009 semester to work on "Development of an R Software Package for the Chemometric Analysis of Spectra." The Fisher Fellowship is one of the most generous awards of reassigned time from all teaching to work on a project between sabbaticals and comes with a salary supplement and project expense budget.

A faculty member stated that she was concerned that no Distinguished Professor Awards were made last year, and there will be none awarded this year as well. As the holder of a Distinguished Professor Award, she expressed concern about this, and urged FDC to encourage and seek out people to be nominated and apply for these awards. The FDC representative responded that FDC is not in charge of advising on the Distinguished Professor Award program; COA is. The chair of COA stated that COA has taken note of this issue, and a discussion about whether the award has outlived its usefulness is on the long-term agenda (after the discussion about the intellectual life issues). The faculty member stated that the award has not outlived its usefulness, but the new criteria for the award are too stringent. She

urged COA to not let it slide and to discuss it now. The FDC representative urged COA to also look at the gender imbalance in the University Professorship award.

Later in the meeting, during his remarks, the VPAA stated that there had been nominations for the Distinguished Professor Award this year and last [when there had been no awards given], but the nominated candidates did not submit dossiers. In the latest round, several candidates indicated that they expected that they would prepare dossiers, but not this year.

*Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC; Bridget Gourley reporting)*

The following announcement was not read during the meeting, but was provided in the meeting's agenda.

- The Nature Park Advisory Committee

The Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC) was asked to provide advice to the administration about the membership and structure of the Nature Park Advisory Committee. The Nature Park Advisory Committee will advise the staff of the Nature Park as well as the VPAA and the VP for Student Life with respect to issues related to serving the mission of Education, Research, Reflection and Recreation in the Nature Park. The FGSC will consider making the Nature Park Advisory Committee a permanent subcommittee of SLAAC after a two-year trial operation. Meanwhile, the committee should report at least once each semester to SLAAC.

The membership of this committee, as proposed by the FGSC and accepted by the administration is described below.

- Three faculty members:
  - One a scientific user (for education and/or research) of the park appointed by SLAAC after reviewing expressions of interest.
  - One a non-science faculty member who is also a user of the park appointed by SLAAC after reviewing expressions of interest.
  - One a representative from the advisory committee for the Ethics Institute appointed by the ethics advisory committee.
- Two students:
  - One appointed by the VPAA from a list of student research users of the park.
  - One appointed by student congress.
- One (administrative) representative of Campus Life appointed by the VP for Student Life.
- One (administrative) representative of Spiritual Life appointed by the VP for Student Life.

The representative for the Faculty Governance Steering Committee announced that the FGSC had collected information from institutions through the GLCA Dean's list serve and other connections about what other private liberal arts institutions do to recognize and honor colleagues at the time of their passing. The responses, from 21 institutions, range from "we do nothing, but maybe we should something," to having services in the campus chapel that the faculty attend in regalia. Several note that while they do something, it is not at a faculty meeting. There is no clear consistent or majority approach. Some schools that report giving a "memorial minute" also note that either the faculty meets more than once a month or that the "memorial minute" is only done for active faculty because retiring faculty were recognized and therefore said good by to at the last faculty meeting of the year in which their active service ended.

The FGSC representative noted that in making the recommendation, the Faculty Governance Steering Committee weighed the competing concerns related to honoring the contributions of deceased colleagues, learning some of our history through these stories, showing respect for both past and present colleagues and balancing the needs of preserving time for discussion of key current issues.

The Faculty Governance Steering Committee recommends, "Written tributes for deceased faculty members must be provided to the Chair of the Faculty in time to be distributed along with a faculty meeting agenda. The Chair will add an agenda item asking for a moment of silence to honor the deceased faculty member(s). The Chair will also read one or two sentences of basic biographical information about each deceased faculty member (see September 2008 faculty meeting agenda for a model). Colleagues may privately read the written tributes that are circulated with the agenda. Each tribute will also be included in the meeting minutes for archival purposes. As has been our tradition, a written copy of the tribute will be sent to the family of the deceased faculty member when possible."

A faculty member asked a procedural question about how a motion made by a faculty member gets referred to committee. The Parliamentarian responded that once a motion is made and seconded, it becomes the property of the entire body [of faculty present at the faculty meeting]. The motion was referred to committee, where it was given full consideration. The committee has returned to the body and made a report on its discussions. If the report concludes with recommendations, a motion is required by the body to adopt the recommendations.

Another faculty member asked if the motion becomes the property of the body once made, how can people offer friendly amendments to the original maker of the motion. The Chair of the Faculty noted that there is no such thing as a friendly amendment in Robert's Rules of Order. Many bodies (ourselves included) use friendly amendments as a convenience, but no friendly amendment may be accepted if any member of the body objects.

The VPAA stated that we need to clarify if this [the statement by the FGSC] was a report or a recommendation to make a motion. He then stated that there could then be a substitution for the motion, such as the original motion on the subject, once a motion on the committee's recommendation was open for discussion. This was confirmed by the Parliamentarian.

A faculty member moved to accept the recommendation of the FGSC. This motion was seconded. The motion read:

***Written tributes for deceased faculty members must be provided to the Chair of the Faculty in time to be distributed along with a faculty meeting agenda. The Chair will add an agenda item asking for a moment of silence to honor the deceased faculty member(s). The Chair will also read one or two sentences of basic biographical information about each deceased faculty member (see September 2008 faculty meeting agenda for a model). Colleagues may privately read the written tributes that are circulated with the agenda. Each tribute will also be included in the meeting minutes for archival purposes. As has been our tradition, a written copy of the tribute will be sent to the family of the deceased faculty member when possible.***

A faculty member spoke against this motion. He stated that the motion eviscerates the motion that was made last month, and that this motion is no real compromise.

Another faculty member state that he did not think that it was disrespectful to the deceased to say that this meeting is not the place for remembrances.

Another faculty member spoke about the motion, neither for nor against. She stated that it felt disrespectful because we had a tradition of reading remembrances, and we changed this tradition at a moment when we had a colleague who needed to be remembered. Thus, it was disconcerting to have a colleague who was not honored in the usual way.

Another faculty member spoke for the motion, and asked where we are going to draw the line? At what point is someone worthy of being honored in the faculty meeting? He stated that this motion is a good compromise.

There was no further discussion of the motion. There was a call for a secret ballot. The motion passed in a secret ballot, with 76 yes votes and 34 no votes.

### ***Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs***

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- AQIP  
As part of maintaining accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission, DePauw has undertaken projects under the rubric of the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). Initial projects focused on: academic engagement, globalization/internationalization, wellness, and ethics. The project descriptions and progress on them may be found in the menu available to you under e-services. As the initial projects are coming to an end, this year we will select new projects which will last for the next several years. Following President Casey's signing of the President's Climate Commitment, we will be working to honor those commitments and those endeavors will form one of our next AQIP projects. Other new projects will be selected after we see what emerges from the discussions launched by President Casey on the topic of the intellectual life at DePauw.
- Faculty and academic staff demographics for 2008-2009  
Following up on my report last month, here are some additional statistics.
  - Tenure-track faculty members - 200 (151 tenured)
  - Faculty members of color are 11% of the tenured faculty members, 37% of the probationary tenure track faculty members, 30% of the term faculty members, 18% of the tenure-track faculty members, and 20% of the full-time faculty members.
  - Academic Affairs salaried staff members (including IT staff members) total 111, 10% of them are staff members of color.
  - Male/female presence among the full-time faculty members is as follows:
    - 85 Professors, 35% female
    - 75 Associate Professors, 48% female
    - 70 Assistant Professors, 47% female
    - 10 Instructors, 40% female
  - Our hiring shows gender balance within one or two people at each rank since 1987, a balance which reaches about one-third of the way into the professorial rank (by seniority). The 50 professors hired prior to 1987 were 28% female.
  - Academic leadership positions
    - Department chairs and Dean of the School of Music
      - 10 of the 20 are female; 3 are persons of color



- Interdisciplinary programs and honors directors/coordinators
  - 10 of the 14 are female; 1 are persons of color [agenda reads 0, see below for discussion of correction]

The VPAA called attention to the written remarks in the Faculty Governance Steering Committee report about one member of the Nature Park Advisory Committee being a student who is doing research in the Nature Park. He asked faculty members to send him the names of students doing research in the Nature Park.

A faculty member stated that he had been one of the team members who went to the AQIP conference. He stated that he had liked that the process was inclusive – it took information and comments from stakeholders all across the campus. He stated that it makes sense that the new President be directing some of the initiatives, but he was disappointed that, in the end, nearly all of the AQIP projects ended up being those that the previous president had set as priorities before the AQIP process began. He hopes that the AQIP process will continue to be inclusive of concerns of staff members and students.

The VPAA noted that on the list of the first AQIP initiatives were several issues that were at the top of lists from community conversations, and that we are required to periodically have community-wide discussions about these issues. The Registrar should be notifying us shortly about summary reports from completed AQIP projects. The process requires us to have at least three projects that we are working on at any given time, and we will need to have a portfolio of three new projects (at least one academic) by the spring.

A faculty member questioned the faculty demographic data, asking if it was true that there were no faculty members of color in leadership positions of interdisciplinary and honors programs. The VPAA noted that this was a mistake, and he believed that the correct number was one faculty member of color for those leadership positions.

### ***Old Business***

There was no old business.

### ***New Business***

There was no new business.

### ***Announcements***

The following announcements were not read in the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- Special elections were held to fill several vacant positions. The results of these elections are as follows:
  - One semester fall 2008 Division Four replacement on SLAAC, Richard Cameron
  - One year 2008-2009 replacement as GLCA representative, Kerry Pannell
- DePauw President Brian Casey recently signed the Presidents Climate Commitment (PCC), joining many other universities and colleges in their concern about the unprecedented scale and speed of global warming and its potential for large-scale, adverse health, social,

economic and ecological effects. Signing the PCC obligates DePauw to create an institutional carbon footprint and a comprehensive plan to address these issues. All faculty, staff and students are invited to a meeting discussing how we are now addressing the issue of our carbon footprint and addressing how our carbon footprint will be created. Bring your curiosity and questions to the meeting on October 9, from 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM (please come when you can and feel free to leave when you must). The meeting will be held in Watson Forum. If you have questions about the meeting or its outcome, please feel free to contact Carol Steele or Jen Everett.

### ***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 PM.

## Minutes of the DePauw University Faculty Meeting Monday, November 3, 2008

### *Call to Order:*

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:02 PM.

### *Verification of Quorum:*

The quorum was verified. 111 voting slips were distributed.

### *Approval of Previous Minutes:*

There were no corrections to the minutes, and they were approved as distributed.

### **Reports from Coordinating Committees**

A complete committee membership list is available by clicking on "Committees" from the web site <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/>.

### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

MAO brought forth a motion that the faculty approve the following new courses:

- *MUS 451 – Student Teaching in Music (2 credits)*  
A 14-week, full-time teaching experience in an approved music department of a school district. Student teachers are under the supervision of a cooperating teacher and at least one university supervisor. Prerequisites include admission to Student Teaching and a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or higher. Applications are submitted one full year in advance of the student teaching semester. This course is required for state licensure, is typically offered spring semester, and may not be taken pass/fail. Students must concurrently enroll in Senior Seminar for Music Educators.  
*Note from MAO: This course is a replacement for EDUC 450, which is no longer offered.*
- *MUS 452 – Senior Seminar for Music Educators (1 credit)*  
A seminar stressing a professional examination of principles of classroom management, legal rights and responsibilities, certification, accountability, and current issues in education. Practical problems faced in the profession will be addressed. An emphasis is placed upon the examination and refinement of personal attitudes and teaching skills. Students will participate in a final exhibition that involves a formal presentation of personal growth and competence via the electronic portfolio process. Prerequisite is admission to Student Teaching. This course is typically offered spring semester and may not be taken pass/fail. Students must concurrently enroll in Student Teaching in Music.  
*Note from MAO: This course is a replacement for EDUC 430, which is no longer offered.*
- *PHIL 340 – Classical Political Philosophy (1 credit, Group 4)*  
With an emphasis on classic texts from writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Hobbes, Locke, Mill, and Marx, this course pursues fundamental questions in political philosophy. Why have government at all? What is the nature and extent of our obligation to obey government? What obligations does government have towards us? What right do we have to disobey? Our first goal will be to understand our authors' answers to these questions, but our most important task will be the critical appraisal of their answers. Prerequisite: one course in philosophy or permission of instructor.

The chair of MAO elaborated that the new courses in the School of Music are courses that used to be offered in the Department of Education Studies. The courses are simply being moved into the School of Music.

Since this motion came from a standing committee, it needed no second. Since there was no objection, the three courses were considered as a group. There was no discussion, and the motion carried.

The chair of MAO announced that MAO would be making a recommendation to the Registrar related to the policy used for transferring credit for online courses. This policy appears in the University Catalog but not in the Academic Handbook. Comments or concerns about the proposed changes should be addressed to the chair of MAO by November 14. In the absence of comments MAO will move forward with the recommendations indicated below. *[The proposed revised policy and added bullet point differ from what was written in the meeting's agenda, and match the correction sent by the chair of MAO via e-mail to the faculty after the meeting.]*

*Current Policy (found in the University Catalog, Section IV, Distance Learning Credit):*

A maximum of one course credit may be earned through correspondence or open-ended distance learning classes. Distance learning courses with a fixed beginning and end date which allow regular interaction with the class members are treated the same as other transferred classes. This credit must be approved by the department into which it transfers. The University does not allow credit in modern languages or laboratory science taken in this way.

*Proposed Revised Policy:*

Online courses with a fixed beginning and end date which allow regular interaction with the class members are treated the same as other transferred courses. For correspondence or open-ended online courses, a maximum of one course credit may be earned. All policies governing transfer credit apply to courses taken online or by correspondence: they must be sponsored by an accredited institution and be accepted for credit by that institution toward its own bachelors degree; they must be on a liberal arts topic; and they must be pre-approved by the chair of the department into which the course transfers, the student's academic advisor, and the Registrar's Office. Normally, the University does not award credit for modern language or laboratory science courses taken online. Students may not earn transfer credit from online or correspondence courses offered concurrently with their DePauw enrollments except by permission of the Petitions Committee.

*To be added as a bullet item in transfer credit policy (University Catalog, Section IV, Transfer Credit):*

Students may not earn transfer credit from courses offered concurrently with their DePauw enrollments except by permission of the Petitions Committee.

The chair of MAO elaborated that the Registrar wanted to update the policy in terms of online courses. Please give feedback, if you have any, to MAO within the next couple of weeks.

A faculty member asked if there have been a large increase in the number of students taking online courses. The chair of MAO responded that he was not aware of a significant increase in the number of students taking courses online, but the Registrar was noticing a number of cases where the language in the policy seemed out of date. The meaning of a distance course has changed.

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

CAPP has asked to meet with each of its subcommittees and to receive an update and report on the status and work of those subcommittees. Thus far, CAPP has met with the IEC and has received communication from the others. As with other coordinating committees, CAPP has been engaged with the questions about Intellectual Life and the President's charges to the faculty. CAPP encourages faculty members to continue to write to, or contact, the chair or any member of CAPP if they have any additional input or comments to make.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

At the December faculty meeting, COF will present a motion that the faculty approve the following changes to the Academic Handbook regarding the Conflict of Interest Policy. Deletions are shown with a strike through, and additions are in bold.

Regarding Full-time Position Request Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.c.1: ~~“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 (see section b(1) above). 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.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

Regarding Search Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.b.1(b): ~~“No person who has a familial relationship to a potential candidate for the position may serve on this search committee, and it is expected that persons with similar conflicts of interest (e.g., significant romantic involvement) will notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs that they should be excused from service.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

Regarding Personnel Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.a.1: ~~“No person who has a familial relationship to the person under review may serve on his or her Personnel Committee, and it is expected that persons with similar conflicts of interest (e.g., significant romantic involvement) will notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs that they should be excused from service.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

In the Personnel Policies section III.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.~~ **Membership exclusion based on**

**Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.** 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.”

#### Regarding Grievance Procedures

In the Personnel Policies Section VIII.I: ~~“Grievance Committee members and alternates must recuse themselves from participating in any proceeding, including a panel proceeding, in which that member or alternate has a conflict of interest.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.** Other Grievance Committee members, the faculty member who is seeking COF or Grievance Committee review under the procedures described below (the "Petitioner"), the COF, and/or the Vice President of Academic Affairs may request consideration of whether a Grievance Committee member or alternate should be excluded from participation in any particular matter due to a conflict of interest. The final determination whether a conflict of interest justifies the exclusion of a Grievance Committee member from participating in a particular matter will be made by the Chair of the Faculty. If the Chair of the Faculty is recused or challenged because of conflict of interest, then that role will be filled by the most recent past Chair of the Faculty in succession. Questions of conflict of interest may be raised at any time during a proceeding but must be raised prior to the conclusion of that particular proceeding.”

#### Regarding Animal Use and Care in Research Policy

In the General Policies Section on “Animal Use and Care in Research Policy” at the end of the section on Membership of IACUC: “No member of the committee may review a project in which the member has a conflict of interest, such as a role as a participant in the project **or those covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook.** In this case the alternate will replace the regular committee member for this review.”

#### Regarding Human Subject Research Review Procedure

In the General Policies Section on “Human Subject Research Review Procedure,” the section on “Composition of the Board:” “The Institutional Review Board must consist of at least five members, appointed by the chief academic officer, on the recommendation of current members. The members must have varying backgrounds sufficient to assure complete and adequate review of research activities commonly conducted by the institution. The committee must be sufficiently qualified in expertise, experience and sensitivity to issues such as community attitudes (which might arise from their race, gender or cultural backgrounds). In addition, the committee should strive for diversity of intellectual and methodological traditions in its membership. If the IRB regularly reviews research involving a vulnerable category of subjects, consideration must be given to inclusion of one or more individuals who are knowledgeable in working with these subjects. The committee must include at least one person whose chief concern is scientific issues and at least one whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas, and at least one member neither affiliated with the institution nor a member of the immediate family of a person affiliated with the institution. A member who has a conflicting interest **(Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook or other conflict such as serving as a**

**consulting researcher or having a relationship to the subject of the research)** may not participate in a review, except to provide information. The IRB may invite individuals with special expertise to assist in a review, but that person may not vote. Full reviews must be carried out at the convened meetings with a majority of members present, including the nonscientific member; approval requires a majority vote of those present.

#### Appendices

#### **Appendix 4: Conflict of Interest Policy (Approved by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration)**

**Insert new Appendix 4 into the Appendices for Personnel Policies section of the handbook. The relevant content is provided as an appendix to these minutes.**

The chair of COF noted that, according to COF's bylaws, the Committee on Faculty has responsibilities which include: "The committee shall represent the faculty by (a) recommending policy and procedures for personnel decisions to the faculty; (b) communicating procedures for personnel decisions to faculty members; ... (e) considering the legal propriety and risks of all faculty personnel procedures, including those at the school and department level; and informing all faculty participants in personnel procedures of possible legal concerns. The committee should be informed by a lawyer knowledgeable in the application of law to institutions of higher education." The University shares the responsibility to ensure that academic, employment, and business matters affecting faculty members are decided as fairly as possible.

As a result, jointly COF and the Administration sought and considered advice from University legal counsel on the matter of conflicts of interest in faculty personnel matters. COF and the Administration shared a concern that the current statements and procedures to follow regarding conflict of interest are incomplete and vague, and that they need elaboration and clarification. This process has been ongoing for at least the last two years. However, COF is happy to report that it is now ready to bring forward changes to the Academic Handbook to rectify the concern about the policy's statements and procedures.

The chair of COF continued by noting that the Conflict of Interest Policy and procedures before the faculty is a result of several drafts edited and revised by COF, the Administration and University counsel. This draft has taken into account feedback received from faculty members after COF's release of a previous draft and call for input last May, with that request for feedback reiterated in September. University counsel feels the current draft is defensible in court should the need arise. It has been approved by the administration and approved by COF.

As COF developed this policy, some of the key issues that were considered and COF's approach to developing a policy included:

- a recognition that no policy would be able to provide an exhaustive list of possible conflict of interest situations;
- a belief that the new policy should emphasize the importance of self-reporting and clarify that University employees have the responsibility to report known/suspected breaches of University policy;
- an understanding that complete confidentiality was not an option for anyone involved in the process because of the obligation to report violations;
- a respect for as much confidentiality as could be reasonably be expected;
- a recognition that few enough Conflict of Interest situations arise that having the adjudicator be someone with experience in this regard had value; and
- an acknowledgement that the new policy needed to clarify who was responsible for investigating, who was responsible for making the final decision about recusal, who was responsible for taking

action on policy violations, and who adjudicated when the conflict was with the designated adjudicator.

At this point, the chair of COF gave the faculty notice that COF plans to bring the Academic Handbook changes regarding the Conflict of Interest Policy to the faculty for a vote at the December faculty meeting. In general, these changes replace every place in the handbook where a conflict of interest and subsequent actions were mentioned with a statement referring individuals to the Conflict of Interest Policy that will become Appendix 4 of the Personnel Policies Section. This provides one consistent statement and approach in all cases. The policy that will become Appendix 4 is an appendix at the end of these minutes. Lastly, the chair of COF noted that this Conflict of Interest Policy is dealing with different issues than the policy referring to financial conflicts that also appears in the handbook.

There were no questions to the chair of COF regarding the Conflict of Interest Policy.

The chair of COF then addressed the point that COF has made a number of changes to procedure with regard to student opinion forms recently. These changes were a result of concerns raised by individual faculty, by students and by COF themselves. As a result of concerns raised and many discussions during COF meetings, COF formed a subcommittee with representation from all four Divisions. The subcommittee's work began in February 2007 with the following charge.

*To address the following issues regarding student opinion forms:*

- *Develop a student opinion form that could be used to obtain student comments for a course keeping in mind that any student opinion form is to be used as both a developmental tool for the faculty member and as an evaluative tool for DPCs and COF.*
- *The format of the form should allow the collection of information of both a quantitative and qualitative nature.*
- *The form will be administered electronically by the Office of Institutional Research.*
- *Study and recommend the time allowed for students to provide feedback.*
- *Evaluate the timing of administration of the form.*

The subcommittee met regularly through spring 2007 to address these issues in their charge. Additionally, they held open meetings to seek input from faculty members. They reported back to COF in the early fall with a number of suggestions and a draft form which COF continued to discuss and modify throughout fall 2007 and into the early spring 2008 in consultation with the subcommittee. As a result of their recommendations COF moved to a trial of on-line completion of student opinion forms in Fall 2007 by a group of faculty volunteers. The outcome of that trial with regard to on-line submission led to the change that all student opinion forms were administered on-line in Spring 2008.

The chair of COF stated that in spring 2008 further changes were instituted and another trial was conducted. Tenured faculty members were given the option of allowing the completion of student opinion forms outside of class. A group of faculty tested the experimental form resulting from the COF subcommittee. Feedback was divided: some faculty who tested the new form preferred it and felt it gave them better feedback, other faculty didn't feel there was much change in the quality or quantity of responses they received. There were no highly negative responses to the form. In COF's opinion, given the small number of faculty who tested the form and the diversity of types of courses they were teaching, a numerical analysis of the quantitative portions of the form were not likely to provide data meaningful to the discussion.

COF performed an electronic comparison, via a character count of total responses, and no significant difference between the quantities of responses on old established form versus the newly designed form was evident. Faculty members who tried the newly designed form allowed COF to aggregate their data removing identifying remarks, like a reference to an individual or subject. COF looked at the aggregate set of comments and didn't notice any significant improvement in the quality of the comments.



Given all that, COF is also aware that many things changed last year with regard to student opinion forms. In addition to a few faculty members trying the experimental form, we went to all electronic submission of student opinion forms and allowed tenured faculty to opt to have their students complete the forms outside of class. Consequently, it is really hard to know what is or isn't contributing to the quality feedback from students that COF hopes to receive. As a result COF has decided **not** to fully implement to the experimental form at this time but to hold it and re-evaluate the question of what form in about three years when filling out student opinion forms electronically has become routine. At that time experimental form will be the first form considered if a change is warranted.

The on-line submission addresses student concerns about their handwriting giving them away – even if the evaluations are not distributed until after grades are submitted, the student may need to take another class from that professor. The out of class submission addresses some faculty concerns about time taken away from class in the critical last days of classes. COF stands by the recommendation that the out of class option only be allowed for tenured faculty, given that COF doesn't have enough data yet about the difference in response rate for in class versus out of class submission and not wanting to put untenured faculty at risk. Additionally, COF stands by its previous decisions not to provide statistics on the numerical responses since COF doesn't use those statistics in their review of files, given that the statistics aren't meaningful given the number of different styles of classes and instruction being aggregated.

As always faculty will be able to choose between the standard form and the form designed for more experiential learning courses. Your fall semester deadline for a decision on the standard form versus the experiential form is Monday November 23; please notify Carol Cox, [cofcoord@depauw.edu](mailto:cofcoord@depauw.edu), if you wish to use it. Also, departments have the opportunity to develop a form specific to their needs; the deadline for pursuing that option is Monday November 10. Finally, the chair of COF thanked the members of the subcommittee: Tiffany Hebb, Eric Edberg, Meryl Altman, Sharmin Spencer, Scott Ross, Pat Sellers, Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, Bob Hershberger and Scott Thede. At this point, the chair of COF opened the floor for questions and comments.

A faculty member asked, given the difficulty of using statistics to look at quantitative feedback, why do we collect quantitative data in the first place? The chair of COF responded that there are some courses for which it has value, but it does not necessarily have universal value. Since we use the same form for most classes, this means that it is collected for most classes, even if it is not needed.

A faculty member, who was on the COF subcommittee that worked on the experimental survey, encouraged COF to continue with the experimental form. He asked if it is possible to continue and use the experimental survey this semester? The chair of COF responded that she cannot speak for all of COF, but a challenge to DPCs and COF is that some files contain several different student opinion surveys which may have been administered in different ways. It may be a possibility for tenured faculty only – she will take the issue back to COF for discussion.

Another faculty member from the subcommittee stated that he was amazed that COF had decided to keep the old form. He stated that from a psychometric standpoint (an area in which this faculty member is an expert), the old survey was abysmal. He was surprised that COF had not consulted any faculty members who were experts at designing such surveys to analyze the quantitative data. The chair of COF responded by stating that, in an effort to keep her comments short, she may have shortchanged the amount of effort put in by COF in examining the new form and its data. COF cannot share the data from the forms, since they are confidential. COF felt that, given that there were only ten faculty members using the form for perhaps 20-30 courses, there was not enough data to aggregate. The faculty member responded that the data from these courses would be enough to work with in a statistical fashion. The Chair of the Faculty cut off the one-on-one discussion that had developed on

the floor of the faculty meeting and encouraged the faculty member to continue the conversation with the chair of COF after the meeting.

Another faculty member stated that he had worked on a previous committee to develop a new student opinion survey, and that survey was changed dramatically by COF. He is against redoing the current form, because it is now hard to evaluate personnel in a consistent fashion. He suggested that COF find a way to distribute the data to the expert faculty members to evaluate it. The faculty members participating in the experiment are presumably volunteers, and they may be willing to distribute that data further. The chair of COF responded that she could see if any members of the subcommittee were willing to continue their work. The Chair of the Faculty suggested that the Chair of COF contact the subcommittee and discuss the issue with them, before bringing something back to the faculty.

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- COF has completed initial chair interviews and provided their recommendations to the VPAA.
- COF continues to discuss
  - the COA memo about file size/structure
  - the COA memo about promotion linked to tenure
- If you have not yet provided feedback and are interested in doing so, soon would be important before COF makes decision and moves on to other issues.
- COF has begun its work reviewing files.
- Once again COF reminds department chairs to please arrange class visits for our untenured colleagues so they aren't all done the last week of the semester. Everyone should keep in mind importance of talking face to face with the colleague both before and after the visit in addition to providing the written summary. Just like for our students, feedback is most valuable when it is timely. A link to the peer observation policy can be found on the COF web page.

#### *Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC announced that SLAAC continues to gather information about social spaces. They have sent a survey to every faculty member, staff member, and student to get their feedback about social spaces.

At the December faculty meeting, SLAAC will present a motion that the faculty approve the following changes to the Disruptive Student Policy. The current policy is shown first, followed by the proposed revision.

#### *Current Policy:*

At DePauw, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance. In our classrooms we strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of courtesy, respect and professionalism. A student's inappropriate behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment. This policy outlines the procedures that should be followed when a professor feels that such disruption has occurred.

1. For any incident, the faculty member should warn the student that the disruptive behavior is unacceptable. This warning could be issued privately (in person or in writing) or publicly (such as asking the student to leave the class for the day).
2. The instructor may seek advice from a senior colleague, his/her chair, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, or Dean of Student Academic Support Services.

3. If the behavior occurs outside of the classroom and/or involves harassing behavior, there are other processes in place to handle the situation, and those processes should be followed. Incidents of harassment should be reported to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students or the campus police. The University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks.
4. If the behavior continues, the situation may warrant stronger measures such as dropping a student from a course. In this case, a formal warning must be given to the student and reported in writing to Vice President of Academic Affairs. At this point mediation must be initiated.
  - A. The Vice President of Academic Affairs appoints a mediator and sets up a meeting.
  - B. The mediation meeting is held as soon as possible, ideally 48 hours, after the formal warning. A representative of the Office of Academic Affairs must be present at the mediation. The faculty member and the student may each have an adviser present.
  - C. The representative of the Office of Academic Affairs writes a memo summarizing the results of this mediation. This memo will be kept in the files of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - D. A recommendation to dismiss the student from the course must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the conclusion of the mediation is that the student should not return to the course, the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides what will appear on student's transcript for the course: W, F, or no entry.
  - E. A pattern of disruptive behavior in several classes will be addressed by the Office of Academic Affairs in conjunction with the Dean of Students.

*Proposed Disruptive Student Policy:*

At DePauw University, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance. In our classrooms we strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of courtesy, respect and professionalism. A student's inappropriate behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment.

Frank yet respectful informal discussions between faculty members and students are the preferred response to disruptive behavior. Each case is different, however, and given the complexities faculty members may wish to consult with the student's academic advisor, colleagues, and/or a designated member of Academic Affairs (currently the Dean of Academic Life), even at the stage of informal interventions.

(Please note: The Disruptive Student Policy is not meant to cover behavior that occurs outside the classroom and/or involves harassment. Other policies are in place to handle those situations; the University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks. Incidents of harassment should be reported immediately to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, or Campus Safety officers.)

If informal measures taken to address a student's disruptive behavior are unsuccessful, faculty members should follow these procedures:

1. The faculty member should warn the student in writing that the disruptive behavior is unacceptable and that if it continues the student may not be allowed to remain in the course. Depending on circumstances, a warning may need to be made during class, as well; for example, the faculty member may ask the student to leave the classroom

for the day. The faculty member should also encourage the student to talk to an academic advisor or dean in Academic Affairs.

2. The faculty member should keep notes on the dates, times, and details of the incidents of disruption, the impact of disruption on those present, and warnings conveyed to the student, as these are useful in later stages of the proceedings.
3. If the behavior continues after a written warning has been given, the faculty member should notify the Dean of Academic Life in writing, giving a summary of what happened and the action that has been taken. Upon receipt of this summary, the dean sets up a three-way meeting involving the faculty member, student, and dean. In order to minimize the procedure's interference with courses, this meeting is scheduled as soon as possible, preferably before the next class meeting.
4. At the meeting, the faculty member and student are invited to discuss the situation. The goal of the meeting is to give both parties a chance to discuss, in a safe space, what has happened. Such a discussion may enable the faculty member and student to see the problem from a different point of view or to hear the perspective of the other person in a new way. The dean's role is to moderate the discussion, insuring that the conversation remains civil and on target. Either party may, but neither must, bring an advisor (DePauw student, faculty member, or staff member) to the meeting. Advisors may consult privately with the person whom they are accompanying, but they do not enter the discussion.
5. As soon as possible after the meeting the faculty member makes a recommendation to the Dean of Academic Life.
  - If the faculty member recommends that the student be allowed to remain in the course then the dean and faculty member should consult regarding how best to convey this decision and any stipulations or conditions to the student.
  - If the faculty member recommends that the student be dropped from the course, he or she reports this conclusion in writing to the dean of Academic Life; the dean then conveys the faculty member's conclusions along with a written summary of the three-way meeting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - A recommendation to dismiss the student from the course must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the student is not allowed to return to the course, the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides what appears on student's transcript for the course: W, F, or no entry.
6. A pattern of disruptive behavior in several courses may be addressed by representatives of the offices of Academic Affairs and Student Life.

The chair of SLAAC stated that SLAAC feels strongly that an adjustment to the policy is needed. The current version would streamline the process and encourage an informal resolution outside the classroom, but offers a formal procedure if necessary.

A faculty member asked if e-mail constitutes a written warning, as mentioned in the policy. The chair of SLAAC responded that it does.

The chair of SLAAC stated that if any faculty member has comments about social spaces at DePauw, please send them to any member of SLAAC.

### ***Reports from Other Committees***

A complete committee membership list is available by clicking on "Committees" from the web site <http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/>.

*Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

There was no oral report and no questions. The following announcement was not read during the meeting, but was provided in the meeting's agenda.

- COA is considering the faculty responses to the faculty time and workload question, gleaned from both the online survey and the open meetings.

*Report of the Faculty Development Committee (Chair: John Schlotterbeck)*

The chair of FDC recognized the recipients of Faculty Fellowship awards for the three year period 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12. There were twenty-two applications. As the chair read the names, he asked that the recipients stand and be recognized.

**Teaching Projects/Curricular Development:**

- Mary Kertzman (Professor of Physics and Astronomy) – *“Expanding the Universe of Astronomy at DePauw”*

**Scholarly/Creative Projects:**

- David Gellman (Associate Professor of History) – *“The Jay Family and American Slavery – Three Chapters of a Book Manuscript”*
- Wade Hazel (Professor of Biology) – *“Natural Selection on the Timing of Diapause in Swallowtail Butterflies”*
- Matthew Hertenstein (Associate Professor of Psychology) – *“Emotional Development in Infancy”*
- Carl Huffman (Professor of Classical Studies) – *“An Edition and Translation of Fragments 69-139 of Aristoxenus of Tarentum”*
- Michael Mackenzie (Associate Professor of Art) – *“Otto Dix, Grotesque Realism, and the Language of the Trenches”*
- Sherry Mou (Associate Professor of Modern Languages) – *“A Book Proposal: Through the Confucian Lens”*
- Matthew Oware (Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology) – *“A Sociological Analysis of Rap, Race, and Politics”*
- Greg Schwipps (Assistant Professor of English) – *“Pretty Country: A Novel”*
- Barbara Steinson (Professor of History) – *““Making Do”: Essays on Gender and Rural Life in Indiana, 1960-1960”*
- Janet Vaglia (Associate Professor of Biology) – *“Continual Addition of Posterior Tail Segments Across Life Stages in the Two-Lined Salamander”*
- \*Erik Wielenberg (Associate Professor of Philosophy) – *“Moral Knowledge and the Scientific Study of the Human Mind”*

### **Combination of Teaching Projects/Curricular Development and Scholarly/Creative Projects:**

- Ophelia Goma (Associate Professor of Economics and Management) – *“The Asian Economic Perspective”*
- Gloria Childress Townsend (Professor of Computer Science) – *“Using Robots to Bridge the Academic Divide Between DePauw University and Putnam County”*

### **Service Projects:**

No applications submitted in this category.

- \* This is an ethics related project.

The chair of FDC announced that starting with Faculty Development grants awarded in the 2009-10 academic year, grant reports will be due on the first Monday of the semester following the completion of the grant. This action is not retroactive – current grants will have the old deadlines. Faculty award letters will spell out when grant reports are due. This change in deadline includes Professional Development Grants over \$500, Faculty Summer Stipends, Fisher Time Outs, Pre-Tenure leaves, Fisher Fellowships, and Sabbatical leaves. Reports for faculty development grants awarded for the Fall 2009 semester will be due February 1, 2010; grants for the Spring 2010 semester have reports due in summer 2010, and year-long sabbatical leaves are due August 30, 2010.

The chair of FDC stated that there are two main reasons for the change:

- Many faculty members have long-term ambitious projects, for which the faculty member applies for several grants in series. That is great, and FDC loves these kinds of projects. However, often FDC needs to make decisions about a new funding request before the grant report for the previous award has been received. The new deadline allows consideration of the report about the previous award in evaluating the proposal for the new award.
- FDC wants to encourage people to build time into the grant itself to write the report – the report should not be done on top of all the work for the grant, but should be part of the time allotted for working on the grant.

A faculty member asked if this means that student summer research grants, which end in early August, will now have reports due in late August. The chair of FDC pointed out that student summer research grants are separate from this, and in fact already have deadlines early in the fall semester. Another faculty member pointed out that the deadline switch does apply to Summer Stipends. The chair of FDC acknowledged this, and pointed out that those are different than student summer research awards.

### *Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (FGSC; Dave Berque reporting)*

The following announcements were not read during the meeting, but were provided in the meeting's agenda.

- At the request of the VPAA and the President, the FGSC is considering the best way to formalize the faculty Admissions Committee. This has previously been an informal group. The FGSC will likely recommend to instead have the group serve as a formal subcommittee of CAPP.
- The FGSC is considering a request from President Casey to determine the best way to have faculty representation on a Campus Planning Committee.
- The FGSC thanks everyone for contributing to the discussions related to the questions posed by President Casey.
  - More than 95 on-line submissions have been received from faculty.
  - More than 120 faculty members signed up to attend one or more open meetings.
  - A survey of Department and Program Chairs is in progress.

- More than 40 on-line submissions have been received from staff.
  - Two open meetings for staff have been scheduled (signups continue).
  - Student on-line submissions are still being gathered.
  - Two open meetings for students have been scheduled.
- CAPP, MAO, SLAAC, and COA are discussing [the input] that is being provided. Committee reports are anticipated for the December faculty meeting. Additional input may be sent to members of CAPP, MAO, SLAAC, and COA.

A faculty member asked if there was a typo in the third to last sentence of the written statements. The FGSC representative stated that the sentence should say, “discussing the input that is being provided.” [*This correction is made in the sentence above.*]

Another faculty member asked if CAPP is the natural committee to guide the faculty admissions committee? The FGSC representative pointed out that the Faculty Handbook states that CAPP is the committee with authority over admissions requirements.

### ***Remarks from the President***

The President made his address to the faculty as follows:

I have a few matters about which I want to report to the faculty this afternoon. First I want to acknowledge and thank Dave Berque and the Faculty Governance Steering Committee for organizing a truly complete and comprehensive series of conversations about DePauw’s intellectual life. I want to thank Dave and the Committee for their work in creating the survey instruments, organizing the conversations and, importantly, connecting these conversations to both students and staff.

I wanted to open my comments to you with these particular acknowledgements, because I want to emphasize that – in my mind – there is no more important conversation happening on this campus, and among our alumni and our Board of Trustees, than this one.

In a moment I will go over some University financial information and some of the challenges we all face, but I must emphasize that the most important thing we can do – we must do – is to consider those ways in which we can strengthen our curriculum, enrich our culture of inquiry and creativity, support a heightened set of conversations about teaching and learning, increase our appeal to strong students, and build a campus climate conducive to inquiry and community. This is our long-term investment strategy. If we take care of these core activities all else will follow.

I now want to offer an update on the recent Board of Trustees Meeting that I addressed in part in my mid-October letter to the community. First, the Board was informed about the ongoing intellectual life conversations and, through a joint meeting of the Academic Affairs committee and the Student Services Committees, heard from faculty members and students about the questions that have been put before this faculty. The Board was very enthusiastic about the conversation and asked that we remain confident and bold in these conversations.

The Board also endorsed the allocation of funds for our Admissions efforts. They have asked us, to do the necessary research to understand

- who is applying to DePauw and who is not;
- who comes here and who chooses to go elsewhere.

They have also asked us to review and improve all aspects of our communication efforts in attracting bright, curious, engaged, lively, and diverse students.

Together with the board, we have appointed a special Board Admissions advisory committee. In connection with this effort I am working with the Faculty Governance Steering Committee to identify a parallel faculty committee focused on our admissions efforts. The Board also endorsed the employment of a campus planning firm to help us address some pressing campus issues.

I believe it is crucial that we begin this campus analysis effort now because our admissions efforts are strongly affected by the appearance of the campus and its relationship to the town. I also am convinced, based on my meetings with departments and our campus-wide conversations that we must improve space allocation and its utilization to support and encourage the enhanced intellectual life we seek.

More importantly, we simply cannot afford to make decisions about our infrastructure in unplanful ways. In the very, very near term, we will inevitably have to make significant decisions about the Walden Inn and the social space connected to it, the bookstore, the Library, the Development Office, student and community social and athletic spaces in general, and the best ways to integrate the Nature Park and the Ethics Institute with the main campus. Finally, our intellectual life conversations have drawn increased attention to our relationship with Greencastle.

We will be making space decisions in the next few years – no matter what the economic situation of the University or the nation. We should make these decisions shrewdly, and in connection with a plan for our future – a plan connected to the intellectual life conversations and with our admissions planning efforts. If we don't have careful space analysis I am concerned that we will make decisions about our space that harm us, and ultimately cost us.

The Board also discusses DePauw's continuing operating deficits which I would like to discuss with you now. As you know from my recent letter to you, the University generated a deficit of over \$3 million in the 07-08 budget, and projects one for the current fiscal year. The major sources of this deficit are three:

- The Walden Inn continues to place a significant drain on our operating budget.
- The cost of health care and our benefits.
- The cost of servicing the debt that this institution holds.

The Board called for the creation of special Board committees to look at the first two of these issues: the Walden Inn and our benefits costs. I am happy to report that I am working with the Faculty Governance Steering Committee and the Committee on Administration to garner necessary and appropriate faculty input into the exploration of the benefits questions.

The Walden Inn's operations may be addressed through short-term changes in the hotel's operations we are considering; and there may be further adjustments after consultation with the campus planners. If the building is not succeeding as a conference center or as a student social space, we need to rethink how to better use those spaces. But, having a large building on the edge of our campus go dark for a while strikes me as a wrong move.

As for the final structural pressure on our budget, the cost of the debt we hold, Tom Dixon and I are working on this issue with rather fevered and constant attention. We



have nothing to specifically report now, as the picture is still unfolding while we wait for the credit markets to both loosen up and stabilize.

This now brings me to the issue of the nation's economy. All of you are very aware that we have had some rather intense weeks of failing credit markets, gyrating stock markets, and a weakening economy. This bad economic news has the chance to affect negatively DePauw's three main sources of revenue:

- Endowment Income
- Gifts to the annual fund
- Net tuition revenue

We must prepare now for potentially significant further pressures on our budget due to negative news about any of these revenue sources. So, I have charged Tom Dixon, working with all the Vice Presidents and most especially with Neal Abraham, to review every aspect of our operating budget. We must make sure we are not only addressing the structural issues inherent in our budget but that we are prepared for potentially long term negative economic news.

This does not mean that there will be a hiring or spending freeze, but it does mean that every potential hire and every major expenditure will be scrutinized with extraordinary attention. Neal Abraham will speak shortly about faculty searches. As for now, and under my specific direction, all previously-announced searches to fill tenure-track positions will go forward as planned. But to preserve these positions Neal, alongside the other senior administrators, will have to find other savings in our operating budgets. For this year and next we will be looking for savings in term and part-time faculty hiring, in Academic administration and academic programs, in Student Life and Athletics budgets, in Facilities, in the Library, and Information Technology. In short, we will be looking at all aspects of our operating budget.

So, from now through January we will enter a rather unique and distinct period of planning and analysis. We will begin by reviewing all operating budgets. During this time we will also review all open positions, allowing for very selective filling of the most crucial open positions. And finally during this time we will be working closely with the Faculty Committee on Administration to get their input in these planning efforts.

What Tom Dixon and Neal Abraham have been charged to do – and what the COA will be called on to do as they are brought into this discussion – is to ensure that all of our financial decisions are made in a strategic way. Neal and Tom, and indeed all of us, are charged to address financial problems in a way that we are positioned to move forward aggressively and appropriately towards a vision for a new and stronger DePauw: a DePauw is known around the country and around the world as a unique, vibrant and exciting place to learn and work and live.

Every financial decision, every space decision, from this day forward has to be in service of the vision that I hope emerges from the faculty discussions about our intellectual life, about our discussions about how to present DePauw to the world, and about our deliberations about enriching our campus and our town. This will be difficult, and I know we will not agree on every decision, but this planning effort is necessary and it will – in the long run – make this strong institution even stronger.

As a final, and very important note, I am very pleased to report that, in response to the Campus Climate Task Force Report that I received at the beginning of September, I have recruited Associate Professor of Economics and Management Ray Burgman to serve as Special Advisor to the President for Strategic Initiatives beginning in the spring

2009 semester. Among the many tasks that will be placed on Ray's shoulders will be to lead a longitudinal review of and a report on our faculty hiring efforts, a to develop a report on best practices used at peer institutions to see what programs we should put in place here at DePauw not only for recruiting a diverse faculty, but in supporting and retaining those faculty members. She will also be working with me to help implement recommendations that emerge from our intellectual life discussions. I view a profound emphasis on diversity to be an essential part of our intellectual life discussions.

I will also shortly appoint a senior advisor for staff and community concerns. I am beginning this week the conversations and interviews necessary for the appointment of that member of my senior team. With the help of these advisers, I plan to report to you by our meeting in December what steps we have taken to address the recommendations of the Campus Climate Task Force and which offices and administrators have been assigned responsibility to address their other and continuing recommendations.

The President then opened the floor for questions.

A faculty member stated that, given the importance attached to student social spaces and serendipitous meeting spaces, we should continue to consider academic spaces as well – there are a lot of needs to address there as well. The Presidents responded that he agreed, and was very aware of those particular pressures.

A faculty member asked the President to speak about how he sees the discussions about intellectual life and campus planning fitting in with climate issues and sustainability. Where does pursuing sustainability fit into your vision? The President responded that he certainly hopes that sustainability will help the financial issues of the University. He will engage the campus planners to look at this and be sensitive to ecological issues. For example, how do we connect the main campus to the Nature Park and the Ethics Institute? The President said that one idea might be to use Safe Ride vans to connect the campus to local stores and the Nature Park and Ethics Institute.

A faculty member asked how much we should be thinking about economic concerns when we discuss the intellectual life questions – she has heard a lot of radical ideas in the discussions already. The President told the faculty to not think about economic concerns. One reason is that many ideas are really not that costly to implement. The planning effort will identify funds that we can apply to some items coming from intellectual discussions. Not-so-costly items will be put into place immediately; costly items will be planned for or have funds raised to support them. Think boldly, and we'll plan for things as needed.

The faculty member then asked the Chair of the Faculty what comes next in the discussions? How do you plan to bring everything together, since the input seems to be so divergent? The Chair of the Faculty responded that input is still coming in. The FGSC will meet on Thursday (November 6) to discuss the input, and hopes to have a set of initial reports prepared for the December faculty meeting. He stressed the word initial, as they will have just started to assess directions.

A faculty member noted that several students have commented that it is very difficult for them because they are getting back to campus late on Monday morning after an athletic trip. He noted that our conference is geographically bigger than the Big Ten. He asked the President to assess why we are in such a big conference, since it drains our students so much and presumably costs a lot in travel as well. The President stated that this is very much on the table. He explained that the issues the faculty member raised are valid ones, and something to investigate. The President did note that the conference is a powerful recruiting tool – it gives athletes a "Division I" experience at a "Division III" school. He also pointed out that some more compact conferences have Wednesday night games, which would also be difficult on students.

## ***Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA made the following statement to the faculty:

Let me begin by saying that some of these details will be conveyed to the campus community in a letter from VP for Finance and Administration Tom Dixon and me early this evening. Hence I will read, in part, sections from that letter. However, I will also add some points of specific interest to the faculty as they concern details of faculty hiring and strategies for expenditure reductions in academic areas.

Let me begin by repeating, as indicated by President Casey, that despite the uncertainties in the current financial situation, we see no reason to think that the turmoil will be so sustained as to put at risk any of the currently tenured or probationary tenure-track faculty positions or the currently authorized tenure-track searches.

As President Casey indicated, we are resolved to protect the core strengths of a DePauw education. Sustained and continuing core needs will be well supported, even if a little bit more modestly. As an example, after careful review of the recent RAS and CAPP recommendations that we search to fill the tenure-track position in Voice left vacant by the death of Stan Irwin, Dr. Casey and I have decided that there is a clear and multi-year (indeed, into the foreseeable future) need for this position. Since we currently have two term positions in Voice, we have decided it is prudent to authorize a tenure-track search to replace one of them, because that will ensure greater quality in an area where the expense will be essentially cost neutral.

Even before this period of financial uncertainty, I'd been saying that as we increase the number of tenure-track faculty members (which has grown from 160 toward the target of 205 for next year, if all eight currently authorized tenure-track searches are completed successfully), we will have less funding for, and less need for, sabbatical leave replacements, early replacements for those on phased retirements, and pre-tenure leave replacements.

Hence for next year not only will we will the lower need for term positions, but as well the financial pressures will require that we make do with even fewer term positions. I believe that through careful planning we can do without many of the current term (full-time and part-time) positions as those terms expire over the next few years. (Eight term positions will be ended by replacing them with tenure-track positions; I believe we will be able to reduce an additional 15-25 term positions over the next 5 years as those terms come to an end.) However, we will retain a few term positions and some part-time positions to meet critical curricular needs. We will still go through the processes of asking departments and programs to indicate their needs for full-time and part-time supplemental staffing to offer and optimal set of courses for next year, but our resources to meet those needs will be much fewer. We are helped in that our efforts in recent years to balance the number of leaves from year to year will minimize the curricular impact of these important periods of faculty renewal.

These changes will increase our student-faculty ratio a little bit, but by fractions, and not beyond our current benchmark of 10:1; and these changes will lead to modest increases in our average class size. We will have to raise the class size limits in courses which have the prospect of gaining additional student enrollments. In particular we will have to

manage with modest increases in the sizes of introductory courses in departments and programs and in first-year seminars and English 130 so that we can reduce the number of sections of these courses. We will have to do this carefully, lest class sizes grow so large as to negatively affect the engaged student learning and frequent faculty feedback on student work which are hallmarks of the recent successes of DePauw's educational environment.

We will have to carefully scrutinize the need for classes with small enrollments, as we have done in recent years. But we will continue to recognize that some small classes are crucial to the health and vitality of our diverse liberal arts curriculum.

As well, the vice presidents will examine all of our budgets carefully to see where we can reduce expenditures for programs and staffing. We will give particularly careful attention to each open staff position before authorizing that it be filled. Our strategy is to address the deficits while we continue to develop the plan to strengthen intellectual life, admission and our campus. In the review of possible savings in academic areas, we will work particularly closely with COA.

We ask for your patience and support as we take a close look at expenditures for this year and next. We welcome your suggestions on where the needed economies can be achieved with minimum impact on our core academic mission. We will have different ideas, different priorities, and different judgments about the "best solutions." We would not be a faculty if this were not so.

We are sustained by the confidence that DePauw will resolve its financial difficulties and with our available institutional resources will remain strong during this period of global financial crisis. Through it all, DePauw will move forward. While there will be temptations to think "locally," we ask that you join in the efforts to think on behalf of what is best for the University as a whole.

We look forward to your help in these endeavors.

The VPAA then opened the floor for questions.

A faculty member asked if the administration would still be sending out a request for RAS proposals, or whether this be suspended for now? The VPAA stated that he would be asking program directors and department chairs for short-term staffing requirements soon. These will be analyzed and reported upon after Thanksgiving. There will be far fewer short-term staffing requests approved, but if a request is necessary it should be made. The nature of the depth and degree of financial difficulty should be clearer by February – at that point, the administration may decide it doesn't make sense to ask for RAS proposals because the university cannot afford them. If it is unclear, we might ask for proposals and determine whether to proceed later. He added that the University is coming close to the largest number of tenure-track positions that it can support. He noted other changes that might happen which could affect enrollment – for example, students may have financial difficulties and be unable to return in the spring. He also pointed out that there are very few retirements planned for the next few years at this point.

A faculty member suggested that there be a suspension of all departmental and programmatic reviews, given that the entire landscape of the University might change soon as a result of the intellectual life discussions and/or the economy. The VPAA agreed that in some cases, launching new self-studies before the financial and programmatic picture for the University was clearer might not make sense, however, since the planning needs for departments and programs are localized not universal, it seems wiser to make the decisions about new self-studies on a case-by-case basis. Completing studies that

have been started and are nearing completion does make sense. In light of recommendations from department chairs and program directors, the timeline between major reviews has already been extended, with the possibility for mini-reviews to address particular topics.

The VPAA then announced the winners of the Exemplary Teaching Award. The award recipients for 2008-09 are Barbara Steinson (History) and Matthew Oware (Sociology/Anthropology). The VPAA stated that he will be sending an announcement of the award by e-mail later this week; the text of that e-mail is included here:

Each year DePauw University and the General Board of Higher Education of the United Methodist Church co-sponsor an award to recognize a faculty member at DePauw. The "Exemplary Teaching Award" is to be given to one who exemplifies excellence in teaching; civility and concern for students and colleagues; commitment to value-centered education; and service to students, the institution and the community. This recognition is supported by the George and Virginia Crane Distinguished Teaching Award Fund.

After reviewing the nominations from faculty colleagues and the annual reports of the nominees, I am pleased to announce that the Exemplary Teaching Award for 2008-2009 is given to Professor of History Barbara Steinson and Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology Matthew Oware.

Barbara Steinson came to DePauw in 1978 as an Assistant Professor of History, was tenured and promoted to Associate Professor in 1984 and promoted to Professor in 1992. She received recognition as University Professor for sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship and research in 2003-2007. She earned her B.A. (1970) from Grinnell College and M.A. (1971) and Ph.D. (1977) from The University of Michigan.

Her teaching spans U.S. History from the colonial to present times, the History of Women in the U.S., Legal History, First-Year Seminars (Mirrors of War, Americans and War, and the Great War), and History 105 The American Experience (Violence; Violence and Nonviolence). She has led Winter Term Study projects to France three times.

She is described by students and colleagues as one of the most passionate teachers they have encountered. As one said, "she is absolutely committed to promoting a love of learning amongst her students and to ensuring that they are exposed to the most up-to-date historical materials and schools of thought." She is also well known among her colleagues for her commitment to renewing and updating her courses, mastering an ever-growing historical literature. She is also described as an innovative teacher, truly concerned with the success of her students, "forging deep intellectual and personal connections with her students which often last long past graduation day."

She has received two faculty fellowships (Rural Women in Indiana, 2000-03; and Making Do: Essays on Gender and Rural Life in Indiana 1890-1960). She published *American Women's Activism in World War I* (New York: Garland) in 1982; which is currently under contract for a second edition (revised, expanded and updated) with U. Illinois Press, a project supported by the award of a Fisher Fellowship in Fall 2003. Her other major book project now coming to conclusion is "Rural Women in Indiana, 1870-1990. Her most recent publications include "Farmers' Institutes" and "4-H" in the *Encyclopedia of the Midwest* (2006) and "U.S. Women from the New Republic to 1900," and edited an annotated anthology available from XANEDU, as well as many book reviews. She also served (2000-2006) as Co-chair of the Rural Women's Studies Association, and she

currently serves as a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of Indiana Magazine of History.

She has served as chair of the History Department for six years and as a member of the Conflict Studies Steering Committee, the Women's Studies Steering Committee and the Compton Center Advisory Committee. She has served on many other committees, including the planning committee for the Asian Studies Program, the Public Occasions Committee, and the University Priorities Committee.

Matthew Oware came to DePauw as a faculty fellow in 2000-2001 while he was still a graduate student participant in the Preparing Future Faculty program in Sociology at Indiana University. He was next appointed as a pre-doctoral scholar for 2001-2002 and then as a full-time faculty member beginning in 2002-2003. He was granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor effective with the 2008-2009 academic year. He earned his B.A. in 1995 from the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign in 1995 and his M.A. (1999) and Ph.D. (2002) from Indiana University.

His effectiveness in the classroom is well documented by students and colleagues, ranging over such courses as Contemporary Society/Introduction to Sociology, Race and Ethnic Relations in the US, Individual and Society, Sociology and Popular Culture, Sociology and Hip Hop (originally taught as a First-year Seminar), Methods of Sociological Research, and the Senior Seminar on Racism in the US and Abroad. He has also taught in Winter Term, twice leading study projects to Botswana. Students report that he is a dedicated and inspiring teacher, a mentor who is able to raise difficult topics in class while making the discussions safe for what might otherwise be awkward or threatening. He holds students to rigorous standards of critical reading, analytical discussions, and thoughtful speaking, challenging them at many levels. His colleagues attest to how his conversations with them about teaching have been insightful and inspiring, particularly in how he succeeds in drawing student into addressing issues of race in the classroom without alienating others. He is known among his colleagues as an effective speaker, an engaging lecturer, and a skillful discussion leader. In short, his classes exemplify the best of liberal arts college teaching.

His scholarship includes studies of self-identification in different settings of children of mixed racial heritage. His recent articles include: "Code of the Street" and "Hip Hop" in the Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity and Society; and "Status Maximization Theory, Hypodescent Theory, or Social Identity Theory?: A Theoretical Approach to Understanding the Racial Identification of Multiracial Adolescents" scheduled to appear in the edited book Biculturalism. His latest article "A 'Man's Woman'?: Contradictory Messages in the Songs of Female Rappers, 1992-2000" will appear shortly in the Journal of Black Studies. In 2007 he joined the editorial board of Teaching Sociology, the flagship teaching journal in the field. He was recently awarded a three-year faculty fellowship (2009-2012) for "A Sociological Analysis of Rap, Race and Politics."

His service outside of the classroom, which forms a key part of his exemplary teaching, includes work with the Black Studies Steering Committee, the Publications Board, the Black Caucus (which he has served as co-convener), the Campus Climate Task Force and the First-Year Seminar Committee. He helped to organize and launch a series of lunch-time discussions for the Sociology and Anthropology Department. He has served as a member of the Community Conduct Council and the Covenant Working Group of the Task Force for a Responsible Community; he also served for three years as faculty advisor to the Association of African American Students and has served as the advisor to Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. He led a trip for students, faculty members and staff last

spring to visit the Percy Julian Exhibit at the DuSable Museum in Chicago. He also continues to work with the IU Future Faculty Teaching Program.

We are all honored and inspired to have colleagues such as Professors Steinson and Oware.

Recipients in prior years have been the following.

92-93 Tom Chiarella, English  
93-94 Andrea Sununu, English  
97-98 Valarie Ziegler, Religious Studies  
98-99 Craig Pare, School of Music  
99-00 John Dittmer, History  
00-01 Terri Bonebright, Psychology  
01-02 Carl Singer, Computer Science  
02-03 David Field, English  
03-04 Jackie Roberts, Chemistry and Biochemistry  
04-05 Robert Hershberger, Modern Languages  
04-05 Tamara Beauboeuf, Education Studies  
05-06 Anne Harris, Art History  
05-06 John Schlotterbeck, History  
06-07 Wayne Glausser, English  
07-08 Kerry Pannell, Economics and Management  
07-08 Pam Propsom, Psychology

It continues to be one of the most rewarding aspects of my responsibilities to review the nominations and the records of accomplishment of the nominees. We have a talented faculty and many, many colleagues deserving of this recognition.

There were no further questions or comments for the VPAA.

### ***Old Business***

There was no old business.

### ***New Business***

There was no new business.

### ***Announcements***

As previously announced, the next faculty meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2008 at 4:00 PM. Please note that this meeting is scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of the month because the first Monday of the month is the first day back from a break.

### ***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 PM.

## **Appendix to Minutes for November 2008 Faculty Meeting**

### **APPENDIX 4 CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND PROCEDURES for FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

In order to ensure that faculty personnel processes are as fair as possible, DePauw University has adopted the following policy and procedures.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

At an institution such as DePauw, a variety of personal relationships may exist among faculty members which create the potential of a conflict of interest between a person who handles personnel matters (performance reviews, hiring requests, supervision) or a member of a committee that handles personnel matters (Full-Time Position Request Committee, Search Committee, Special Review Committee (for faculty librarians) or Department (or School) Personnel Committee referred to hereinafter as the "DPC") or a member of the Committee on Faculty "COF" or the VPAA and a faculty member or job candidate under review. However, in the shared work environment, common interactions – e.g., friendships and antagonisms, likes and dislikes, concurrences and disagreements, and praise or criticisms -- do not represent Conflicts of Interest if they fall within the bounds of University policies governing professional working relationships.<sup>1</sup> It is also in the best interests of the University (and of the confidence that should be placed in the faculty personnel processes) that appropriate steps be taken to limit the appearance of Conflicts of Interest by excluding the participation of some who might otherwise serve, if there are reasonable alternatives to participation in a faculty review process (i.e., when others may fairly judge the relevant evidence). This policy is intended to alert faculty members to the types of concerns for which a Conflict of Interest may exist and to encourage members of the relevant committees and the VPAA, and faculty members under review, to avoid situations for which a potential conflict of interest exists. The successful application of this policy requires all faculty members to familiarize themselves with the contents of this policy. Anyone with a Conflict of Interest should request to be recused from the committee in question and from other personnel responsibilities. Further, any faculty member who has knowledge that a conflict of interest may exist, or is in doubt as to whether a conflict exists regarding an issue before one of these committees, should follow the procedures set out within this policy.

#### **DEFINITION**

A Conflict of Interest exists when a faculty member is in a position to exercise judgment on a personnel matter, either personally or as a member of a committee reviewing a faculty colleague or candidate and when that exercise of judgment could be (or is perceived to be) influenced by a current or past personal relationship (as defined herein). A Conflict of Interest may exist even though it may not be acknowledged by one or more of the parties.

#### **PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS SUBJECT TO THIS POLICY**

Circumstances that are of concern under this policy are those in which a person with personnel responsibilities has, or has the appearance of having, such a bias so strong as to undermine the presumption of fairness in the execution of those responsibilities. These circumstances include, but are not limited to, a situation of dependency or interdependency, or a commission of a policy violation in dealings with the faculty member to be affected by a pending committee recommendation. Examples

---

<sup>1</sup> Whenever the phrase "conflict of interest" is used, it means not only actual conflicts but potential or perceived conflicts of interest as well; whenever the phrase is capitalized "Conflict of Interest" this refers to an actual conflict of interest.



of circumstances that could result in a conflict of interest, or the possibility of perceived conflict of interest, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- shared financial interests;
- familial relationship;
- former or present marital, romantic, amorous, or other intimate relationships;
- current co-living arrangement;
- giving or receiving of substantial gifts or benefits;
- employment relationship outside of DePauw; and
- an incident involving violation of the harassment policy or the consensual relations policy.

There may be other circumstances for which a faculty member believes that a colleague could not render an impartial judgment in a personnel matter. A faculty member concerned about a bias that might hinder impartiality due to any circumstance should report the situation or relationship to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or to the designated prior chair of COF if the conflict involves the VPAA) for evaluation pursuant to these procedures. The designated prior chair of COF for matters of conflict of interest involving the VPAA shall be recorded on the annually published list of faculty members of committees.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST PROCEDURES**

1. A faculty member who believing that his or her service in personnel matters will be affected by (or may be affected by) a Conflict of Interest should consult with the VPAA. In such circumstances the faculty member may request to be recused from service on these personnel matters. The VPAA will consider any request to be recused from work on personnel matters; and if the request is granted, the VPAA will notify the appropriate individuals about this recusal (such as the chair of the relevant committee).
2. To report a conflict of interest of another faculty member, a faculty member should notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs confidentially of the existence of a conflict of interest as soon as practical after it is identified. However, to protect privacy, information regarding the nature of the circumstances leading to the conflict of interest (e.g., financial, family, romantic, etc,) need not be divulged beyond that information which the Vice President for Academic Affairs would reasonably require in order to determine whether a Conflict of Interest exists. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs is a party to the conflict of interest, then the most recent past chair of the COF who is not currently serving on COF and not on leave shall substitute for the roles designated in this policy for the Vice President.
3. Once notified, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will exercise discretion in determining what are the prudent steps to take in order to determine whether a Conflict of Interest exists. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may investigate the conflict of interest through gathering information and interviewing relevant parties. While that determination is underway, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall suspend the related work of the relevant committee if it has already begun. In assessing conflicts of interest, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should focus on whether the particular interest and/or personal circumstance of the faculty member are likely to compromise, or are likely to be perceived as compromising, a committee member's ability to function impartially.
4. Once an assessment has been made, the Vice President for Academic Affairs must promptly share his or her decision by confidential memorandum to the faculty member about whom a question of conflict of interest has been raised. Where it has been decided that a Conflict of Interest exists, the Vice President for Academic Affairs must promptly instruct the person who has been determined to have a Conflict of Interest not to participate in the decisions regarding

the affected faculty member with whom the Conflict of Interest exists. Depending on the nature of the Conflict of Interest, the exclusion of a member of a particular committee from personnel responsibility for another faculty member may apply for certain other personnel responsibilities and/or for a certain length of time as determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

5. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will also notify the chair of the relevant committee if a committee member is to be excluded for reason of Conflict of Interest. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall also then authorize the committee to resume the review process; that authorization may include instructions returning the committee to an earlier point in its process so that the work is not influenced by the person (or persons) who has (have) been excluded, such as when a person determined to have a Conflict of Interest had already participated in part of the deliberations. The Vice President may also amend the evidence (such as in an application or decision file) on which the considerations are to be based in order to remove items that may have been influenced by the Conflict of Interest. For other personnel matters, the Vice President will take steps to reassign tasks and responsibilities as needed to re-create an impartial personnel process.
6. Retaliation against any individual who discloses an actual or perceived conflict of interest is not permitted and may result in use of sanctions and disciplinary procedures for unprofessional conduct.
7. Questions regarding this policy and/or its interpretation should be directed to the chair of the COF and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### **CONFIDENTIALITY AND RECORDKEEPING**

It is imperative that all information regarding conflicts of interest be kept as confidential as circumstances permit. It is legitimate for those involved in resolving a conflict of interest to seek advice and/or guidance from other University officials or faculty members with relevant experience. Internal disclosure of information about potential or actual conflicts of interest should be limited strictly to those faculty members or employees who need to have access for official purposes. However, if through investigation of a potential conflict of interest the VPAA (or surrogate) discovers a violation of a University policy, then this information may require additional action and some level of confidentiality may be lost in that case. Details of matters relating to conflicts of interest shall be kept in confidential files held in the Office of Academic Affairs and access to such files will be restricted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or others serving in a surrogate role as provided for in this policy. All records shall be kept for a period of at least ten (10) years with the actual duration of the record keeping to be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the surrogate.

**DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, December 8, 2008**

*Call to Order:*

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 by the Chair of the Faculty.

*Verification of Quorum:*

There were 111 voting faculty members in attendance, so the meeting had a quorum.

*Approval of Previous Minutes:*

There were no corrections to the minutes from the November meeting, and the minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

***Motion to Confer Degrees***

The Registrar moved 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 2008.

The motion was seconded. There was no discussion on the motion, and the motion passed.

***Remarks from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA announced that an e-mail would be sent later this afternoon regarding some changes in staffing in career development starting next year. DePauw will shortly launch a national search for a full-time Assistant/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Director of Career Development (serving students and alumni regarding internships, careers and post-graduate study). The new dean/director will work closely with our current programs and staff members in these areas and with faculty members responsible for academic advising and pre-professional advising to strengthen all of these services.

The VPAA noted that Tom Cath has been Director of Career Services at DePauw for more than twenty-five years, and he will continue to serve as the Director through June 30, 2009. Tom, a nationally-recognized NCAA Division III tennis coach, has also led the DePauw men's tennis program for the past twenty-two years. He will continue to serve the University in the capacity of Men's Tennis Coach and will take on new responsibilities next year as Coordinator of Campus Fitness.

The VPAA spoke about the DePauw budget, particularly for this year and next. He stated that the University needs to be cautious this year about budgets, as some challenges (somewhat unexpected) came up this year. The VPAA was impressed that academic departments and other programs had managed to find \$600,000 that can be cut from the budget. No more cuts are anticipated for the current year. For the next year, senior administrators will work closely with COA and review the assumptions upon which next year's budget will be built. Your patience is urged with this process as it works its way forward – if you have questions about what will be happening, please ask them. Do not assume that rumors about the process are true.

Finally, the VPAA addressed the issue of sustainability at DePauw with the following comments:

As you know, in September President Casey signed the Presidents Climate Commitment, pledging both corporate responsibility for the way DePauw does business

and educational commitment to do all that we can to engage our community in dialogue and shared effort to minimize human contributions to global warming.

I report today that DePauw has met the first benchmark required of those institutions that join the Presidents Climate Commitment and is setting a course for community-wide contributions. We had two months to produce a plan for how we would be moving forward with this.

You will shortly receive (or may have already received) a written announcement about the plans for DePauw's sustainability efforts. The message will outline ways you can suggest improvements in the sustainability of the University operations, including close cooperation on these initiatives with the Greencastle community.

That announcement will also indicate ways that you can volunteer to contribute to one or more of the various working groups on topics ranging from environmental studies to energy conservation, from local food initiatives to reduced fossil fuel consumption, and from carbon footprint analysis to diversion of waste from landfills.

What is the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (the PCC)? The over 600 US college and university presidents/chancellors who have signed the PCC affirm that they: are deeply concerned about the unprecedented scale and speed of global warming and its potential for large-scale, adverse health, social, economic and ecological effects; accept the scientific consensus that global warming is real and is largely caused by humans; and accept the personal and institutional responsibility to help meet the goal of reducing global emission of greenhouse gases by 80% by mid-century.

The reasons that President Casey and DePauw joined the Presidents Climate Commitment are first, that as representatives of the institution and as an institution we must:

- Exercise leadership in our community and throughout society by modeling ways to minimize global warming emissions;
- Provide the knowledge and the educated graduates to achieve climate neutrality. These students, educated as critical and systems thinkers, will be best suited to lead as we solve the century's economic, social and ecological challenges; and
- Address climate change as a community (this includes our campus, alumni, and trustees, as well as the community that surrounds us) by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions and by integrating sustainability into our curriculum and into our daily lives as a way of meeting our social mandate to create a thriving, ethical and civil society.

In short, adhering to the PCC goals are totally congruent with – and a stimulus to – our efforts to continually improve the intellectual life at DePauw and the relationship with our surrounding communities. Sustainability, which refers to the economic, social and ecological aspects of our lives, is like diversity, in that it cuts across all of our curricular, co-curricular, operations and community aspects of our campus.

The second reason is that President Casey and I also recognize that, as our campus successfully models our sustainable intellectual and social community, we will:

- Stabilize and reduce our long-term energy costs;
- Attract even more excellent students and faculty members who share this commitment and who desire to study, live and work at an institution that endorses these principles;

- Attract new sources of funding; and
- Increase the support of alumni and our local community.

All of these are good and great reasons to sign the Presidents Climate Commitment, but there are two other equally important reasons to be part of the PCC: we now have access to a specific roadmap to guide us toward carbon neutrality; and we have immediate entrée to others who have successfully and creatively solved the challenges we will face as we determine what our contributions to sustainability will look like.

To this date, with the leadership of some of our faculty members, specifically Jen Everett, Jeane Pope, Michele Villinski, and Kelsey Kauffman, staff members Ted Fares, Tony Robertson, Valerie Rudolph and Sarah Ryan, and many of our students (notably this year's sustainability interns Tiffany Briery, Missy Orr, Taylor Cantril and Sarah Batto), we have developed a sustainability program that compares favorably to similar programs of longer duration at schools such as Tufts, Middlebury, the University of New Hampshire and Harvard.

But to move toward our goal of carbon neutrality, we must create a structure that both leads us to that goal and lets us know how far along we are in meeting it. That structure is called the Sustainability Initiative, which, by tomorrow, will be accessible on the DePauw website for you to view and to comment upon. This structure was created by Carol Steele, our current Sustainability Coordinator, who was aided in the endeavor by Assistant Professor of Philosophy Jennifer Everett and our talented Sustainability Interns. It is developed in a way that will help us study and improve upon all of the factors that will move us toward carbon neutrality; and it will aid us in being responsive to the reporting requirements of the Presidents Climate Commitment.

The Sustainability Initiative document has three parts. It provides the philosophical underpinnings of the PCC and our program, delineates an institutional structure that shows who will implement the Initiative; and establishes several Working Groups whose efforts will provide the creative answers needed to solve the climate problem.

It would be easy to say that our move toward sustainability is in good hands; others are taking care of our commitments. But of course that is not the truth. The truth is that sustainability is everyone's responsibility. You will be receiving a formal invitation from President Casey this evening that will provide you with more information about how you – and you refers to the whole community of faculty members, staff members and students – can participate in efforts that will ultimately save our planet. I urge you to find time in what I know are already very busy lives to actively participate in our Sustainability Initiative.

### ***Remarks from the President***

The President opened his remarks by noting the supporting materials appearing the agenda related to some of his remarks. These materials are reproduced here:

“Over five years have passed since the Task Force on the Status of Women at DePauw made a set of recommendations, the significant positive impact of which across our campus has been widely recognized. We believe the time has come to revisit and update their report, to examine our progress as a campus and a community, collect a range of information and a variety of views, and assess what remains to be done.”

“We call on President Casey to appoint a new Task Force on the Status of Women, again with members drawn from all constituencies, with a mandate to identify and consider a range of issues affecting gender equity and campus climate, and with a particular charge to examine DePauw’s progress toward meeting our goal of providing a family-friendly environment.”

--- Meryl Altman, Rebecca Schindler, Anne Harris, Deborah Geis, Julia Bruggeman, Kerry Pannell, Martha Rainbolt, Marthe Chandler, Susan Anthony, Tamara Beauboeuf, David Gellman, Dave Guinee, Bob Hershberger, Pedar Foss, Gloria Townsend, Lili Wright, Brett O’Bannon, Peter Graham, Kevin Moore, Marnie McInnes, Barbara Steinson, and Kathleen Knaul

The President then began his remarks:

In just a few moments we will begin a discussion on the six questions on DePauw’s intellectual life that this faculty has been engaged with for several months. Let me first thank the enormous efforts that have gone into creating the reports from the committees and the overall report from the faculty.

As a reminder, you are invited as a faculty to come over to the Elms directly after the meeting to celebrate the semester and all your work with these planning discussions but more importantly all your work with each other and with our students.

It would be easy to have today’s Intellectual Life discussion, and the ones that follow, focus on the mechanics and minutia inherent in each of the six questions. But I did not ask the questions to engender a debate about the adjustments we might need to make to our graduation requirements or the changes we might want to consider for Winter Term.

Rather, I viewed the six questions as aspects of a single question, angles on the fundamental issue. And that is: What ought we be? What is DePauw and what should it become?

In my own mind, I thought of this as a category question: what is our form? Are we a Liberal Arts College along the lines of a Bowdoin, Middlebury, Carleton, Grinnel, or Kenyan? Or have we become, by choice or by circumstance, something else? And if we are something else, can we say what that is? Is it intentional? Is it the best version of that form that we can achieve? The six questions all go to this fundamental issue – so I hope that our continuing discussions can be guided by the larger question and our larger aspirations.

Now, these questions were launched on this campus at what may look to have been the most inopportune time one could ever imagine for forward planning. In the few months that we have been grappling with these questions, the University has had to manage first, a long-standing operating budget deficit, and second, a very challenging world economy.

Should we continue, then, to ask these questions? Would it not be wiser to, in some way, hunker down, as it were, and wait, hopefully, for the storm to pass? Is dreaming now an exercise in futility? Is it irresponsible?

I am here to argue today that hunkering down is not the stance to take. We are obliged, in this darker season, to decide for ourselves what is most important to us, how we should expend our resources.

Planning now is not foolish dreaming, not building castles in the air while the foundation crumbles. We are talking about the foundation.

What would be foolish would be to add new programs without identifying the resources to pay for them. Or to make investments in new planning efforts – whether it be in Admissions or in campus planning – without determining how we can pay for the expertise that such planning often requires.

But to not ask the question of what we are and what we ought to be and to not make our plans in accordance with the answers to that challenge is a strategy for even greater long-term disaster. It will be a guarantee that the financial troubles we face now will confront us for an even longer time. It will mean that the questions and decisions we inevitably face in the next year – and in the next five years – and the next decade – will not be guided by our principles and our aspirations but will be made, one by one, by the concerns of the day. This is not a long-term strategy, nor is it the mark of a great college or university.

So it is time to think and aspire to imagine the DePauw we want to be. But first, let me briefly tell you about two of planning efforts – beyond the intellectual life planning efforts – that we will have to engage in, carefully, over the next few years.

First, as you know, we have asked faculty members to join a campus planning committee. This is not, I repeat, not an effort for us to decide where we are going to build the next five large buildings on this campus. This is NOT a building plan.

It is instead an effort to see how we actually use this campus, how we interact with the town, and how we might create more opportunities for encounters among faculty and between faculty and students. It is an attempt for us to see certain of our existing space challenges – the Walden Inn, the Hub, the Development Building, the Admissions Building, distantly-located fraternities, to cite just a few of our non-academic space challenges – as potentially related.

Over the next several years we will have to address these and other space challenges. With the help of a plan, or at least planning principles, we can make these inevitable decisions in a manner that is both cost effective and supportive of the type of environment we seek here on this campus. Without a plan, we will simply react – creating buildings or spaces unrelated to our core mission and unrelated to our long term needs.

We have asked some selected architectural firms to send us their approaches to campus planning. We will consider these proposals in the early spring and with all deliberate caution and as resources allow, we will move in this planning effort. Again, we will only engage in this campus planning effort as resources allow. But we must balance the need to tend to the future while we consider the pressures of today. My hope is that we can locate an excellent planning firm that will form a partnership with us for the next several years.

Second, again, as resources allow, we will look at what we need to do in Admissions and in marketing DePauw. We have precious little data that tells us exactly who ISN'T

applying to DePauw. We need to know what students actually hear about us, what they expect about us, and how we may best tell our story effectively to those students we all want to be our future students.

Again, we are considering the use of experts to provide their particular assistance. And again, we will proceed with due caution as we identify available resources for this effort. I want to also note that I have asked Christopher Wells from my office to relocate his office, and his talents, to the Admissions and Financial Aid Offices. Christopher has a background in technology and systems and I have asked him to help guide the Admissions Office through this challenging year.

Now on to two other efforts that I would like for all of us to think of as connected to these planning efforts.

The first is in the area of diversity. As you know from our last meeting, I have asked Professor Ray Burgman to serve as Advisor to my office for Diversity efforts related to faculty matters. By early next week, I will announce the appointment of the second of these advisor positions. The second will primarily focus on staff issues, but will work in coordination with Ray Burgman. Together these two advisors will see that the recommendations of the Campus Climate Task Force are addressed and that diversity is considered in all our future planning efforts.

The second is sustainability. As Neal discussed, we are moving forward with the commitments necessary to meet our climate commitments. Diversity and sustainability should infuse all our discussions about planning.

On a somewhat related topic, as you have seen in the meeting agenda, a group of faculty have asked that I appoint a new Task Force on the Status of Women at DePauw “with a mandate to identify and consider a range of issues affecting gender equity and campus climate, and with a particular charge to examine DePauw’s progress toward meeting our goal of providing a family-friendly environment.” I gratefully accept the charge and, working with the two new senior advisors on Diversity, I will charge such a committee to begin its work at the beginning of the new year. I will ask that this committee have a very wide purview, recognizing that we must create an extremely welcoming environment here at DePauw supportive of those personal and familial decisions we all make.

Now, I would like to move on so that we can consider the reports from the coordinating committees.

### ***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/).

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

MAO had no report, but the chair was available to answer any questions. There were no questions.

#### *Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*



The chair of CAPP announced that the appointments to the Admissions Committee for the 2008-09 academic year have been made. All the relevant information was included in the written agenda and also appears here:

CAPP solicited nominations from all Divisions, and with consideration of rank, diversity and experience selected the following representations for the remainder of this academic year:

- Division I: Nicole Brockman
- Division II: Eugene Gloria
- Division III: Bruce Serlin
- Division IV: Sally Harvey-Koelpin
- CAPP representative: Susan Anthony

The charge of the Admissions committee as agreed upon by the FGSC, the VPAA and President Casey is as follows:

The Faculty Committee on Admission is a subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning. The membership of the committee, for this interim year, will consist of five faculty members appointed by the chair of CAPP after discussions of the nominations with the VPAA – one from each division selected from divisional nominees and one current member of CAPP. If this committee is regularized, the members will be elected by CAPP from divisional nominees for staggered three-year terms. Preference will be given to candidates who can serve all three years without interruptions for leaves (to achieve the greatest continuity). The chair of the committee will be elected by the members of the committee.

The charge of the committee is to represent the faculty in discussions of admission requirements and admission efforts. It will report regularly (at least once each semester) to CAPP. It will meet with and provide advice when requested by the Vice President for Admission and Financial Aid. It will review data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and the VP for Admission and Financial Aid on the DePauw recruitment efforts and entering class demographics and credentials, as well as the strategies and results of peer institutions. It will, at least annually, review academic requirements for admission with the VP for Admission and Financial Aid and reports any possible changes to CAPP for its consideration in advance of necessary faculty action.

The committee will review the impact of admission requirements and of recruitment and communication strategies on the academic credentials, academic performance, and persistence to graduation of entering students. It will report its findings to the VP for Admission and Financial Aid, the VP for Student Life, the VPAA, the President, and CAPP. It will contribute to discussions at the end of each admission season in retrospective assessment of outcomes and in planning for the subsequent year's work in admissions.

It will serve as an advisory body to the President of the University with whom the committee will meet at least once each semester, assisting in the evaluation of the University's total admissions and recruitment efforts. It will offer a written report of its considerations and deliberations to the President annually.

The chair of CAPP then noted that CAPP supports the Kinesiology Department's decision to discontinue offering the accredited Athletic Training program in that department. Current seniors, juniors and sophomores will ideally be allowed to declare the major (with an emphasis in Athletic Training), apply for admission to the program (CAATE) if they have not already done so, and continue

to completion with the program to end in June 2012 although this remains subject to the decision of the external accreditation agency.

The department will work with the Admissions office and Registrar to make certain that the catalog and public promotional documents will now indicate that the ATEP program and Kinesiology major with emphasis on Athletic Training will not enroll students for accreditation after spring 2009.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The chair of COF moved that the faculty approve the following changes to the Academic Handbook regarding the Conflict of Interest Policy. Deletions are shown with a ~~strike through~~. Additions are in **bold**. Advance notice of this motion was given at the November faculty meeting.

Regarding Full-time Position Request Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.c.1: “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 (see section b(1) above). 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.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

Regarding Search Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.b.1(b): “~~No person who has a familial relationship to a potential candidate for the position may serve on this search committee, and it is expected that persons with similar conflicts of interest (e.g., significant romantic involvement) will notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs that they should be excused from service.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

Regarding Personnel Committees:

In the Bylaws section IV.A.5.a.1: “~~No person who has a familial relationship to the person under review may serve on his or her Personnel Committee, and it is expected that persons with similar conflicts of interest (e.g., significant romantic involvement) will notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs that they should be excused from service.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.”**

In the Personnel Policies section III.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.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section**

**(Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.** 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.”

#### Regarding Grievance Procedures

In the Personnel Policies Section VIII.I: ~~“Grievance Committee members and alternates must recuse themselves from participating in any proceeding, including a panel proceeding, in which that member or alternate has a conflict of interest.~~ **Membership exclusion based on Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook apply.** Other Grievance Committee members, the faculty member who is seeking COF or Grievance Committee review under the procedures described below (the "Petitioner"), the COF, and/or the Vice President of Academic Affairs may request consideration of whether a Grievance Committee member or alternate should be excluded from participation in any particular matter due to a conflict of interest. The final determination whether a conflict of interest justifies the exclusion of a Grievance Committee member from participating in a particular matter will be made by the Chair of the Faculty. If the Chair of the Faculty is recused or challenged because of conflict of interest, then that role will be filled by the most recent past Chair of the Faculty in succession. Questions of conflict of interest may be raised at any time during a proceeding but must be raised prior to the conclusion of that particular proceeding.”

#### Regarding Animal Use and Care in Research Policy

In the General Policies Section on “Animal Use and Care in Research Policy” at the end of the section on Membership of IACUC: “No member of the committee may review a project in which the member has a conflict of interest, such as a role as a participant in the project **or those covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook.** In this case the alternate will replace the regular committee member for this review.”

#### Regarding Human Subject Research Review Procedure

In the General Policies Section on “Human Subject Research Review Procedure,” the section on “Composition of the Board:” “The Institutional Review Board must consist of at least five members, appointed by the chief academic officer, on the recommendation of current members. The members must have varying backgrounds sufficient to assure complete and adequate review of research activities commonly conducted by the institution. The committee must be sufficiently qualified in expertise, experience and sensitivity to issues such as community attitudes (which might arise from their race, gender or cultural backgrounds). In addition, the committee should strive for diversity of intellectual and methodological traditions in its membership. If the IRB regularly reviews research involving a vulnerable category of subjects, consideration must be given to inclusion of one or more individuals who are knowledgeable in working with these subjects. The committee must include at least one person whose chief concern is scientific issues and at least one whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas, and at least one member neither affiliated with the institution nor a member of the immediate family of a person affiliated with the institution. A member who has a conflicting interest **(Conflicts of Interest as covered by the policy established by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration and published in the Personnel Policies section (Appendix 4) of the Academic Handbook or other conflict such as serving as a consulting researcher or having a relationship to the subject of the research)** may not participate in a review, except to provide information. The IRB may invite individuals

with special expertise to assist in a review, but that person may not vote. Full reviews must be carried out at the convened meetings with a majority of members present, including the nonscientific member; approval requires a majority vote of those present.

#### Appendices

#### **Appendix 4: Conflict of Interest Policy (Approved by the Committee on Faculty and the Administration)**

**Insert new Appendix 4 into the Appendices for Personnel Policies section of the handbook. The relevant content was provided as an appendix to the meeting agenda, and is included as an appendix to these minutes.**

This motion comes from a coordinating committee and does not need a second.

The chair of COF elaborated on the motion by noting that these changes insert the Conflict of Interest Policy as Appendix 4 of the Personnel Policies Section into DePauw's by-laws; in every place in our by-laws where a Conflict of Interest is mentioned, it now refers to the policy in Appendix 4.

The policy and procedures before you are a result of several drafts edited and revised by COF, the Administration and University counsel. COF has taken into account feedback received from faculty members. University counsel feels the policy and associated procedures are defensible in court should the need arise. It has been approved by the administration and approved by COF. It provides one consistent policy and set of procedures to address Conflicts of Interest when they arise.

There were no questions or discussion about the motion. The motion passed.

The chair of COF then gave a follow-up report regarding COF's decisions related to the Student Opinion Forms. The faculty asked COF to reconsider whether to ask the subcommittee to do statistical analyses on the data generated when their revised form was trialed last spring; whether tenured faculty members could continue trialing the revised form; and whether COF would reconsider its decision not to implement the revised form at this time. The chair of COF noted that she is now reporting back to you about COF's decisions.

In placing her report in context, the chair reminded the faculty that DePauw's by-laws note that COF is charged with "(a) recommending policy and procedures for personnel decisions to the faculty." Additionally, the personnel policies portion of the handbook notes that the procedures for student opinion forms will be done based on procedures approved by COF and the Administration. COF takes its responsibility of protecting the personnel processes very seriously and considers gravely its responsibility to give colleagues the best opportunity to succeed in the personnel process. COF discussed these issues at three separate COF meetings since the last faculty meeting. COF stands by its decisions.

COF has decided not to implement the revised form at this time. We have asked the sub-committee that developed the revised form to provide COF with some written "talking points" about the rationale behind the questions they chose on the revised form. COF wants to place this documentation with the revised form in our records. COF is recommending that the issue of using a revised form be addressed again in a couple of years with the subcommittee's revised form being the first form considered. It will be on COF's log of uncompleted business to be reviewed again at that time. The delay allows COF to assess the impact of switching to an on-line, and in some cases, out-of-class administration of the form. The delay is not a reflection of any concerns about the revised form.

Furthermore, COF decided against sharing the data from those that tried the revised form with the subcommittee to attempt statistical analyses on the numerical data. COF found too many differences

between the types of courses offered to feel any such analyses would be meaningful. COF was not willing to waste the time of the subcommittee on an effort that COF did not think they could be convinced was useful. In the future, perhaps COF can arrange a trial more appropriate for a statistical analyses, e.g., having faculty members who are teaching two sections of the same course have one section use the old form and the other the revised form or at least having different faculty members teaching sections of the same or, at least, similar types of courses create that kind of a comparison.

Lastly, COF decided that our charge of maintaining the integrity of the review process out weighed the desire of some faculty members who wanted to continue testing the revised form. There will be no continued testing of the revised form at this time.

The Chair of COF then noted that if faculty members had any clarifying questions about COF's current decision with regard to student opinion forms she was happy to take them. She noted that if individuals wanted to discuss any of these issues, they are encouraged to contact her. She noted she was happy to chat on the phone, discuss the issue over coffee or via email. Lastly, she noted that if anyone had any questions on COF's written announcements or other questions for COF she was happy to take them.

A faculty member from the subcommittee noted that he appreciated COF's reasons for not continuing with the experiment, but he is concerned about the integrity of the process. If a faculty member invests a large amount of time in a subcommittee, feeling good about the progress that it is making, it is very frustrating to have the process stopped.

Another faculty member asked if the chair of COF could explain COF's position about what exactly is the function of the student survey form? The chair of COF stated that the survey is a piece of the broader personnel file, which is considered for any personnel decision.

The following announcements were included in the meeting agenda, but not announced during the meeting.

- COF continues to discuss the following topics:
  - The COA memo about file size and structure.
  - The COA memo about promotion linked to tenure, hoping to have specifics to the faculty in the spring.
- COF continues its work reviewing files.

#### *Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC made a motion that the faculty approve the following changes to the Disruptive Student Policy (Article VIII in the Academic Policies section of the handbook). The revisions do not lend themselves to presentation using bold-faced additions and strike-through deletions. However, the proposed revision is presented below followed by the current policy. Advance notice of this motion was given at the November faculty meeting.

#### **PROPOSED REVISION to the Disruptive Student Policy**

At DePauw University, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance. In our classrooms we strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of courtesy, respect and professionalism. A student's inappropriate behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment.

Frank yet respectful informal discussions between faculty members and students are the preferred response to disruptive behavior. Each case is different, however, and given

the complexities faculty members may wish to consult with the student's academic advisor, colleagues, and/or a designated member of Academic Affairs (currently the Dean of Academic Life), even at the stage of informal interventions.

(Please note: The Disruptive Student Policy is not meant to cover behavior that occurs outside the classroom and/or involves harassment. Other policies are in place to handle those situations; the University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks. Incidents of harassment should be reported immediately to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, or Campus Safety officers.)

If informal measures taken to address a student's disruptive behavior are unsuccessful, faculty members should follow these procedures:

1. The faculty member should warn the student in writing that the disruptive behavior is unacceptable and that if it continues the student may not be allowed to remain in the course. Depending on circumstances, a warning may need to be made during class, as well; for example, the faculty member may ask the student to leave the classroom for the day. The faculty member should also encourage the student to talk to an academic advisor or dean in Academic Affairs.
2. The faculty member should keep notes on the dates, times, and details of the incidents of disruption, the impact of disruption on those present, and warnings conveyed to the student, as these are useful in later stages of the proceedings.
3. If the behavior continues after a written warning has been given, the faculty member should notify the Dean of Academic Life in writing, giving a summary of what happened and the action that has been taken. Upon receipt of this summary, the dean sets up a three-way meeting involving the faculty member, student, and dean. In order to minimize the procedure's interference with courses, this meeting is scheduled as soon as possible, preferably before the next class meeting.
4. At the meeting, the faculty member and student are invited to discuss the situation. The goal of the meeting is to give both parties a chance to discuss, in a safe space, what has happened. Such a discussion may enable the faculty member and student to see the problem from a different point of view or to hear the perspective of the other person in a new way. The dean's role is to moderate the discussion, insuring that the conversation remains civil and on target. Either party may, but neither must, bring an advisor (DePauw student, faculty member, or staff member) to the meeting. Advisors may consult privately with the person whom they are accompanying, but they do not enter the discussion.
5. As soon as possible after the meeting the faculty member makes a recommendation to the Dean of Academic Life.
  - If the faculty member recommends that the student be allowed to remain in the course then the dean and faculty member should consult regarding how best to convey this decision and any stipulations or conditions to the student.
  - If the faculty member recommends that the student be dropped from the course, he or she reports this conclusion in writing to the dean of Academic Life; the dean then conveys the faculty member's conclusions along with a written summary of the three-way meeting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - A recommendation to dismiss the student from the course must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the student is not allowed to return to

- the course, the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides what appears on student's transcript for the course: W, F, or no entry.
6. A pattern of disruptive behavior in several courses may be addressed by representatives of the offices of Academic Affairs and Student Life.

### **CURRENT VERSION of the Disruptive Student Policy**

At DePauw, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance. In our classrooms we strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of courtesy, respect and professionalism. A student's inappropriate behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment. This policy outlines the procedures that should be followed when a professor feels that such disruption has occurred.

1. For any incident, the faculty member should warn the student that the disruptive behavior is unacceptable. This warning could be issued privately (in person or in writing) or publicly (such as asking the student to leave the class for the day).
2. The instructor may seek advice from a senior colleague, his/her chair, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, or Dean of Student Academic Support Services.
3. If the behavior occurs outside of the classroom and/or involves harassing behavior, there are other processes in place to handle the situation, and those processes should be followed. Incidents of harassment should be reported to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students or the campus police. The University's harassment policies are published in the Student and Academic Handbooks.
4. If the behavior continues, the situation may warrant stronger measures such as dropping a student from a course. In this case, a formal warning must be given to the student and reported in writing to Vice President of Academic Affairs. At this point mediation must be initiated.
  - The Vice President of Academic Affairs appoints a mediator and sets up a meeting.
  - The mediation meeting is held as soon as possible, ideally 48 hours, after the formal warning. A representative of the Office of Academic Affairs must be present at the mediation. The faculty member and the student may each have an adviser present.
  - The representative of the Office of Academic Affairs writes a memo summarizing the results of this mediation. This memo will be kept in the files of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - A recommendation to dismiss the student from the course must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the conclusion of the mediation is that the student should not return to the course, the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides what will appear on student's transcript for the course: W, F, or no entry.
  - A pattern of disruptive behavior in several classes will be addressed by the Office of Academic Affairs in conjunction with the Dean of Students.

The motion was made by a coordinating committee, so no second was needed.

The chair of SLAAC noted that the revision is meant to be a clarification, and SLAAC is hoping to streamline the process. There were no questions or discussion about the motion. The motion passed.

In closing, the chair of SLAAC noted that all faculty members should have received e-mail concerning various cheating incidents that have occurred on campus. SLAAC will continue to look at this issue, in addition to its discussions about student social spaces.

### ***Reports from Other Committees***

#### *The Committee on Administration – COA (Marcia McKelligan)*

There was no report in the meeting. The following announcement was provided in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

- COA has continued to work on the questions related to enriching intellectual life at DePauw. At our next meeting, on December 11, the Vice President for Finance Tom Dixon will meet with COA to share information and begin discussions on the university budget.

#### *Faculty Development Committee – FDC (John Schlotterbeck)*

The chair of the FDC announced that the FDC is wrapping up its work completing its reviews of sabbatical leaves and pre-tenure leaves. Participants are notified once the FDC has approved their projects.

The chair of the FDC announced that the competition for Fisher Time Out awards was keen with thirteen applications. The FDC was able to fund eight awards, with one being funded through the Prindle Institute. Congratulations to Jennifer Adams, Beth Benedix, Angela Castaneda, Bob Dewey, Tim Good, Nic Pizzolatto, Smita Rahman, and Michelle Villiniski on their awards.

#### *Fall Awards*

- \*Beth Benedix (Associate Professor of Religious Studies) – “Re/Collecting Joseph”
- Angela Castañeda (Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology) – “Divine Design: Visualizing the Sacred in Afro-Brazilian Candomblé”
- Robert Dewey (Assistant Professor of History) – “History of the British Empire – Course Development”
- Nic Pizzolatto (Assistant Professor of English) – “*Galveston: A Novel*”
- Smita Rahman (Assistant Professor of Political Science) – “Book Proposal - The Present, Past, and the Future Present: Reflections on the Concept of Time in Political Theory”

\* This award is funded with ethics-related funds.

#### *Spring Awards*

- Jennifer Adams (Assistant Professor of Communication and Theatre) – “Developing a Course in Environmental Rhetoric”
- Tim Good (Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre) – “Arts Illiana Grant Writing for Putnam County Team-Building Workshop”
- Michele Villinski (Associate Professor of Economics and Management) “Application of Spatial Analysis to Environmental Economics”

The FDC then thanked all the faculty members who responded to the FDC’s recent survey calling for suggestions to make expenditure/budget reductions in faculty development programs for the spring and summer 2009 that would least negatively affect intellectual life at DePauw. Some comments about the survey responses:

- The FDC received eighty-nine survey responses and e-mails. Many were long, thoughtful and many proposed deeper cuts than we suggested.



- Most responses cited reducing (or even eliminating) course development grants, arguing that this is part of our job, except perhaps in the case of incentives for University-wide initiatives.
- The FDC received mixed advice on a strategy of across-the-board cuts vs. reducing the number of Fisher Fellowships and Fisher Time Outs. These awards have already been allocated for next year.
- The FDC received many suggestions to reduce or eliminate funds in areas outside of the FDC's responsibility, including the Faculty Hospitality Fund, stipends and project budgets for Faculty Fellowships, University Professorships, Distinguished Professorships, and Pre-Tenure Leaves.
- There was strong support for maintaining current funding levels for sabbatical leaves, conference funding, and the Professional Development Fund, but a few suggested very modest reductions (if necessary) or setting per diems for meals.

In the end, the FDC followed the most common suggestion: a one-year suspension of the Faculty Summer Stipends for 2009. In making this decision, the chair made the following two points:

- This does not affect Collaborative Student/Faculty Research Grants. The FDC believes such collaborations are valuable for students and should be fully funded.
- Summer Stipends can only be awarded every other year. Those faculty members who were eligible to apply in 2009 will have to wait until 2010 because of the elimination. Faculty members who had awards in 2008 will have to wait an additional year before applying (they will be eligible to apply in 2011).

The FDC also accepted the VPAA's recommendation that faculty development funds follow the same limits on meals as Administrative funds. The new limits are: \$10 for breakfast, \$20 for lunch, and \$30 for dinner (not to exceed \$50 total per day with no alcohol). These limits most affect the PDF and the PCF but are included in all faculty development funds. The VPAA is willing to consider exceptions if any faculty members appeal to him that they needed to increase the meal limit.

A faculty member asked if the FDC was planning to send the suggestions for items that were not the responsibility of the FDC to the agencies in charge of those programs. The chair of FDC responded that people taking the survey provided a lot of information, and they clearly were not aware of the areas of responsibility for the FDC. The student entertainment fund was the second most suggested item to cut, and it is administered by Academic Affairs.

#### *Faculty Governance Steering Committee – FGSC (Dave Berque)*

The FGSC representative stated that the FGSC had provided a draft document about the discussions on intellectual life, and wanted to provide the faculty a chance to discuss and ask questions about the document, in an effort to get feedback about the document. He then opened the floor to questions and discussion about the draft.

A faculty member asked about how this process of discussion will unfold. Is it too early to say how fast things will happen – what would be a short-term action plan? Will the changes happen next year? In five years? Or is it too early to speculate about the timing?

The chair of CAPP responded that the process is still in the early stages, so no decisions have been made. Now is the time to make suggestions about what to do, and there is no specific date in mind for implementation. President Casey is taking a draft of this document to the Trustees meeting [in January]. The Chair of the Faculty also responded by saying that the hope is that by the end of the spring semester we will have a plan which could include pieces that could be implemented in the next year or so.

A faculty member had a point to make about two of the items – faculty member’s available time is a concern, as is the engagement of the faculty with students. In conversations with other faculty members, he confirmed his observation that this is an e-mail crazy place. E-mail has made faculty office hours twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Questions come to faculty member at any time that would normally have happened in office hours, and faculty members spend hours answering e-mail.

The chair of COA noted that COA has not yet talked about the full range of issues, since they had been focused on the discussions about a 3-2 teaching load. We agree with your observations, and will discuss them.

A faculty member stated that he was confused about this discussion at this point in time. He asked if we shouldn’t be discussing the question “What DePauw should be?” instead of focusing on the document.

The Chair of the Faculty replied that he certainly thinks it is appropriate to make comments about that question now. There is much entanglement between the six questions, and the draft is not intended to be six separate reports.

A faculty member stated that he noticed that the Greek system was one thing in common with many of the issues surrounding the six questions. The Greek system is the students’ common experience. It is going to be difficult to make progress on some of these issues if we do not address the Greek system.

Another faculty member stated that early on there was a discussion about Greek life and intellectual life. She added that she had been thinking about student agency and engagement – we can get the students more engaged by giving them more control over their experience. For example, we could give the students a self-designed academic experience – something that they design themselves. We need to have a discussion about how to improve intellectual agency when their social agency is so limited by the Greek system. How can we get students talking about their own intellectual agency? Should we be having a conversation with students about this?

A faculty member commented about the discussion about moving to a 3-2 teaching load. He stated that it seemed like there should be a discussion before this about equity and fairness in teaching at DePauw. There seems to be a lot of imbalance about what people are asked to do – differences in class sizes, difference in numbers of advisees, and so on. Before we talk about 3-2 teaching loads we should address fairness and equity across departments.

The chair of COA stated that moving to a 3-2 teaching load does in fact do nothing to address inequity issues, and might even exacerbate it. However, if we try to solve workload inequity first, we would never get anywhere on the 3-2 teaching load issue, which was the charge made by President Casey in his six questions. We should definitely keep fairness in mind as we move forward on the 3-2 teaching load discussions. Because of the way things have begun, we have been operating in separate spheres; we hope that soon we can consider how these things mesh together.

A faculty member stated that he thinks that the place we want to be is the place where students feel really comfortable engaging with their professors. Faculty members value being able to interact with students – they do not regret time that is spent with students. Interactions with students can be very valuable. To help students understand what it means to be intellectually active, they need to have role models – we are the best models that they have. Unfortunately, many of us feel like we do not have time to model intellectual life to our students. We don’t have time to go to events with students. That is where we can show them what it is like to be intellectual.

A faculty member stated that she keeps coming back to the question of autonomy – how to student have it and how can we give it to them? We need to model how to pursue our passions to the students. We should see if there is a holistic model that allows students to figure out how their experience fits together. How does their minor help them address what they are learning? Should we dissolve departmental majors, so students are not bound to a particular department?

A faculty member wanted to return to an issue raised by a previous faculty member. Should DePauw be a liberal arts institution, or is there some other model we should aspire to? What was President Casey thinking about when he raised this issue? The answer determines the direction of everything we discuss from now on.

President Casey responded by asking if we are a liberal arts institution, which is a school where students are not pursuing pre-professional degrees, but getting a classical liberal arts education. Or are we a small university, with an array of vertically aligned pre-professional degrees?

The faculty member responded that we should have a conversation about who we are as an institution before we can answer the issues addressed in the draft. The Chair of the Faculty commented that maybe we should address these higher level issues here and now.

A faculty member stated that it seemed that the second question should be about the difference between liberal arts institutions and universities, but most of the discussions were about programs of distinction. She is wondering if CAPP could talk a little bit about what other ideas (besides programs of distinction) came out in those discussions.

The chair of CAPP responded that none of the comments from discussion groups are being ignored – all of the data is still there. However, most of the stuff in those discussions was the programs of distinction. Other points included the School of Music – how should it interact with the College of Liberal Arts? There is a lot of data about how we view ourselves as a liberal arts institution. The faculty chose to focus on these two issues – many programs of distinction are outcome oriented.

The faculty member responded that it makes her think that the question of how to be the best liberal arts school (with a school of music) is too big to consider.

A faculty member stated that this is a great time for us to be engaged in these discussions. He is concerned that we are going down a path that results in faculty members who have an institutional inferiority complex. He stated that he likes Winter Term; he came to DePauw because of things like that, not because we are just like Grinnell. We are strong enough, we are good enough, and people like us. We should not lose our uniqueness to become just another liberal arts school.

The VPAA responded that these conversations go on at other institutions, and they are driven by misunderstandings of students and their parents about what college really is. The Dean of Earlham said that the point of a liberal arts education was to “decenter” student expectations, then let them rebuild themselves in the presence of faculty and other intellectual people. There is a desire by students and parents to have a purpose for paying money to go to college. We will have to accept that student think this way and work with it, rather than push back against it. Decentering is a way to make students think about what they really want.

A faculty member returned to the programs of distinction issue, and noted that one criticism in the discussions was a perception of elitism that is attached to these programs. He questioned whether this is true about all the programs of distinction. He then asked if there is anything wrong with a little bit of elitism? He noted that he is a new participant in the Honor Scholar program, and realized that he could ask more of these students than he could in other classes. There is something about the Honor Scholar students that gives them a commitment to read more and reflect more deeply than other

students. There are always a few of this type of students in any class, but having a concentration of excellent students in one class is very nice.

President Casey responded by stating that the first time he read a description of the program, he asked himself why this was not the description for DePauw in general. Then he realized that having the program attracts the “excellent” sorts of students to DePauw. We should celebrate the program. As far as elitism goes, he wonders if the programs of distinction are overly careerist. Do they put students too quickly on the path to a career? Also, why aren’t some of these features available to more students than just those who are in the programs?

A faculty member stated that another problem that we, as well as other schools nationally, are having is that average grades are quite high. If we are not happy with the engagement of our students, why are we rewarding them so much and so well? It is a national problem, but we should consider it at DePauw as well.

The director of the Honor Scholar program addressed the discussion about the program. She noted that students applying to the program are taken very seriously from the very beginning, starting with the admissions process. The students’ first interactions with DePauw are conversations about their intellectual work. The students are also very engaged because it is their responsibility to come up with their own intellectual experience. She noted that the first-year seminar program came out of the Honor Scholar program, and she would like to see an institutional senior experience similar to the Honor Scholar senior experience as well. We should take our students more seriously. She also noted that she loved that there was differentiation between students here – some go to graduate school, and some go to work.

A faculty member addressed distribution requirements. He began by noting that his son took several Alpha courses at DePauw while a high school student, but chose to attend Grinnell. His son’s choice was mainly because his son felt that intellectual engagement by students is higher at Grinnell than here. He was really happy to see responses in the document about the idea of loosening up group requirements. He asked what good it does to have students in a course that they absolutely are not interested in. There is something to be said for trying to ensure that students take a broad spectrum of courses, but it is also nice to allow students to pursue their own path of imagination. It is hard to change our brand – we are branded as a school where you party and drink a lot. But another brand is that students have to take a lot of courses that they don’t want to take.

The chair of COA noted that twenty years ago, CAPP did a large survey on faculty workload. If anyone remembers this study, or has documents about it, please send the information to the chair of COA.

A faculty member discussed student motivations by noting that there are several possible motivations for students to take a course: they are interested in the topic; the course is “easy”; their parents want them to take it; or it is part of a self-designed career path. She noted that in the Chinese educational system, students are channeled into narrow paths from very early in their careers. She was very happy to see group requirements at DePauw, since it gives students a wider range of experience. She thinks it is the core of DePauw’s education.

Another faculty member noted the inherent contradiction in some of our comments: a liberal arts school is a place where you become “decentered” vs. a liberal arts school is where you take courses you are interested in. He feels that the beauty of the distribution requirements is that it forces students into areas of learning that they would not have gone into otherwise. It forces them to confront differences and concepts alien to them. He stated that this is the core of what a liberal education should be.

Finally, a faculty member asked if there was a compromise between the two viewpoints. Is there a way to ask students to really think through the choices that they are making? Can we force them to look at

the courses they are taking, and come up with a reason why they are taking each course? Can we give the students a sense of ownership over what they are taking and why?

The following item was in the agenda, but not announced in the meeting:

- The FGSC has selected the following six faculty representatives to President Casey's Campus Planning Committee: Beth Benedix, Dana Dudle, Pedar Foss, Susan Hahn, Tiffany Hebb and Keith Tonne.

#### *International Education Committee – IEC (Carrie Klaus)*

The IEC representative informed the faculty that the IEC, in conjunction with the Center for International and Experiential Education (CIEE), is coordinating a self-study for international education at DePauw. This will be much broader than a typical self-study of a single department or program. The twelve areas that will be addressed in this study are:

- Off-campus study
- Winter term projects
- On-campus curriculum
- Faculty development
- Admission and recruiting
- Student life
- Student internships
- Campus programming
- Inter-institutional collaborations
- Recruitment and support of faculty and staff
- Academic support and resources
- The governance of international education (the IEC and the CIEE)

Faculty members will serve on small groups of two to five faculty members, staff, and students; each group will address one of the above items. If you want to express interest in this self-study, please contact Carrie Klaus (chair of the IEC) or Kate Knaul (director of the CIEE) by Wednesday, December 17. Please indicate which area or areas of study are of interest of you.

A faculty member asked if expressing interest in the self-study means that you would like to be in one of the small groups. The chair of IEC replied that yes, it does.

#### ***Old Business***

There was no old business.

#### ***New Business***

There was no new business.

#### ***Announcements***

The following announcements were not made in the meeting, but were found in the agenda:

- Chris White will be the Coordinator of Programming and Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee at the Prindle Institute for the spring semester of 2009.

- The Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics Faculty Advisory Committee announces a call for proposals for an ethics symposium for the 2009/2010 academic year. Proposals are due January 28th, 2009. Martha Rainbolt can answer questions.

### ***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 PM.

## **Appendix to Agenda for December 2008 Faculty Meeting**

### **APPENDIX 4 CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND PROCEDURES for FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

In order to ensure that faculty personnel processes are as fair as possible, DePauw University has adopted the following policy and procedures.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

At an institution such as DePauw, a variety of personal relationships may exist among faculty members which create the potential of a conflict of interest between a person who handles personnel matters (performance reviews, hiring requests, supervision) or a member of a committee that handles personnel matters (Full-Time Position Request Committee, Search Committee, Special Review Committee (for faculty librarians) or Department (or School) Personnel Committee referred to hereinafter as the "DPC") or a member of the Committee on Faculty "COF" or the VPAA and a faculty member or job candidate under review. However, in the shared work environment, common interactions – e.g., friendships and antagonisms, likes and dislikes, concurrences and disagreements, and praise or criticisms -- do not represent Conflicts of Interest if they fall within the bounds of University policies governing professional working relationships.<sup>1</sup> It is also in the best interests of the University (and of the confidence that should be placed in the faculty personnel processes) that appropriate steps be taken to limit the appearance of Conflicts of Interest by excluding the participation of some who might otherwise serve, if there are reasonable alternatives to participation in a faculty review process (i.e., when others may fairly judge the relevant evidence). This policy is intended to alert faculty members to the types of concerns for which a Conflict of Interest may exist and to encourage members of the relevant committees and the VPAA, and faculty members under review, to avoid situations for which a potential conflict of interest exists. The successful application of this policy requires all faculty members to familiarize themselves with the contents of this policy. Anyone with a Conflict of Interest should request to be recused from the committee in question and from other personnel responsibilities. Further, any faculty member who has knowledge that a conflict of interest may exist, or is in doubt as to whether a conflict exists regarding an issue before one of these committees, should follow the procedures set out within this policy.

#### **DEFINITION**

A Conflict of Interest exists when a faculty member is in a position to exercise judgment on a personnel matter, either personally or as a member of a committee reviewing a faculty colleague or candidate and when that exercise of judgment could be (or is perceived to be) influenced by a current or past personal relationship (as defined herein). A Conflict of Interest may exist even though it may not be acknowledged by one or more of the parties.

---

<sup>1</sup> Whenever the phrase "conflict of interest" is used, it means not only actual conflicts but potential or perceived conflicts of interest as well; whenever the phrase is capitalized "Conflict of Interest" this refers to an actual conflict of interest.

## **PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS SUBJECT TO THIS POLICY**

Circumstances that are of concern under this policy are those in which a person with personnel responsibilities has, or has the appearance of having, such a bias so strong as to undermine the presumption of fairness in the execution of those responsibilities. These circumstances include, but are not limited to, a situation of dependency or interdependency, or a commission of a policy violation in dealings with the faculty member to be affected by a pending committee recommendation. Examples of circumstances that could result in a conflict of interest, or the possibility of perceived conflict of interest, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- shared financial interests;
- familial relationship;
- former or present marital, romantic, amorous, or other intimate relationships;
- current co-living arrangement;
- giving or receiving of substantial gifts or benefits;
- employment relationship outside of DePauw; and
- an incident involving violation of the harassment policy or the consensual relations policy.

There may be other circumstances for which a faculty member believes that a colleague could not render an impartial judgment in a personnel matter. A faculty member concerned about a bias that might hinder impartiality due to any circumstance should report the situation or relationship to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or to the designated prior chair of COF if the conflict involves the VPAA) for evaluation pursuant to these procedures. The designated prior chair of COF for matters of conflict of interest involving the VPAA shall be recorded on the annually published list of faculty members of committees.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST PROCEDURES**

1. A faculty member who believing that his or her service in personnel matters will be affected by (or may be affected by) a Conflict of Interest should consult with the VPAA. In such circumstances the faculty member may request to be recused from service on these personnel matters. The VPAA will consider any request to be recused from work on personnel matters; and if the request is granted, the VPAA will notify the appropriate individuals about this recusal (such as the chair of the relevant committee).
2. To report a conflict of interest of another faculty member, a faculty member should notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs confidentially of the existence of a conflict of interest as soon as practical after it is identified. However, to protect privacy, information regarding the nature of the circumstances leading to the conflict of interest (e.g., financial, family, romantic, etc,) need not be divulged beyond that information which the Vice President for Academic Affairs would reasonably require in order to determine whether a Conflict of Interest exists. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs is a party to the conflict of interest, then the most recent past chair of the COF who is not currently serving on COF and not on leave shall substitute for the roles designated in this policy for the Vice President.
3. Once notified, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will exercise discretion in determining what are the prudent steps to take in order to determine whether a Conflict of Interest exists. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may investigate the conflict of interest through gathering information and interviewing relevant parties. While that determination is underway, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall suspend the related work of the relevant committee if it has already begun. In assessing conflicts of interest, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should focus on whether the particular interest and/or personal circumstance



of the faculty member are likely to compromise, or are likely to be perceived as compromising, a committee member's ability to function impartially.

4. Once an assessment has been made, the Vice President for Academic Affairs must promptly share his or her decision by confidential memorandum to the faculty member about whom a question of conflict of interest has been raised. Where it has been decided that a Conflict of Interest exists, the Vice President for Academic Affairs must promptly instruct the person who has been determined to have a Conflict of Interest not to participate in the decisions regarding the affected faculty member with whom the Conflict of Interest exists. Depending on the nature of the Conflict of Interest, the exclusion of a member of a particular committee from personnel responsibility for another faculty member may apply for certain other personnel responsibilities and/or for a certain length of time as determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
5. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will also notify the chair of the relevant committee if a committee member is to be excluded for reason of Conflict of Interest. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall also then authorize the committee to resume the review process; that authorization may include instructions returning the committee to an earlier point in its process so that the work is not influenced by the person (or persons) who has (have) been excluded, such as when a person determined to have a Conflict of Interest had already participated in part of the deliberations. The Vice President may also amend the evidence (such as in an application or decision file) on which the considerations are to be based in order to remove items that may have been influenced by the Conflict of Interest. For other personnel matters, the Vice President will take steps to reassign tasks and responsibilities as needed to re-create an impartial personnel process.
6. Retaliation against any individual who discloses an actual or perceived conflict of interest is not permitted and may result in use of sanctions and disciplinary procedures for unprofessional conduct.
7. Questions regarding this policy and/or its interpretation should be directed to the chair of the COF and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY AND RECORDKEEPING**

It is imperative that all information regarding conflicts of interest be kept as confidential as circumstances permit. It is legitimate for those involved in resolving a conflict of interest to seek advice and/or guidance from other University officials or faculty members with relevant experience. Internal disclosure of information about potential or actual conflicts of interest should be limited strictly to those faculty members or employees who need to have access for official purposes. However, if through investigation of a potential conflict of interest the VPAA (or surrogate) discovers a violation of a University policy, then this information may require additional action and some level of confidentiality may be lost in that case. Details of matters relating to conflicts of interest shall be kept in confidential files held in the Office of Academic Affairs and access to such files will be restricted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs or others serving in a surrogate role as provided for in this policy. All records shall be kept for a period of at least ten (10) years with the actual duration of the record keeping to be determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the surrogate.

**Minutes for DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, February 2nd, 2009**

***Call to Order:***

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:02 PM.

***Announcement of Quorum Requirements for Spring Semester:***

The Vice President for Academic Affairs announced that the quorum for the spring semester is 86.

***Verification of Quorum:***

It was verified that more than 86 ballots had been distributed to voting faculty as they entered the meeting. Thus, quorum was met. A total of 135 ballots had been distributed by the end of the meeting.

***Approval of Minutes of the December 2008 Faculty Meeting:***

The minutes from the December 2008 faculty meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

***Moment of Silence to honor Edward G. Ypma:***

Edward G. Ypma, Professor Emeritus of Psychology, served DePauw from 1966 – 2004. Ed passed away on November 6, 2008. A moment of silence was observed in his honor, and a full tribute to Ed may be found in the appendix to these minutes.

***Special Report on Intellectual Life Discussions Including Remarks from the President:***

The President opened by stating that he will be reporting on two related, though distinct, large topics today. The first is a report on the discussions at the January Board of Trustees meeting about the University's finances. Then he will turn to a talk about the intellectual life discussions we have had this year and how these will continue this semester and into the next academic year.

The President noted that the only formal act undertaken by the Board regarding the University's finances at last week's meeting was the approval of a 4.5% tuition increase for the 2009-10 academic year. This rate is below the 7% annual increases that the Board had originally endorsed for the next few academic years. 4.5% is still higher than the President would like, but with the ongoing operational budget deficit that must be addressed swiftly and in the face of extraordinary pressure on our budget due to the international economic crisis, this was as low an increase as could be endorsed without radical alterations in our operations.

The Board is still pressing rather hard for us to balance our budget as soon as possible, and we are working now on presenting some scenarios in April that will allow for that. This afternoon an e-mail summary of all these matters will be sent to the entire DePauw community.

The President pointed out that the bulk of the January Board meeting was spent on a discussion about DePauw's intellectual life, and this topic will now be addressed in earnest. But first, he asked the Chair of the Faculty to report on the faculty's involvement in this Board retreat.

The Chair of the Faculty stated that, on behalf of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee, he was pleased to report on the FGSC's positive experiences at the January Board of Trustees retreat. The FGSC thanks President Casey for continuing to work closely with the committee during December and

January, for inviting them to the Trustees retreat and, especially, for making the intellectual life topic such an important part of that meeting.

An entire day, and part of a second day, at the retreat was devoted to the topic of DePauw's intellectual life. The seven faculty members on the FGSC, joined by two student leaders, introduced this topic through a panel that was moderated by President Casey. Through the give-and-take which ensued, the Trustees were fully apprised of the campus discussions that began this fall. The Trustees were also updated on the state of DePauw's intellectual life more generally.

The panel was followed by presentations, discussions, and break-out groups related to intellectual life. Throughout the sessions, the Trustees showed deep interest in the issues, an understanding of faculty viewpoints, genuine appreciation for the ongoing work of the entire faculty, and overwhelming support for the notion that the faculty should feel empowered to develop and implement mechanisms for helping DePauw grow into the type of intellectual community the faculty would like it to be. Further, the Trustees strongly encouraged the FGSC to be bold in its thinking and for the faculty to do its work **now**.

The Chair of the Faculty noted that in his remarks at the Faculty Institute, he said: "I believe we are going to find that a door is being opened to us. We have to be organized enough to walk through the door rather than getting ourselves tangled in the entryway. But once we are inside, I believe there is the opportunity to have a truly paradigm-shifting dialog." The Chair continued by stating that it is now clear that the door has been opened by President Casey with the full support of the Trustees. The faculty spent most of the fall semester organizing itself in an orderly fashion outside the doorway. Now it is time to cross the threshold. Once the faculty are inside, the FGSC is committed to the hard work that will be required for DePauw's committees to shepherd the next steps in the process that the entire faculty began this fall. This will be a great challenge, but it is one that the faculty are prepared to rise to.

The Chair of the Faculty returned the floor to the President, who noted that the Board of Trustees, at the meeting, passed a resolution that the Board fully supports the faculty in their work, and encourages them to move forward with it. The text of the resolution (not read in full in the meeting) reads:

**Resolved:** The Board of Trustees hereby enthusiastically endorses the work of the Faculty and the President on both examining and strengthening the intellectual life of DePauw and encourages the faculty, with student input, to move forward on its work on these issues, reporting on progress towards recommendations and actions by the April 2009 Meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The President also noted that David Hoover, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, wrote a letter to the faculty expressing his support for their work. The letter concludes as follows: "We encourage the faculty to strive for boldness, and to answer the charge that we create, at DePauw, 'one of the most vibrant intellectual and creative environments in the nation.' The Board of Trustees applauds your efforts thus far, and stands ready to support your future efforts in sharpening our curriculum, our co-curriculum, and the overall intellectual life of our school." The resolution and letter will be e-mailed to the University community sometime tonight.

The President then reported on what he believes he has learned from the intellectual life conversations and reports of the last semester.

- The core of DePauw's academic experience, the curriculum, has become confusing and cumbersome for ourselves and our students. The reasons behind our current structure of six groups of departments and courses, three competencies, and so on, are unclear and this has harmed the experience we offer students and the image we offer the world.
- The layer of co- or extra- curricular programs DePauw has built over the years – the Management Fellows program, the Media Fellows program, the Science Research Fellows program, Honor

Scholars, Winter Term, our approach to internships – while providing many wonderful experiences for students and engaging many members of this faculty and staff, do not together form a coherent vision for how we think, holistically, of our approach to education and does not present a clear image to the world about how DePauw connects the work of the classroom to the world at large.

- DePauw's Winter Term program is favored by students and provides many of them with wonderful, enriching experiences that connect them to the world and provide, for those on the campus, an excellent opportunity to form social bonds. For others, this is the moment when many travel for the first time, or engage in life-changing service trips. At the same time, many consider the on-campus classes as being not meaningful or challenging. We expend enormous amounts of time and energy mounting a Winter Term program, but it seems not motivated by or guided by a theory as to what it truly seeks to achieve for our students.
- Finally, DePauw's campus does not, for a variety of reasons, always create the sort of lively, energizing atmosphere that supports our intellectual and social goals and aspirations.

The President then asked what should we do now? He began by stating that he is about to present a rather vigorous timetable for us to follow this spring in reviewing our curriculum and our co-curriculum and he is about to list five specific charges to the faculty. These will get to some specific issues, but through the changes and charges about to be described, DePauw can and must do three important, broad things:

- First, clarify the foundation of what we do for our students – and that is to teach through a liberal arts curriculum. The Board this past weekend reaffirmed that DePauw is, fully and fundamentally, a liberal arts college enriched by a School of Music. We must know what it means, at its heart, to be a liberal arts college. I am concerned, however, that at this liberal arts college we have created such a complex curriculum that it fails to motivate or inspire. As noted in so many replies from faculty and students, it is, at best, a list of tasks to be completed, boxes to be checked. We are better than that.
- Second, the President would like for us to reanimate and refocus all those many programs that have been created over the years that rest besides and near the curriculum – all those programs that seek to link the liberal arts to life's work. Let's clarify what they can and what they ought to do.

The various programs of distinction, our Winter Term, our complex system of internships, all have been built up over the years. In many ways they do marvelous things. But through them, we have allowed the culture of doing to move away from the culture of learning. They operate in myriad ways with our curriculum so that together we cannot say how it is that we are connecting the liberal arts to life's work. Further, all these programs are supported by an infrastructure that confuses and confounds.

We are better than that. Just as we need a curriculum animated by our highest values, our co-curriculum needs to be clearly and confidently driven by our mission of educating students. Let us bring these into our intellectual heart, under the watchful eye of the faculty, and driven by a sense of wonder and discovery.

- Finally, let us trust each other and let us trust our students so we can create a world in which we are all animated by our work, rather than overwhelmed by our obligations. We can change our requirements and create a culture of inquiry and discovery. Some of our students, under any system of course requirements, will seek the paths of least intellectual resistance. Most, however, will not, if we show them what they achieve by their own acts of discovery.

Further, faculty members have, since this summer, complained that we have no oxygen here. The lack of oxygen is a product of a lack of trust. Again, we are better than that.

The President continued by noting that, in years past, DePauw developed both a mission statement and a vision statement. And while he stated that he was not typically a fan of mission statements, the mission statement we have offers a fine summary of our purposes:

“DePauw University, a residential liberal arts college, provides a diverse learning and living community which is distinctive in its rigorous intellectual engagement and international and experiential learning opportunities. DePauw teaches its students values and habits of mind which serve them throughout their lives as each of them makes a positive difference as active citizens of the world.”

The vision statement, of more recent origin, notes (in part) that

“We are a distinguished university and a proud family, nationally recognized for extraordinary effectiveness in linking liberal arts education with life’s work.”

Both the mission statement and the vision statement, grounded as they are in a deep awareness of DePauw’s history and distinctive characteristics, can continue to guide us now.

The President stated that what he heard from your conversations about the state of our intellectual life and what he read in your comments and in this report, are echoes in ways of both the mission and the vision statement. Let’s become an even stronger liberal arts college than we are now by developing a curriculum that captures our vision. And if DePauw uniquely links the liberal arts to life’s work, then let’s do this in a way that makes us proud, which offer our students experiences, and which makes DePauw a model for others. If we do this, the world – the best students, the best faculty, our alumni, those who care and think about education – will beat a path to our door.

The President then began an electronic presentation for the faculty, noting that the information would be e-mailed later as well. He first discussed the timeline, noting that the University will be working on intellectual life during this spring and all next academic year. He charged the FGSC to act as the special faculty planning committee for another year. He will be asking the current members of FGSC to stay on the committee for another year, to allow for continuity in the discussions. The new members of the committee will come on and join the old members. The President also noted that he has asked the FGSC to ensure that the School of Music is represented on this committee. The FGSC will determine how to distribute discussions and work amongst the various constituent committees. Finally, the President stated that we need to ensure that the students have a voice in this process. The student report is available on the faculty governance web site.

The President then presented his proposed calendar for the upcoming discussions and activities. This spring, the faculty would consider the President’s five charges (discussed in detail later). At the May 2009 Faculty Meeting, the faculty can vote, in principal on changes to graduation requirements, winter terms, internships, programs of distinction, and first-year programs. In the following academic year, the FGSC and the appropriate committees will propose specific legislations and regulations to implement the changes. This would mean that the students entering in Fall 2010 (the class of 2014) would be admitted to the new structures. The President stated that he is aware that this is very ambitious, and that the University would be moving extremely quickly. But, he notes, everything needs to be done as a single piece – everything is interrelated, so it all needs to be done at once.

The President then discussed the five charges that he is giving the faculty.

*Charge One:*

The faculty should vote, in principle, on the broad structure and outline of a new system of graduation requirements, focusing specifically on the group structure, course requirements within groups, the ‘W’, ‘S’, and ‘Q’ requirements, and Physical Education course requirements.

President Casey offered his opinion about the issue, noting that he thought it was appropriate or helpful for the faculty to know of some of his positions on these issues. He believes a move to four groups would be appropriate. Given that, roughly one third of a student's courses would be devoted to breadth, one third to depth in a major, and one third to explore the curriculum. He believes that it is time for the Q, W, and S requirements to be removed for students. He thinks that DePauw teaches these competencies well, and that it is wonderful to have faculty development support for them. DePauw should keep the faculty development side, but the student requirement should be removed. Finally, the President believes that PE courses should not receive course credit. Instead, there should be a wellness program for students. PE courses would still be offered, but would not satisfy a course requirement for the University.

*Charge Two:*

The faculty should vote, in principle, on modifications to the Winter Term program that build on current strengths, but strengthen the overall program.

President Casey offered his opinion about the issue. He believes that DePauw should give course credit for Winter Term courses. They should be graded, and they should be departmental courses. There would need to be discussion about how trips abroad and service trips would fit into this model. He thinks we should keep the "learning life skills" programs – don't call them courses, but keep them available.

*Charge Three:*

The faculty should vote, in principle, on new criteria to guide internships (both semester long and winter term) at DePauw.

President Casey offered his opinion about which direction he would like to go. He wants to ensure that there is strong faculty oversight of internships, and that the experience is strongly connected to the curriculum. He believes there should be changes in course credit regulations to connect internships to curricular requirements. He also believes that advising structures should be created to make internship experiences available to any student.

*Charge Four:*

The faculty should vote, in principle, on new criteria to guide the programs of distinction to link academic programs to life's work.

President Casey offered his opinion about the issue. He believes we should consider delaying entry into these programs for nearly all students until the second year. He notes, however, that immediate entry into these programs is a selling point for prospective students, and DePauw probably cannot make this change immediately. He also wonders if there are other programs that could be built, in areas where there are strong faculty and student interests. These programs could create formalized bridges to connect the curriculum to life's work. For example, sustainability, the environment, and ethics are examples of programs that could be built.

*Charge Five:*

The faculty should vote, in principle, on enhancements to the first-year experience at DePauw.

President Casey offered his opinion about the issue. He asked what the best way is to create the first year as a time of inquiry and discovery; how to create common intellectual experiences among all first-year students; and how to best prepare first-year students for advanced courses. He thought that a possibility would be to create a distinct first-year quadrangle, which would let all first-year students live together, maybe with faculty members as well.

The President then moved to discuss some related and administrative issues.

*Related Issues:*

The President proposed expanding the SRF program into an Office of Research and Internships. This would give all students the option to have a research or internship experience. He stated we should discuss ways to modify the ITAP program so that it is more directly grounded in the curriculum; right now, it is a program that straddles two worlds -- a POD and a work study program. And he believes that there should be discussions about the Honor Scholar program, and how it will reflect the new changes to the curriculum.

*Administrative Issues:*

The President stated that we should address issues of faculty workload. How can we arrange faculty time so that it is easier for faculty members and students to connect in a meaningful way outside of the classroom? How can we adjust the academic administrative structure to better meet the needs to new curricular and co-curricular structures? The President stated that administrative offices should be connected to the needs of the faculty – they should work with the faculty and for the faculty. Additionally, the President wondered how we can address the sense that DePauw's academic culture is over-bureaucratized. He will be having discussions with COA, COF, and senior administrative personnel about this issue. Finally, he noted that the campus planning and marketing groups will be driven by the faculty actions that are taken this year.

The President ended his electronic presentation, and stated that he will be continuing to talk to the faculty. The Board is completely excited by our work, and completely behind it – they want to support us. He noted it will be hard to put all the pieces together, but we cannot separate them and still come up with a coherent plan. He then opened the floor for questions and comments.

A faculty member commented that she was excited by the discussion. However, she had not heard the word “diversity” or the word “staff” in the presentation. She feels that we should include them in our discussions – we can link our curricular experience to what the staff already does. President Casey noted that students have a structure for their discussions, as do the faculty, but the staff doesn't really have an effective structure for working as a large group. He will take under advisement the best way to include the staff in the discussions. He stated that diversity and sustainability will definitely have to be included in the discussion.

A faculty member noted that President Casey had made the point that the changing campus climate cannot be discussed without talking about all the aspects together. The faculty member noted that he is thinking particularly about the first-year program, and how it should be more of a year of intellectual discovery and exploration, and what that would mean to winter term. He pointed out that a central obstacle to making this place a place of intellectual discovery is the Greek system, and he does not think it is remotely feasible to talk meaningfully about a significant transformation of the intellectual atmosphere here without discussing the Greek system.

The President responded by mentioning that, while he was preparing these notes over the weekend, he heard much screaming from outside his office, and saw that Pi Phi was having a rush event. He realized that they were enjoying themselves, and were welcoming new people into a community, and that this was not such a bad thing. He also, of course, knows what damage it can do, but stated that every faculty member can identify a favorite student that is Greek and a disappointing student that is independent. This issue needs to be addressed, but not by throwing up our hands and giving up, but by making the republic of letters as compelling and interesting as fraternity and sorority life. DePauw has ceded community, identity, and ritual to the Greek system – our first move should be to take some of this back by offering compelling intellectual rituals and experiences. With regards to the first-year program, we might consider delaying rush back as far as we can within the first year, to give students a chance to breathe and figure out who they are. The President concluded by noting that he did not

believe that the Board of Trustees would support the removal of the Greek system, and there is no financial ability for DePauw to house Greek students. DePauw needs to make intellectual life as strong as Greek life for the students. This is a topic that will need to be discussed for a long time, and we need to work with the Greek system.

A faculty member stated that taking a vote at the May Faculty Meeting is different than reaching consensus. The faculty need to have some conversations built around the intellectual life issue. There are good articles about what curriculums should look like – she hopes that we could read these articles, and have an intellectual discussion about the curriculum before a potentially divisive vote is taken. The President responded that he has spoken to the Mellon group, and hopes to find some funding for these sorts of conversations.

The faculty member continued by noting that, since she is responsible for spending months trying to place many students into English 130 and 'W' courses, she is not wedded to that structure. However, she is interested in making sure that DePauw teaches good writing. She hopes that we will discuss how we would facilitate faculty members in learning to teach in 'Q', 'W', and 'S' if those requirements are lost. She stated that we need to have an intellectual conversation about these issues as well; we shouldn't just change the requirements. The President responded that he has never been at an institution where the faculty cares more about teaching. He thinks we can get rid of the mechanism but keep the faculty development there.

A faculty member asked why there are 31 academic requirements (course credits), and not 32 (or more). The President responded that he would definitely prefer 32, especially if winter term courses start counting as courses.

A faculty member stated that she understood the timetable, but did not see how the discussions would be formatted. She has lots of ideas, but where should she take them? The President responded that they should be taken to the Chair of the Faculty. The Chair of the Faculty stated that the FGSC would be staying after the meeting to talk about how to continue the discussions and how to continue to receive input. Faculty members should look for communications from the FGSC about what that process will be. He stated that the process will not be the FGSC making the decisions – he hopes that the meeting in May will be similar to a Ph.D. defense. We should not get to the meeting in May to vote on things for which we do not already have consensus.

Another faculty member stated that DePauw should start considering lab credit for students. Students have commented to her, and other faculty members, that graduate programs are wondering why students do not get credit for labs. This issue should be included in the curriculum discussion. The President responded that he loves the fact that DePauw has a course system, not a credit system. He will take her comment under advisement.

A faculty member stated that he is still interested in hearing more about the process. These five charges are huge, and we are being asked to consider them in a short period of time. Given all the other demands on our time, when are we supposed to add in all these discussions, so that we end up in May feeling that we are educated enough and comfortable enough to make a valid vote on these issues. The Chair of the Faculty stated that this process would indeed be hard and challenging, and will require everyone to rethink some priorities. All the issues are intertwined, and we currently have support from the faculty, the administration, and the trustees. If this is dragged out, we could lose momentum and support. He also noted that we are voting in principle – the details do not have to be completely worked out.

The faculty member continued by asking if we would be handling all of this in faculty meetings, or will there be special meetings? President Casey stated that we will need to have special meetings, and the Chair of the Faculty concurred by noting we could have forums for on-line discussion, visits to



department meetings, and other special forums. The President noted that this might take over committee meetings for the standing committees for the next several months. The Chair of the Faculty noted that the Academic Handbook gives standing committees the power to create subcommittees for specific tasks – he will meet with the standing committees to discuss this further. The President stated that the danger with not doing this now is that admissions numbers are softening – we have no compelling vision to give our students. Making these changes will allow us to give students a vision of what is coming. The faculty member stated that he is not trying to push things back, but just wondering where the slack time is for us to accomplish this. The President responded by saying we should try, and see how far we can get.

Another faculty member noted that there are two issues – one is that everyone will be asked to do something, and the other is about money. At the same time that we are being asked to do things big, we are also asked to cut budgets and personnel. How does the vision work with that? The President responded that it will be brutal. The problem is trying to keep the concern about managing the present at the same time as planning for the future. But the future will be stormier if the planning is not done now. He doesn't think the changes will cost that much, and can thus be done without stretching the budget.

A faculty member stated that she is working on a self-study for the international education program now. She asked if there were some things that could be put on hold, so that people who are committed to these things could direct their attention to the University initiative. The Chair of the Faculty said to send ideas for things that could be put on hold to the Chair of the Faculty and the VPAA.

A faculty member stated that this is a huge project, but it is not as big as it appears, because we have all thought about these issues before. He stated that he thinks we can accomplish this, but he doesn't think we will reach consensus. Those in the minority will have to accept it and hope that it works. But, what happens if the in principle vote goes through, but we cannot agree on the details. The President said that he agrees with the faculty member, namely that we have been through this before. It is a risk that we will have to take. The faculty member asked if there was someone who could be given executive power to override us if something like that happens. The Chair of the Faculty stated that we will look at ways to increase the chances of implementation. We need to trust each other, as well as departments and programs.

Another faculty member asked what it would be like if we simply declared no committee work for a year? FDC and COF have time-sensitive issues to address, but other committees could address this issue for the year. The Board of Trustees does not often give the faculty a vote of confidence, so we need to move on this. This is a lot of work for the next 6-18 months, but it will hopefully turn this place into a much better place to work. The President responded by saying that he is willing to state to the standing committees that this is your job for the year. These issues could be made part of the AQIP process as well.

### ***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/).

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

MAO had no report. The chair offered to answer any questions, but there were none.

#### *Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

CAPP had no report. The chair offered to answer any questions, but there were none.

The following announcement was found in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- CAPP has approved the Winter Term in May option be extended for 2010. CAPP has asked the Winter Term subcommittee to carefully consider the timing of deadlines for submission of proposals and applications and that the Winter Term office consult with the VPAA about adequately reserving funds for financial support of May students who qualify for support, including those who enroll in the spring. CAPP asks that consideration of proposals for the May option not be limited to projects which can only be offered in May. No more than four proposals will be approved for the Winter Term in May option in 2010 given the relatively low demand for this alternative and the need for planning on the part of students and faculty members whose May projects do not fill.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The chair of COF noted that COF is suggesting the following language changes to the Academic Handbook in sections written by the Administration; these changes would remove the time in rank requirement for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. COF invites comment by the faculty to COF by Tuesday, February 17, after which time COF will forward their recommendation to the Administration.

***Section 1.B.2.e.(2)***

*Current wording:*

Normally, an assistant professor must have the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree. (See Appendix 3: Terminal Degrees. Exceptions may be made for temporary appointments and when there are compensating factors.) When an assistant professor is reviewed for tenure, that review will also include a review for timely promotion if the candidate has completed three years in rank prior to the review year (an academic year is counted as a “year in rank” if the rank is achieved on or before December 31 of that year); if tenure is granted without promotion, specific reasons for doing so must be made clear to all parties. When a tenured assistant professor is reviewed for promotion, that will be considered review for timely promotion if the candidate has completed three years in rank prior to the review year. In cases of exceptional performance promotion may be granted earlier, except that an assistant professor may not be reviewed for promotion prior to the tenure review. The review of an assistant professor for promotion should consider performance over all prior years of service at DePauw regardless of rank, and, if the faculty member has served fewer than five years at DePauw, evidence of immediately prior years of service at other institutions also may be included at the discretion of the candidate so that the span of time considered in the performance review is at least five years.

*New wording:*

Normally, an assistant professor must have the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree. (See Appendix 3: Terminal Degrees. Exceptions may be made for temporary appointments and when there are compensating factors.) When an assistant professor is reviewed for tenure, that review will also include a review for promotion according to the criteria in Section V; if tenure is granted without promotion, specific reasons for doing so must be made clear to all parties. When a tenured assistant professor is reviewed for promotion the criteria will be those of Section V. An assistant professor may not be reviewed for promotion prior to the tenure review. The review of an assistant professor for promotion should consider performance over all prior years of service at DePauw regardless of rank, and, if the faculty member has served fewer than five years at DePauw, evidence of immediately prior years of immediately prior service at other institutions also may be

included at the discretion of the candidate so that the span of time considered in the performance review is at least five years.

**Section 1.B.2.d.(3)**

*Current wording:*

When a faculty member is promoted to the rank of associate professor, he or she is entitled to tenure at that rank.

*New wording:*

Delete this subsection and renumber subsequent subsections.

The chair of COF stated that it is COF's responsibility to make recommendations related to the personnel process. In response to the memo from the Committee on Administration (COA) to COF last year about the time in rank requirement for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, COF has thoroughly discussed and considered COA's suggestion. As it turns out, the relevant section of the Handbook is in the portion written by the Administration. COF is prepared to forward its recommendation about changes to Handbook language to the Administration. The purpose of COA's recommendation was to reduce faculty workload, particularly with regard to cases where a candidate for tenure did not have enough years in rank to be considered for timely promotion; this frequently necessitated a second review only a few years later.

The chair of COF continued by noting that COF decided that if a probationary tenure-track candidate has met the standards of strong teaching, at least adequate performance in service and in scholarly or artistic work, and significant accomplishment in either service or in scholarly or artistic work, then promotion should be granted at the time that tenure is granted, rather than insisting (as do our present rules) that a certain number of years elapse after the completion of the terminal degree before such a promotion may occur. It appears to the members of COF that the linking of regular reviews for tenure and promotion, regardless of when the terminal degree was completed, is by far the standard procedure at other primarily undergraduate institutions.

The chair of COF noted that COF's recommended Handbook language differs from that suggested by COA. The language recommended by COF maintains the current standards for tenure, strong (or good) teaching, unquestioned promise of accomplishment in scholarly and artistic work (or professional development) and adequate service. With the revised Handbook language, if accepted by the Administration, a candidate who achieves the standard of strong (or good) teaching, and either significant scholarly and artistic work or significant service and adequate performance in the other category should be recommended for promotion at the time of the tenure review. This would reduce faculty workload for candidates, DPCs and COF because a second review would not need to be completed after the time in rank had been established when the standard for promotion had previously been met.

Since this is a change in favor of all candidates regardless of prior rules and criteria, the chair of COF stated that if the recommendation is accepted by the Administration, it would take effect immediately.

The chair of COF offered an opportunity for members of the faculty to comment on the language being recommended to the Administration for the Handbook. Please forward your comments to COF no later than Tuesday, February 17, after which time COF will forward their recommendation to the Administration. You may forward your comments directly to the chair of COF or to the COF coordinator, Carol Cox.

A faculty member asked if it were still possible for a faculty member to receive tenure without being promoted. The chair of COF responded that if the faculty member met the criteria for tenure, but not the criteria for promotion, it was possible to be granted tenure without promotion.

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

SLAAC had no report. The chair offered to answer any questions, but there were none.

***Report from Other Committees***

*Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

COA had no report. The chair offered to answer any questions, but there were none.

*Report from the Faculty Development Committee (Chair: John Schlotterbeck)*

The chair of FDC announced that the new faculty development coordinator will be David Guinee, who will be starting his term in the academic year 2009-2010. He also announced that the deadline for fall reports is March 16, not January 26 as noted in the agenda.

The following announcements were found in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The deadline for applications for money from the Student/Faculty Summer Research Fund is Wednesday, March 4.
- Faculty Fellowship reports for years one and two are due Wednesday, May 6.
- Summer Stipends for Faculty Development awards are suspended for Summer 2009.
- Reports for projects awarded for the Fall 2008 semester were due Monday, January 26. Please send them to Terry Bruner as soon as possible. ***[See above for change of this date to March 16]***
- The new limits for reimbursement for meals is \$50/day, with a limit of \$10 for breakfast, \$20 for lunch, and \$30 for dinner.

*Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (Chair: Dave Berque)*

FGSC had no further report. The chair offered to answer any questions, but there were none.

The following announcement was found in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The FGSC has selected the following faculty representatives to the University Assessment Committee for the balance of the academic year: Bob Hershberger and Bruce Serlin.

***Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA noted that the budget planning schedule for this year is different than in previous years. The schedule has been moved up by two months – the budgets will be sent to departments and programs in mid-February. He noted that if faculty members wanted to contribute ideas for savings or to ask for items to be included in next year's budget, they should speak to their department chairs or program coordinators. The hope is to have the budget assembled and completed by the end of February.

***Old Business***

None.

## ***New Business***

None.

## ***Announcements***

Jim Benedix announced that Darwin Days will be celebrated at DePauw this year, as with previous years. He noted that anyone can join the Facebook group for “Charley Darwin.” If someone has an event linked to Charles Darwin, you can post it on the Wall for the Charley Darwin group, or e-mail Jim Benedix, and it will be promoted.

The following information was found in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- Jim Benedix (from the department of Biology) would like everyone to be aware of the following upcoming events linked to the celebration of the 200th anniversary of Charles Darwin's birth (DePauw Darwin Days 2009). The best way to be kept informed about all Darwin Days events and activities is to either a) become one of Charley Darwin's friends on Facebook, or b) write an e-mail to [darwindays@depauw.edu](mailto:darwindays@depauw.edu).
  - Darwin Birthday Party – Displays, cake, sign his card – 3:30-5:30 PM Thursday, February 12, in Julian Atrium.
  - Showing of PBS special “Darwin’s Dangerous Idea” – 6:30-8:30 PM Thursday, February 12, in Julian Auditorium (Julian 147).
  - Q&A with Michael Ruse, Scholar in the Philosophy of Biology, 11:30 AM-12:30 PM Thursday, February 19, in Julian Auditorium (Julian 147).
  - Keynote Address – Michael Ruse “Is Darwinism Past its ‘Sell-By’ Date? Reflections on The Origin of Species in 1859 and 2009” 4-5 PM Thursday, February 19, in Olin Auditorium (Olin 123).
  - More events coming

The Chair of the Faculty announced that Stefanie Niles was sick today but asked that he call attention to the written announcement in the agenda and share that she met with the Chairs recently to ask them to seek departmental support for admissions events. Stefanie asked that the Chair of the Faculty thank the faculty for their ongoing support of recruitment efforts, especially for opening classrooms and offices to prospective students.

The following announcement was found in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The Office of Admission requests your assistance in the recruitment process for the Class of 2013. As President Casey has indicated in earlier conversations, there is a significant priority placed on meeting our enrollment goals this year to assist with the financial pressures faced by the University. Towards this end, I will be asking for departments and programs to be represented, as they have for the past few years, at the Spring Admitted Student Open House on April 18th during the Community Fair. Your participation in this event, whether offering information about your academic area or providing more general information on academic life at DePauw, is greatly appreciated by our students.

In addition, I will also reach out to the entire faculty in the spring asking for volunteers to contact prospective students who may have an interest in your academic discipline. Again, these contacts are appreciated by prospective parents and students alike, and help reinforce the notion of the faculty's investment in the educational development and goals of each student. I hope you will assist us in this important effort.

***Executive Session to Consider Honorary Degrees***

The meeting moved to an Executive Session to consider candidates for Honorary Degrees.

***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:31 PM.

## ***Appendix to the Agenda for the January 2009 Faculty Meeting***

### **Remembrance Edward G. Ypma (1940-2008)**

Ed Ypma was a member of the Psychology Department at DePauw University for 38 years. Ed earned his Ph.D. at Purdue University, where he also met his wife (and DePauw's future Registrar) Ellie. Teaching at a liberal arts college and living the life of a small university professor was more of a free choice for Ed than for most of us. Ed's specialty area was Organizational Psychology, which is one of the few areas of our discipline where there are more jobs—in psychology, business, and management departments and in industry--available than there are qualified candidates. Ed could very easily have chosen a different and far more lucrative path. In fact, he turned down jobs paying more than twice as much in order to be at DePauw. That Ed so consciously chose to devote his career to teaching speaks loudly about his character. He remained a valuable member of our department for longer than some of our current faculty members have been alive.

In his many years at DePauw, Ed made a unique contribution to our curriculum through his teaching. He taught classes in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Consumer Psychology and Advertising, Cross-Cultural Theories of Management, Testing and Psychological Measurement, and Statistics. Several generations of Psychology majors, Management Fellows, Economics majors, Communications majors, and other DePauw students benefited from these courses. These classes, especially those in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Consumer Psychology and Advertising, and Cross-Cultural Management, played an important role in integrating our department into a much broader university context. Many alumni who now run their own companies and businesses have commented on how valuable and useful they found Ed's courses.

In addition, Ed sponsored departmental senior theses in his specialty area—and beyond-- as a service to our department and our students. Ed served as an advisor and mentor for many of our students who went on to careers in management, human resources, or academic work in business. Ed also applied his expertise beyond the university setting, often serving as a consultant and an expert witness in court cases.

Ed valued diversity, globalization, and international study in education long before these issues were in vogue. He served as a resident director of international programs in Freiberg, Germany, and Athens, Greece. Ed also had a special attachment to Japan and Japanese culture. He spent a year serving as GLCA resident director in Japan, and he hosted Japanese exchange students coming to DePauw for many years after that. Ed's expertise in cross-cultural approaches to business models, organizational structure, and management systems benefited our students for decades. His infectious enthusiasm for travel and international study afforded many DePauw students an opportunity to learn in another cultural setting.

Ed was for decades a model of humane treatment of colleagues and students. Ed was also a role model for how to deal with extreme adversity, especially serious injury and illness, with great courage and humor. Up to the very end of his life, Ed was positive in his outlook, and

remained an endless source of goodwill, kindness, and humor. Those of us fortunate enough to have known him celebrate his life, and we miss him greatly.

Ed's passion for travel, and his deep and abiding belief in the value of international education was fully shared by his wife, life partner, and professional colleague, Ellie Ypma. Ellie has worked with the DePauw Development Office to establish the Ypma Endowed Scholarship Fund to Support Study Abroad. This fund will provide scholarship support for selected students, to be known as Ypma Scholars, to study abroad for one semester or longer. The fund will give preference to students wishing to study in Asia. Anyone interested in contributing to the Ypma Endowed Scholarship Fund to Support Study Abroad may contact the DePauw University Development Office.



**Minutes for DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, March 2nd, 2009**

***Call to Order:***

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:04 PM.

***Verification of Quorum:***

There were more than 86 ballots distributed to voting faculty as they entered the meeting; therefore, quorum was verified. A total of 114 ballots had been distributed by the end of the meeting.

***Approval of Minutes from the February 2009 Faculty Meeting:***

The minutes of the February 2009 Faculty Meeting were approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

***Remarks from the President:***

The President thanked the Chair of the Faculty for the opportunity to speak, and noted that in a few minutes he would be turning the podium over to Tom Dixon, who would offer an update on DePauw's finances. The information Tom will share actually tracks quite closely to the information recently sent out on the University's finances. The President noted that the administration is moving toward finalizing the University's 2009-10 budget for preliminary review by Trustees at the April meetings of the Board. As he indicated in his letter to the University in his most recent communication about the University's finances, we are committed to certain principles as we construct this budget. He elaborated in the following report:

First, we are maintaining our primary and fundamental commitment to our core mission of teaching and learning. This does not mean that we won't see some cuts in areas that seem directly related to this mission, but, when we are making trade-offs, we are seeking to preserve the foundation of our fundamental enterprise as strongly as possible. Any single decision, when considered in isolation (whether it is the decision to reduce the hours of an office or change the closing time of a building, or a decision to not replace a person who has left a staff position) will feel acute to the office or area most directly affected, and might feel to be running counter to this first principle. But recognize that this year we are facing innumerable difficult tradeoffs and decisions. As I unfortunately had to say in my last letter to you, there is not a single area of the university that will be untouched by these trade-offs. Tom Dixon is leading the Cabinet in a series of budget exercises in which these tradeoffs come to a table for debate and discussion. Again, though, Tom knows what our priorities are and must be.

Second, we are committed to avoiding staff lay-offs. A significant number of our peers have announced lay-offs of staff members, but we are seeking to avoid this unless absolutely necessary. We expect though that, by not replacing positions that become vacant we will see a proportionate reduction in the number of staff positions as we will see on the faculty side as we do not replace those staff positions that become vacant.

Finally, we are committed to maintaining the strength of the faculty. As you know, however, we decided that one necessary response to the present situation is to not renew term faculty positions as these contracts end. This was an extraordinarily painful

decision to make. We have, however, continued with all tenure track searches that were authorized in the beginning of the year.

I will soon turn this over to Tom in a moment who will offer more details on all of these decisions.

Before that, I want to turn to that topic that will determine the long-term health of this institution – namely the intellectual life conversations. Later in this meeting, Dave Berque and the various committees will discuss how these conversations will move forward. I want to thank Dave, all the members of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee and the members of MAO, CAPP and SLACC for their incredible commitment to this process. I also want to thank the faculty as a whole for taking on these topics with such energy.

For this entire year I have maintained an email in box called intellectual life. Since our last faculty meeting, I have added well over 250 emails to that file. I have also received dozens of emails directly from individual faculty members. Among the comments and reactions I received were:

- Some wrote that they thought the five charges were too aggressive, covering too many issues.
- Others wrote that the charges failed to address some important areas that are necessary to consider if we are to significantly increase the intellectual energy and life of this campus, and thus did not go far enough.
- Some wrote that they were unhappy that I indicated some of my own thoughts, or preferences.
- Others speculated that I actually have a completed plan in my desk drawer, and I was being coy by not revealing its details.

I could address any one of these concerns. And I will gladly do so during our discussion about these charges, or after this meeting. But I will tell you know that the only plan I have is to ask this faculty to see what possibilities you can imagine. I remain convinced that the size and strength of this faculty, the quality of our facilities (which while not perfect, are actually strong), and the reputation this institution has already rightfully earned places before us the possibility to become one of the truly dynamic intellectual and creative communities in the nation.

Among the other comments I received were those that wondered whether we can actually move forward to specific charges without a lengthy discussion about what we are: I would put forward that we actually do know what we are. We are a liberal arts college committed to the broad education of our students, informed by a concern for their full development as ethical and empathetic citizens and committed to their obtainment of those critical skills of writing, speaking and analysis that will allow them to engage with the world with creativity and soundness of thought. We are also a School of Music that brings to us a profound commitment to the education in the arts. Together these two units form a university dedicated to teaching, learning, and creativity within a community of trust and concern.

As I noted, I am grateful for the energy that these conversations have already created. I am especially grateful that the faculty has committed this energy despite the difficulties of the charges, their considerable scope, and the comfort of the status quo.

I want to note also that alongside the Intellectual Life discussions that Dave will speak of shortly, the COA has begun their work with Neal Abraham on two extremely important

issues: faculty work load and the ways in which we might modify our academic administrative structures to best support the work of this faculty and the needs of our students. Neal and Marcia will speak of these later.

I also thank Dave for the way that he and the rest of the FGSC have included staff and student voices in these discussions. There will be a student forum in this room tomorrow at 6 o'clock – encourage your students to attend. There are also two staff teams that are involved in these discussions. Ultimately, however, it is the faculty that will have to lead the decisions about the university's intellectual life.

I'd like to now turn this to Tom Dixon.

Tom Dixon came to the podium and thanked the faculty for letting him come to talk with them. He stated that these are tough times, both at DePauw and globally. DePauw is fortunate, however, because we have a large endowment. He stated that he had just looked at the data, which show that the endowment is down 20%, which is good management given the current economic environment.

Tom noted that last year's (fiscal year 2008) deficit was \$3.2 million, and many of the recent previous years had deficits because of health insurance costs. The projected deficit for fiscal year 2009 is \$4.9 million, even taking into account the \$900,000 that VPs have already cut. The university was concerned about losing students due to financial reasons; Tom pointed out that Spring semester attrition does not seem to indicate a large problem, with about ten students leaving the university in the spring semester, including two from university housing. The financial aid situation was stable this semester.

Tom began speaking about the 2010 fiscal year budget by noting that there are three sources of revenue for the budget: net tuition fees (Tom noted that applications are up); gifts (Tom noted that gifts seemed to be flat this year, but the university is worried about next year); and the endowment. He stated that the endowment provides about \$25 million out of the \$100 million budget. The spending amount is determined using the past twelve trailing quarters; given that we have already had two very bad quarters, and possibly more to come, this will have a detrimental effect on the budget.

Tom stated that three possible budgets were presented to the Trustee budget committee – one based on an entering class of 600 students, one with a class of 675, and one with a class of 450 (Tom referred to the last scenario as "dropping off the cliff"). The administration convinced the Trustees that the planned 7% increase in tuition would not be feasible, so the Trustees approved a 4.5% increase. The fiscal year 2010 budget is being created using the following assumptions:

- There would be no layoffs, unless events change for the worst, instead staff numbers will be reduced by attrition. There have already been close to ten positions that have been left unfilled since July.
  - These lost positions will likely affect everyone at the University.
  - Particular changes could affect when buildings are locked up, or when event set-up and tear-down can occur; the administration is asking that there be no overtime for facilities crew.
  - This means that set-ups occurring after 3 PM will be a problem.
- We will maintain Development and Admissions staff as best we can – these are the people that get students into DePauw and get donations into DePauw, so it is important to keep them functioning.
- We will maintain financial aid as much as possible.
- There will be no salary increases unless contractually obligated.

These assumptions change if the incoming class is smaller than expected.

Tom then discussed some of the cuts that had been made by the VPs. He mentioned that \$2 million had already been cut before the Board meeting. He then noted some additional considerations in trying to keep the budgets under control:

- The number of claims made to health insurance have been much less than expected, which will help with health care costs.
- We hope to consolidate building use in the summer, to avoid air conditioning buildings with few people working in them.
- Work orders for facility improvements will be scrutinized carefully, to find work that can be postponed.
- Computer replacements will likely be delayed.
- Eighteen faculty term positions that have completed their terms will not be renewed.
- Additional attrition in staff positions is anticipated.
- The Walden Inn is being encouraged to balance its budget.
- Energy costs will be cut wherever possible.

Tom noted that the Board mandates that the administration present a balanced budget for next fiscal year by April. The balanced budget scenario will assume 635 students in the entering class; other conditional budgets will be presented, based on other possible incoming class sizes. In creating this budget, the VPs have been meeting every week since Thanksgiving, and Tom has met with COA several times. Departments have the budget planner available to allocate the budget. The budget should be complete for review by March 20, to present at the Board meeting in mid-April. Tom concluded his presentation, and the President returned to the podium and invited Tom to help him field questions.

A faculty member asked what enrollment number would signal that we had “dropped off the cliff?” Tom Dixon responded that it was a sliding scale, but 450 would be a dramatic drop off. The class size of 450 was used just to provide us with a big number as a deficit to encourage us to anticipate large budget cuts. President Casey added that 450 was a number they had been using, partly as a way to measure dips in retention. The number could signify a low entering class or a low retention rate from fall to spring. He stated that he did not think that DePauw was looking at something this bad, but things could change.

A faculty member asked if it was the intention to have a balanced budget for 2010. Tom responded that the University has been charged to present the Trustees with a balanced budget. To manage that, the implications to the core mission are difficult, so we may have to make compromises to make sure the core mission is satisfied. He added that he suspects that the Board may eventually agree to a modest deficit next year, with a balanced budget the following year.

Another faculty member asked how much of the \$4.9 million deficit in 2008-2009 comes from the Walden Inn. Tom responded that \$587,000 of the deficit comes from the Walden Inn, down from \$1 million the previous year. He continued by noting that the Walden Inn has cut many controllable expenses, so it needs to focus on increasing revenue. President Casey added that he does not think that DePauw will ever have an inn that makes much money. He noted that many colleges our size have inns that do not make money. He said we need an inn to serve admissions visits, visiting speakers, and so on. He said we need to decide what an acceptable subsidy for an inn on campus is.

A faculty member asked what the thinking was about opportunity hires. President Casey responded that the university is leaving open the possibility of opportunity hires, but the bar will be set extremely high, so it would need to be an extremely good opportunity. The VPAA added that he expects several proposals this year, and we will continue to use the process we have in place (beginning with advice from RAS on the proposal) to determine if it is an extraordinary opportunity. If appointments through the opportunity hiring process continue, the university will be squeezing an already tight budget for faculty salaries to do so.

Another faculty member asked whether the University would be accounting for fewer opportunities to

present at conferences in our personnel review process since less conference travel money is available? The VPAA responded that he had sent an e-mail to all faculty members to ask them to make conference funding requests by today to see how much money would be requested. The budget for such requests for this year has just about been committed. In the budget planning for next year, the support for intellectual life will be an important priority. There will be fewer faculty members, which will relieve the pressure on the professional conference budget somewhat. In addition, some conferences are limiting their scope or changing their format, which could also relieve the pressures on the budget. President Casey added that the budget for conference funds has been speculative, laid out without exact knowledge of the requests that would come in. In years past, the budgets were flexible enough that money could be moved from areas with surpluses to cover overages in this area; this is not the case this year. He also noted that Tom Dixon has been committed to the institution and has been a great help to the President in his transition.

Another faculty member asked about phones on campus. Given that so many faculty, staff, and students have cell phones, can we reduce the number of land lines on campus to save money? President Casey responded that he had not thought about it, and that it would represent a big cultural shift. Tom noted that DePauw has a phone switch that is ancient. The switch does not cost much, except for maintenance. He will look into this change, but is not sure that it will save much money. The VPAA noted that departmental phone budgets are already pretty low, so there would be little savings from that area.

### ***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

The chair of MAO noted that there had been quite a few new course proposals at the last MAO meeting. He made a motion that the faculty approve the following ten new courses:

##### *ENG 350: Writing in Literary Studies, 1 credit, Group 3 Literature*

English 350, a course for upper-level English majors, will present students with a means for developing their writing and research skills as they enter into the larger conversations in our field of study. This course asks students to examine the ways our particular academic discipline writes about literature—the forms, the approaches, the structures we employ—while also asking them to expand their methods of writing for academic and non-academic audiences. The focus here is on student writing: the five major writing projects and peer workshop offer students a means of working within the theoretical approaches to literature discussed in English 351, Principles of Literary Study, a companion course to 350 (Note: although ENG 351 and ENG 350 are companion courses, they are designed so as to not require one to be the pre-requisite for the other). Students preparing for senior seminars in English and graduate study in the humanities are encouraged to take this course.

##### *SOC 220: Sociology of Hip Hop, 1 credit, Group 2*

This course is a socio-historical analysis of hip hop, examining the conditions for the creation and continued existence of this genre of music. We approach it through theoretical frameworks such as Marxism and feminism, address questions such as how capitalism and the commodification of hip hop affect our society. In addition, how do artists conceptualize and present masculinity and femininity? Is it really okay to be a P.I.M.P., hustler, or player? Finally, what role does race and ethnicity have in hip hop music? Are white artists such as Eminem really appropriating the culture from minorities? Our intent is to discover how the socially constructed characteristics of race, class, and gender are addressed and conveyed in hip hop music.

*SOC 340: Sociology of Popular Culture, 1 credit, Group 2*

This course examines what is commonly referred to as popular culture. Of course, popular culture can constitute any number of aspects including, art, soap operas, comic books, sports, music, the clothes we wear, movies we see, the media, and the foods we eat, among other things. We will begin the course defining and dissecting popular culture from a sociological perspective. We will explore whether popular culture is high brow or low brow and who has the power to classify it as such. Also, we will address whether popular culture is created by and for the people, or whether it is created by a dominant or elite group that imposes their will on the masses. Who are the producers and consumers of popular culture? Are they one in the same? Along the way we will examine how various disciplines or groups such as Cultural Studies or the Production of Cultural Studies view and explain popular culture. Finally, no sociology course is complete without exploring how various theorists and theories, such as Marxism, Feminism, or Gramsci's idea of hegemony illuminate our understanding of popular culture.

*ANTH 260: Wars and Militarism, 1 credit, Group 2*

This seminar is on wars and militarism and how these effect and shape human lives. We discuss whether or not wars and the concomitant militarization of human societies are inevitable aspects of our existence. Do wars and militarism reflect primordial human biological and psychological instincts and are therefore inevitable features of human existence? Or can these be traced to certain social, political, and economic contingencies and processes? Can wars be conceptualized only in terms of armed conflicts between nation-states or do wars encompass much more than is usually accepted or understood? This course is intended to blur several boundaries: normative understandings of wars and peace; differences between legitimate and unjust wars; and wars waged by nation-states and by insurgent and terrorist groups. Through an interdisciplinary lens that brings together insights from anthropology, security-studies, cultural-studies, feminist theory, political-science and history, we will define, identify, and understand the different kinds of wars that are being fought in contemporary times. The focus of the course will be to highlight the lived experience of wars and militarism, the strategies of survival that people employ in sometimes extremely adverse situations; the underlying assumptions of wars and militarism that are reflected in social institutions seemingly little connected to them; and most importantly, the power differences that underpin and drive contemporary wars.

*ANTH 355: Anthropology of Development, 1 credit, Group 2*

Development is often considered synonymous with progress and economic growth. This course seeks to challenge the framework within which development policies and practices have been conceptualized since the 1940s. How do discourses and practices of development reflect struggles over power, history, and culture? Why has development often been understood as a "neocolonial" endeavor that seeks to maintain the global hegemony of the first world over the third world? How has the trajectory of development shifted in the past five decades to encompass divergent agendas, practices, and meanings? How have these "macro" agendas shaped the lives of millions of men and women living across the globe? Can development be understood as a monolithic category or is it experienced differently by men and women cross-culturally? This course will also highlight some of the most pressing concerns over the merits and limitations of globalization thereby engaging students with ongoing social, political and economic debates. Using anthropological insights, we will explore the connections between colonialism, development, capitalism, and globalization to analyze how "development" is embedded in social inequities, and whether or not a more equitable form of development can be envisioned.

*ARAB 191: Beginning Arabic I, 1 credit, Group 5*

This course employs the communicative approach to language learning, stressing correct pronunciation, aural comprehension, and basic speaking ability. The major components of each chapter are vocabulary, story, culture, grammar, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, writing and speaking activities, and snippets of colloquial conversation in the widely used dialects of Egypt, the Levant, and North Africa. Grammar is learned inductively with special attention given to morphology.

*ARAB 192: Beginning Arabic II, 1 credit, Group 5*

This course is a continuation of Beginning Arabic I, the first course in Modern Standard Arabic. The course employs the communicative approach to language learning, stressing correct pronunciation, aural comprehension, and basic speaking ability. The major components of each chapter are vocabulary, story, culture, grammar, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, writing and speaking activities, and snippets of colloquial conversation in the widely used dialects of Egypt, the Levant, and North Africa. Grammar is learned inductively with special attention given to morphology. Prerequisite: ARAB 191.

*ARAB 291: Intermediate Arabic I, 1 credit, Group 5*

This course introduces students to Intermediate Arabic, the third course in Modern Standard Arabic. The course employs the communicative approach to language learning, stressing correct pronunciation, aural comprehension, and speaking ability. Grammar is learned inductively with special attention given to morphology. Prerequisite: ARAB 192.

*ML 194: Arabic Literature in Translation, 1 credit, Group 3 Literature*

In this course we will study modern and contemporary works of Arabic literature in a variety of genres: the novel, novella, short story, and poetry. Basic principles of literary analysis will be covered at the beginning of the course, with special attention given to the development of the mentioned genres in their various Arab settings and in the context of particular literary movements. The bulk of the reading will be in the primary sources themselves (novels, novellas, short stories, and poems). Among the authors covered are the Nobel laureate Naguib Mahfouz, Abdulrahman Munif, Elias Khoury, Hanan al-Shaykh, Etel Adnan, Adonis, and Mahmoud Darwish. We will look at film adaptations of a number of Arabic novels. Knowledge of Arabic is not required, but issues of translation will often be presented and discussed. Cross-listed as ENG 155.

*ARTH 133: Asian Art Survey, 1 credit, Group 3*

A survey of East Asian Art analyzing the major developments in the art and architecture of China, Japan, and Korea over a range of media. We will study some of the various methodologies that can be applied to East Asian Art as well as key themes in the chronological and historical development of visual cultures against the background of political, social, and cultural contexts. Cross-listed with Asian Studies.

Since the motion comes from a standing committee, no second was needed. There was no discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The chair of MAO made a motion that the faculty approve the following revisions to the major and minor in Computer Science, and accompanying new courses, effective for incoming students beginning in the fall of 2009, and available as an option for current students. Additions are in **bold**, and deletions are in ~~strikethrough~~:

*Requirements for a major in Computer Science*

Total courses required: ~~Eight~~ **Ten** CSC + MATH 123 ~~and MATH 223~~

Core courses: CSC 121, CSC 122, ~~CSC 221, CSC 222,~~ **CSC 231, CSC 232, CSC 233**, CSC 498

Other required courses: ~~One course from the following is also required: CSC 422, CSC 424, CSC 426, CSC 428.~~ **One CSC course at the 400 level in addition to CSC 498.**

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

Senior requirement: The senior requirement is CSC 498.

Additional information:

- MATH 123 ~~and MATH 223~~ **are also required.**
- **MATH 223 may be substituted for MATH 123 with approval of the advisor.**

- With the approval of the advisor one of the 300 level CSC courses may be replaced by an allied course from another department.
- Students are encouraged to complete an internship or research experience related to the major. This is not a requirement, however, and no departmental credit is awarded for these experiences.
- The advisor will offer guidance on selection of courses inside and outside of the department for students who may be interested in focusing on particular areas related to computer science.

*Requirements for a minor in Computer Science*

Total courses required: Five

Core courses: CSC 121 and CSC 122

Other required courses: **At least two of the courses from: CSC 231, CSC 232, CSC 233. At least one CSC course at the 300 or 400 level.**

# 300 and 400 level courses: One

***New courses:***

*CSC 231: Computer Systems, 1 credit, Group 1*

This is an introduction to the study of computer hardware and its relationship to software. Topics include information representation, architecture of the central processing unit, memory organization and hierarchy, assembly language and machine level representation of programs, interactions and relationships among system components (hardware, operating systems, compilers, network environments), and the impact of architectural decisions on performance. Prerequisites: CSC122. Offered each semester. Not offered pass/fail. Not open to students who have credit for CSC221.

*CSC 232: Software Development, 1 credit, Group 1*

A study of fundamental software development techniques and tools for managing medium to large scale software projects, together with relevant professional and ethical issues. Topics covered include methodologies for specification, design, documentation, and testing, and tools for code management, analysis, and debugging. Students will develop skills in individual and team software development through extensive practice in reading, writing, documenting, presenting, and critiquing programs. Prerequisites: CSC122. Offered each semester. Not offered pass/fail.

*CSC 233: Foundations of Computation, 1 credit, Group 1*

This course explores the theoretical foundations of computation at various levels of abstraction. Specific topics include graph theory and related algorithms; functional programming with an emphasis on recursion and recurrences; the description of languages using formalisms such as regular expressions, finite state machines, and context free grammars; and digital logic and its application to sequential and combinational circuits. Prerequisite: CSC 122 and MATH 123. Offered each semester. Not offered pass/fail.

The chair of MAO spoke briefly on the motion by noting that the changes had come out of the recent departmental self-study. The department has revised the courses that make up the core curriculum, adding one course to the core. The number of courses required for the major has increased by one overall.

Since the motion was from a standing committee, it needed no second.

A faculty member asked what course MATH 123 was, and whether it has any prerequisites. The chair of MAO responded that it is Computational Discrete Mathematics, and it does not have any prerequisites.



Another faculty member asked about how many majors required eight courses versus ten courses? The Registrar responded that majors are allowed to have anywhere from eight to ten courses in the major department, along with up to four courses outside the department. He did not have exact numbers, but he noted that there were few departments that only required eight courses from the department.

There was no further discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The following announcements were included in the agenda, but not read during the meeting. The chair of the Modern Languages department noted a typo in the announcements (corrected below); the course listed on the agenda as ML 140 should be SPAN 140.

The following courses have had a change in course number, title, description, and/or prerequisites.

- PHYS 110: Physics and Society (was Physics for Poets; title and description change)
- PHYS 480: Senior Seminar (was Senior Project; title and description change)
- REL 141: Hebrew Bible (was The Hebrew Scripture; title and description change)
- SPAN 140: Intensive Elementary Spanish (was Review of Elementary Spanish; title change)
- PHIL 313: Death: Philosophical Approaches (was Death; title change)
- CSC 121: Computer Science I (description change)
- CSC 122: Introduction to Data Structures (was Computer Science II; title, description, and prerequisite change)
- CSC 320: Human Computer Interaction (prerequisite change)
- CSC 322: Computer Networking (was CSC 422; number and prerequisite change)
- CSC 330: Artificial Intelligence (prerequisite change)
- CSC 350: Graphics (prerequisite change)
- CSC 424: Programming Languages (prerequisite change)
- CSC 426: Compilers (prerequisite change)
- CSC 428: Operating Systems (prerequisite change)
- CSC 440: Theory of Computation (was CSC 341; number and prerequisite change)
- CSC 480: Database and File Systems (was CSC 381; number and prerequisite change)
- CSC 498: Senior Project (prerequisite change)

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning - (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

The chair of CAPP had no report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty – (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The chair of COF had no report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

- COF continues to discuss the COA memo about file size.
- COF continues its work reviewing files.

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee - (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC had no report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

## ***Reports from Other Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

### *Report from the Committee on Administration - (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

The chair of COA had no report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

- President Casey has asked that COA continue our conversations about faculty workload and how best to address the adjustments needed to facilitate the curricular and co-curricular proposals to enhance DePauw's intellectual life. This means we will resume discussions of possible proposals for achieving a standard 5-course per year workload as well as discussions of the appropriate timetable for working out the details of both the goals and the transitions to them in a way that best supports the responses to the charge President Casey has given the faculty to consider. Also, COA will be engaged in discussions with President Casey, VPAA Abraham and possibly others on how best to ensure that the structure of our academic administration meets the needs of our intellectual life.

### *Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee - (Chair: Dave Berque)*

The chair of the faculty stated that he wanted to offer a report on the FGSC related to intellectual life. Here is his report:

I would like to offer a report on behalf of the FGSC related to the intellectual life discussions. I will keep my remarks brief to save time for you to ask questions of, and offer suggestions to, all the members of the FGSC.

I wish to begin by thanking each of you who has given feedback and suggestions to the FGSC as we have refined this process. Each suggestion has been considered by the entire committee. Based on your feedback, we have altered, refined, expanded and generally improved our approach. In every case we have appreciated the input. And we know you will keep it coming.

You have before you a handout entitled "2008-2009 Updated Timeline: A Handout for the March 2nd 2009 Faculty Meeting." The handout reviews where we have been (mostly page one) shows where we are currently (the bottom of page one) and outlines where we are heading (pages two and three). I will refer you to that handout, which was also distributed by email and is archived on the intellectual life Moodle site, for dates, deadlines and the other details of our process. I will focus my remarks only on providing an overview of how we will proceed.

Currently four cross-committee teams, formed from your elected faculty representatives to CAPP/MAO/SLAAC, are each working hard to develop a proposal that addresses all of President Casey's charges. You are encouraged to send members of these teams your ideas now, or any time this spring. The team rosters are printed on the final page of your handout.

An official student team, an official staff team, and an official joint Academic Affairs and Student Life team have also been formed at the request of the FGSC. A variety of

contributed teams are also organizing themselves (and may continue to do so). These teams are also working on proposals. After proposals are received and posted a week-long series of open meetings for faculty, staff, and students is planned. Tentatively ten different sessions are scheduled. You are encouraged to attend one or more of these as your schedule permits. The FGSC respectfully [respectfully] asks senior administrators to refrain from attending this first round of meetings.

A second round of open, written proposals from official and contributed teams will be informed by the meetings. This set of proposals, in turn, will be followed by a second round of open meetings. At this stage senior administrators are encouraged to participate in the meetings.

Next, the official cross-committee faculty teams will work to develop revised proposals as well as a series of related "in principle" straw-poll questions. These polls will be conducted electronically before the May faculty meeting. For those who have been waiting all semester to learn what an "in principle vote" means here you have it. Since these polls will be conducted outside of a formal faculty meeting they will not enact legislative changes; however, they will capture the sense of the faculty "in principle" and will provide a basis for further work. Results of the polls will be presented to the faculty at the May meeting for discussion. At the same time, a motion, found in its preliminary, tentative, subject-to-change, non-final, open-to-hearing-your-input, DRAFT form on the third page of the handout will be put before the faculty for a formal vote.

The motion, if approved, charges a group, who will be named before the May meeting, to work over the summer to build on the proposals, straw polls, discussion at the May faculty meeting, scholarly literature, and DePauw historical documents. The group will present the faculty with concrete proposals to consider for discussion at Faculty Institute 2009 with subsequent "not in-principle" faculty legislative action to follow as warranted.

The chair of FGSC then invited questions.

A faculty member asked if the committee that will be working over the summer will be staffed with individuals that have been working on the proposals this year, or will it contain individuals with "fresh eyes?" The chair of FGSC responded that it has not yet been completely decided. He said that the current thinking is that it will be a combination of old and new members. A proposal for the makeup of this committee will likely be presented at the April faculty meeting.

Another faculty member asked if new proposals will be allowed in the second round or proposals? The chair of FGSC responded that the hope is that during the second round we will be revising and working on current proposals, but we do not plan to limit ourselves by completely excluding new proposals.

A faculty member asked if any thought has been given to rolling out the information before the Faculty Institute, so that the Institute can be used to finalize things. The chair of FGSC stated that they had not thought about it, and invited comment from the other members of FGSC. The chair of COF stated that she thought something could be given to the faculty two weeks before the Institute, so conversations can begin. The chair of FGSC asked the faculty member for clarification – the faculty member stated he had been thinking of a meeting before the institute, not just receiving the information. The chair of FGSC said that was an interesting idea, and it would be considered.

A faculty member had a question about the written announcement in the agenda. The group of faculty representatives to the Task Force on the Status of Women looks like a good group, but there seem to be very few tenured faculty members on this committee. She stated that we should get more tenured faculty members on this task force, so there would be more experience on the task force and to protect

the less experienced members. The chair of FGSC stated that there were not many tenured faculty members that volunteered. [Later in the meeting the chair clarified that there were two tenured volunteers who were unavailable during the summer and fall.] The faculty member asked more tenured faculty members to volunteer.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

- The FGSC has selected the following faculty representatives to the Task Force on the Status of Women at DePauw: Mandy Henk, Marie Pickerill, Michael Roberts, Francesca Seaman and Alicia Suarez.

*Report from the Library Advisory Committee (Chair: Doug Harms)*

The chair of the Library Advisory Committee had no report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

**The Government Documents Collection**

The University Libraries would like to enhance the use and usability of the Government Documents collection by undertaking a collaborative project to identify the materials most appropriate for you, your students and your research.

DePauw University Libraries are the oldest depository of US Government documents in the state, offering an array of reports and information from a variety of government agencies. We are a partial depository, receiving only a portion of government documents. There are many depository libraries in Indiana and the US, including IU and the State library, which are both full depositories.

The government documents collection can be of tremendous benefit to students and researchers, but in its current state, poses certain challenges to users and to the library:

- Not all items are included in the library catalog. The sheer volume of material over the years has outstripped our ability to create catalog records for each item.
- Much of the material is quickly outdated. Items such as agency telephone directories, newsletters and superseded documents may no longer serve a curricular purpose for DePauw.
- The collection receives little use, but occupies a large percentage of our available shelving and floor space.
- The Government Printing Office (GPO) increasingly publishes these documents online.

In combination, these factors limit the usability of the collection.

There are a great many items, both current and historical, that we will wish to retain. For items that the library and the faculty jointly determine are less useful, there are statewide and national efforts underway to develop comprehensive archives of government documents for rapid access via interlibrary loan. We will work with these efforts to ensure access to all government documents for the DePauw Community, and to ensure that no "last copies" are lost or discarded.

We will develop lists and descriptions of publications and document types to share with you soon. Over the course of the spring semester we will meet with you individually and with departments as appropriate to discuss your use of this collection. Our goal is to enhance the use of this (and all) library collections. Please share your thoughts with any

member of the committee (Doug Harms - Chair, Neal Abraham, Meryl Altman, Dayna Brownfield, Julia Bruggemann, Brooke Cox, Kathryn Millis, Rick Provine).

*Report from the Faculty Development Committee - (Chair: John Schlotterbeck)*

The chair of the FDC noted that he was speaking for himself only – the FDC had not met to discuss this yet. He noted that last week, faculty members had received e-mail from the VPAA announcing that the Professional Development Fund was exhausted and that the Professional Conference Fund is almost exhausted. The FDC is meeting Tuesday to recommend priorities for these remaining funds and you will hear from us soon.

The chair stated that he first became aware of the situation on Wednesday, February 18. In past years, the VPAA has found money to pay for almost all requests, but the university is down about \$20,000 this year from previous spending levels of around \$200,000. The chair urged the VPAA to see if additional funds could be secured, noting that faculty members had no prior warning funds were low and several people presenting papers had not put in their requests. The VPAA and the President have met and discussed the situation.

The chair reminded the faculty that both PDF and PCF are awarded on a “first-come/first served” basis. PDF requests are reviewed by four people from the FDC; PCF awards are automatic. Both require receipts for reimbursement for actual expenses. Because of tighter budgets funds have run out much earlier than usual. FDC may consider policy changes for next year to address this situation. Even though each full-time faculty member has a 3-year allocation of \$3,000 for conferences, like Social Security, there is no actual line of credit. These requests are funded out of the current budget, not out of money set aside in a personal account.

A faculty member asked if it was possible to make sure the receipts are turned in, to make sure that allocated funds are actually spent? She noted that this would help determine how much money was actually available. The chair of FDC agreed that this was a good idea, and prompted faculty members to get in their receipts as soon as possible.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting.

- Reminder that applications for Faculty-Student Collaborative Research Grants are due March 4.

***Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA began his remarks by noting that COF has recommended to the administration that the “time in rank” requirement for eligibility for timely promotion to Associate Professor be removed. Details of this proposed change can be found in last month’s minutes. The VPAA stated that the President and he are favorably inclined to make this change. They invite further comments on this change, to be received by March 15, before they make a final decision. If there are substantive comments, they will return them to COF for further discussion.

The VPAA continued by noting that the campus-wide discussions of the possibilities for the third new AQIP project (needed as part of our procedures for retaining accreditation, and complementing the two projects already chosen – intellectual life and fulfilling the President’s climate commitment) generated many suggestions. Many of the suggestions are already being pursued as part of our normal business as well as through special endeavors such as the Task Force on Family Friendly Policies for employees and students. Following review of the recommendation of the AQIP Steering Committee, the administration has selected the topic of “sustainability collaborative projects with the surrounding communities” for the third AQIP project. Details of our efforts on all the AQIP projects, past and

present, are available through the AQIP link under e-services. The VPAA continued by noting that the listed projects are not the only things we will be doing as a university. Many projects are underway, and being addressed in other ways. AQIP is a process that allows us to maintain our accreditation by identifying particular projects on which we are working that are observed by outside monitors.

The VPAA stated that Marnie McInnes, who currently serves as Dean of Academic Life and who holds a faculty position as well, has been granted a sabbatical for the next year. She has agreed to continue to provide support for student applicants and faculty mentors for nationally competitive scholarships and fellowships both next year and in subsequent years, but she will relinquish her other duties and title as Dean of Academic Life. For the interim year next year, it is the University's plan to recruit a tenured faculty member to serve one-third time or half time as an Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs to assist in providing administrative support for one or more of such things as first-year seminars, orientation, academic advising, and academic policies established in consultation with SLAAC, such as grade grievances and academic integrity matters; as well, next year's Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs will work with the VPAA to plan for the future design/re-design of the academic administration to help facilitate an administrative structure that might better address support for teaching and learning, support and programming for the first-year students, and academic advising and career development. A more long-range restructuring of academic administrative duties to best support the outcomes of programs, policies and plans resulting from the intellectual life discussions will be forthcoming as those plans unfold over the coming year, with a key feature of any plan being the increased inclusion of tenured faculty members for rotating terms in key academic administrative positions. The VPAA noted that this is a return to a model that has been used in the past, and used successfully. He then invited expressions of interest from and nominations of tenured faculty members for work in academic administration for next academic year part time; please send the VPAA these no later than Friday, March 13. The VPAA hopes to fill this position by the first week of April.

The VPAA continued his report by noting that, at the charge of President Casey, he and COA have resumed and will be continuing conversations about the faculty workload issues to ensure that the possible changes will best support the proposals that emerge from the intellectual life discussions. They firmly believe that the goal is to enhance the intellectual life by achieving a better balance of responsibilities within the overall workload.

The VPAA is continuing to monitor the comparisons of average faculty salaries and average total faculty compensation by rank. The preliminary data shows that DePauw has continued progress in the relative ranks (in comparison with peer Midwest liberal arts colleges) from 2007-08 to 2008-09. Based on fragmentary information from peer institutions of their plans for next year, he believes that DePauw will likely maintain its present relative ranking for next year. More will be known by the May meeting of the faculty, and perhaps sooner, after all the peer data for 2008-2009 has been reported and made public.

The VPAA concluded his remarks by commenting on the budget. With regard to this year's budget deficit, the university still needs your help and support in economizing on expenditures this fiscal year. If there are things we can reasonably do to limit expenditures this year without serious degradation of our intellectual life, please do so. Every little bit will help us in our endeavors to address the challenges in this year's budget.

The VPAA invited any questions, but none were asked.

### ***Old Business***

None.

***New Business***

None.

***Announcements***

Kellin Stanfield has been elected to a spring 2009 replacement position as Division Four representative to SLAAC.

Divisional election results are available as a separate handout.

***Adjournment***

The faculty meeting was adjourned at 5:12 PM.

**Minutes for DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, April 6th, 2009**

***Call to Order:***

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:08 PM.

***Verification of Quorum:***

There were more than 86 ballots distributed to voting faculty as they entered the meeting; therefore, quorum was verified. A total of 113 ballots had been distributed by the end of the meeting.

***Approval of Minutes from the March 2009 Faculty Meeting:***

The minutes of the March 2009 Faculty Meeting were approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

***Remarks from the President:***

The President opened his remarks by stating that he wished to offer the faculty updates on the University's finances and on planning efforts outside of the intellectual life conversations, and then talk about the intellectual life conversations that have been going on. He then plans to turn over the floor to Ray Burgman, who will speak about the new committee on women and family policies.

With regards to the University's finances, the President stated that we are working on the budget for 2009-2010, which will be preliminarily endorsed by the Board of Trustees (we need to wait for admissions information to finalize the budget). The President has had a series of meetings with the Executive Committee of the Board regarding the University's budget, and he noted that the Board remains focused on balancing the budget next year.

The President noted that the 2007-2008 budget closed with an over \$3 million deficit. This year, with the budget already approved, the budget deficit grew to over \$4 million. Among the major reasons for the growth in that deficit were difficulties in the debt market, which increased the cost of the debt that the University has taken on over the past few years. In fact, the President noted that it was a bit of a triumph to get new lines of credit – he thanked Tom Dixon for his hard work in negotiating the University's two new lines of credit. Other issues affecting the deficit were continuing issues with the Walden Inn and pressures in fuel costs and health care costs. The President stated that the University has put together special committees to look at both health care costs and the operations of the Walden Inn, and he was happy to report that we have made significant headway in addressing these issues.

The President continued by stating that we still face pressures trying to balance next year's budget. The Vice Presidents have been directed to take significant funds out of the operating budgets, we have had a *de facto* hiring freeze since October, we will have a salary freeze across all sectors next year, and we have decided that we could not continue non-tenured appointments as they came to term. These measures are painful but necessary. This brings the University closer to a balanced budget, but does not yet balance it, so we must continue to look at all options.

The President stated that we will have to look at the budget for the next several years. The budget is based on the average of the twelve trailing quarters of endowment performance, and 5.5% of that value is included in the budget. By next year, six of the twelve quarters will have depressed values, which will make our budget concerns even worse. The President has asked Tom Dixon to model the budget by assuming that we will see modest but consistent increases in our endowment over two years, beginning late next year. The endowment will keep pressure on the budget for a number of years; the question is



at what pace will we see the recovery of the loss in value of the endowment. He noted that he will have a lot to report after the Board of Trustees meeting in April.

The President noted that we are waiting for word on how the admissions cycle will look this year, as well as for what will happen to the Annual Fund and the endowment. Given the unusual admissions cycle, the slowly recovering endowment, and depressed alumni giving, we have to keep looking at budget-balancing options, in line with the Board's call for a balanced budget. Among the options that remain on the table are decreasing VEBA contributions, looking at a reduction in benefits, a reduction in salaries, or terminating employees. The President referred to this as the "parade of horrors," and stated that he hoped that we will not have to do all or most of these things, but we have to keep them available as options as the Board of Trustees is calling for a balanced budget.

The President continued by stating that he has remained extremely committed to two things: first, not terminating staff, and second (based on the recommendations of the faculty committees last year), we have clung to keeping all tenure and tenure-track faculty searches going this year. This makes DePauw one of the few GLCA schools to do this. Staying committed to these things has restricted some of the other financial options that we could have taken, but the President stated that he felt these were important and that he stands by them. He noted that Tom Dixon and the VPAA have been working with COA about these decisions, and we will report to the whole community about the budget situation.

The President said that before he discussed intellectual life, he wanted to mention two other planning conversations that will soon gather greater speed and importance with help and input from the faculty. First, he noted that we want to know who is attracted to DePauw and who is not. A Board of Trustees committee and a faculty committee are working in this area, and we are surveying students who are interested in attending liberal arts colleges, and seeing who applies to DePauw and who does not. We will also be looking at our marketing partner, who produces admissions marketing material; we have used the same firm for a while, and are considering all our options.

Second, the President noted that our campus planning efforts are progressing; he views this effort as being directly related to the intellectual life conversations and to our admissions efforts. We must make our environs as stimulating and connecting as our academic program. He noted that hiring a campus planning firm is an effort focused primarily on how to improve the intellectual and social liveliness of the campus. We have interviewed several firms and one thing the firms noted was that it was hard to find the campus, and that there are no good obvious entrances to campus – we need to make our entrances bold and noble. The campus planning committee has met with five firms, and the President hopes to announce a choice of a firm soon (within a week or two). The President concluded this section by noting that with this effort and the admissions effort, we will move forward as funds allow – especially external funds. He hopes that these planning initiatives will put no pressure on the operating budget.

The President then began his discussion of intellectual life by stating that this is the most important thing for us to do now. Intellectual life is the core of our endeavors; our curriculum is our soul, it is what we tell the world we believe in, and how we believe students at institutions such as DePauw should be educated. This will define what we are in the future, and will place us in a stronger position with the best students in the country. Only if we have a compelling vision of our education can we attract strong, compelling, and interesting students.

The President has attended a few national meetings of various groups, and there is an intense national conversation about the state of the liberal arts today. We need to be clear about what we think liberal arts means and how it is relevant in the world today. DePauw must show that it has a foundation that is strong, and we must present a clear way that we connect this foundation to life's work. All of our peer institutions are trying to figure this out.

The President noted that DePauw has most of the pieces in place already; we have a strong faculty and a strong tradition in the liberal arts. We have also created a number of programs that connect the liberal arts to life's work. We have created winter term programs and internship structures, among other programs. We just need to ensure that, together, our curriculum and our co-curriculum are clear and compelling.

The President has, in conversations with the Mellon Foundation about what is happening with intellectual life at DePauw, shared with them the process this faculty has engaged in this year. He was happy to report that they are rather interested and impressed, and have been very supportive of what is happening and will be providing funds to cover the costs of these continuing conversations.

The President fully endorsed the faculty governance steering committee's proposed timetable, though he remains concerned about momentum and energy. He thinks we must take the sufficient and necessary time to consider all the issues before us well, but he hopes that we do not lose momentum, and that extra time does not falsely lull us into thinking we do not need to act boldly. He also stressed that now is the time to think institutionally, not programmatically. The temptation is to think only about a single program and what it brings to the students it serves. The weight of the status quo can actually feel like comfort.

Finally, the President asked that the faculty think boldly about DePauw. He does not want to be in a faculty meeting here in a year, or in three years, telling us that we hope that we make our class. He'd rather be here speaking about how we have created a compelling picture of the liberal arts for our times, with clear and coherent ways that we uniquely prepare our students for the world. He wants to report that we have become the envy of our peers, and the desired school of the best students in the nation. The moment is now; this is a national issue now. We would like to be first out of the gate.

The President then asked Ray Burgman to come up and speak about the Task Force on Women and Families.

Ray stated that the President has charged the Task Force on Women and Families with assessing the current status of women faculty, staff, and students and the nature and extent of our family-friendly policies and what type of environment we have at DePauw. The Task Force plans to review current practice and policies, review the policies of other institutions, and conduct surveys and focus groups during the fall. The final report is due in December to the President. In the meantime, the Task Force is setting up various ways for faculty members to communicate with them prior to the fall semester. The Task Force will send an e-mail message to faculty and staff to let them know how they can communicate with us; this e-mail will be coming within a few days. Outside of these immediate communication formats, you can also contact a task force member. The members of the Task Force are Raymonda Burgman, Mandy Henk, Jeannette Johnson-Licon, Kathleen Knaul, Marie Pickerill, Michael Roberts, Francesca Seaman, Dorian Shager, Carol Steele, and Alicia Suarez and Lesley Lytle.

The President returned to the floor to answer questions.

A meeting attendee stated that she has heard that two kitchen workers in the Hub have been laid off, and others have had their hours cut. She also noted that physical plant workers have had their hours reduced as well. She asked if this information was correct? She was concerned that we are hurting the people at the bottom; shouldn't we talk about cutting salaries at the top? The President responded that he was not aware of these issues, and invited Tom Dixon to talk about it. Tom noted that many Sodexo employees are part-time and there is worker turnover, particularly in the summer, because of the variability of the food service operation, and DePauw is not responsible for employee decisions. As for the hour reduction, the only thing DePauw has done is eliminate overtime hours in the physical plant.

The person asking the original question responded that she is aware of these facts, but she wants to avoid the lowest salary employees having to bear the greatest burden. She noted that even though Hub workers are paid by Sodexo, they serve us and clean up after us, and we have a responsibility to them. She was also concerned that the reduction in hours by Sodexo might be a result of sustainability initiatives, and that students behind the sustainability movement would be distressed to learn that it had hurt the most vulnerable employees on campus. She then stated that many physical plant workers expect and count on a certain amount of overtime. Tom responded that overtime was approximately \$225,000, so there was not that much eliminated. The faculty member asked if it wouldn't be better if the people at the top took the salary cuts? The President responded that if it got to the point where eliminating positions seemed likely, he would recommend larger salary cuts at the top. He then mentioned that DePauw spends a lot of money on athletic teams to travel; there have been lots of discussions with schools in the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference about travel budgets, and there are committees discussing this issue.

A faculty member asked how we ended up with such a large deficit in last year's budget? The President responded that we are living on the structure built by the previous budget determination; the Walden Inn was thought of as an off-budget enterprise, then it was added to the budget, and we didn't anticipate the impact. We also mismodeled the benefits structure – we assumed certain things that ended up not being true, particularly in health care. Finally, we took on a lot of debt, and maybe didn't fully model it out. When he came in to DePauw, he put everything “on budget,” which changed things.

Later (after the next question), Tom Dixon discussed the Walden Inn further. He noted that the Walden lost \$1.1 million last year, this year it is projected to lose \$600,000, and in the budget for 2010 it is projected to lose \$450,000. The problem with making more headway in reducing the losses is that revenue at the Walden is flat, so expenses need to be cut. The President added that these sorts of inns usually don't make money, so we need to decide what is an acceptable level of subsidy to have an inn like this. He also noted that there is a new Vice President of Finance – in his previous position, he has worked very closely with faculty, and he understands that his job is to support the academic enterprise. Carla McGuire, who was a financial advisor at DePauw, has moved to Hammond associates. Hammond handles some of DePauw's endowment money, so this move will help us have a better arrangement with them.

Another faculty member asked if the President could be more specific about the kinds of conversations that are going on at other campuses. The President responded that Kalamazoo has gotten rid of almost all graduation requirements, as has Wooster. Lots of schools are moving to a looser structure; many are discussing internships and winter terms – some are studying us and looking at our model. These conversations are taking place because people are questioning the value of a liberal arts education. What is our role? How do we explain that we prepare students to think critically when students and parents are more interested in job preparation? The Mellon Foundation is curious about DePauw's situation, since we are critically considering our internships and winter term program, and other schools are adding them to their programs.

A faculty member asked the President to elaborate on the increasingly difficult environment for student recruitment. The President responded that admissions consultants have told us that the recruiting environment is very brutal – unless you are clear on what you do, it is hard to recruit students. Our situation is a little blurry; students that are tempted by liberal arts, but want to have ways to connect them to the real world, are unsure about DePauw. We need to be clear about what we are. Under a complicated academic structure, we are hiding our strengths.

The President continued by noting that his asking questions is not meant to criticize everything. He stated that we are hiding our strengths behind a far too complicated structure that we haven't articulated well yet. He stated that he “doesn't have many horses in the race” – he just wants the

faculty to vote on what we stand for and clearly articulate it. Unless we are clear, it will be really hard to bring strong and intelligent people here. We've got one shot to sell ourselves to smart, strong students, so we need to be able to articulate clearly why these students should come here. It is the faculty's job to think about this, and now is the time – if we wait too long, it will be too late. We have many interesting programs and pieces, but is the whole strong? The faculty's job is to come up with something compelling and exciting, and he will raise the money for it.

There were no further questions for the President.

### ***Reports from Coordinating Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

The Chair of MAO made a motion that the faculty approve the following new course:

*PHIL 370: Intermediate Independent Study, variable credit*

Directed studies in a field or fields of philosophy. It may be repeated for credit with different topics.

The Chair of MAO noted that this is part of a large renumbering of the courses in the Philosophy department. Since the motion comes from a standing committee, no second was needed. There was no discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The Chair of MAO then moved that the faculty approve the following revision to the major in Philosophy, effective for incoming students beginning in the fall of 2009, and available as an option for current students. Additions are in **bold**, and deletions are in ~~strike through~~:

#### *Requirements for a major in Philosophy*

Total courses required: Nine

Core courses: PHIL 251, PHIL 212, PHIL 216, PHIL 490

Other required courses: One course from the following: ~~PHIL 233, PHIL 234, PHIL 230, PHIL 240, PHIL 220,~~ **Value Courses, from PHIL 230 to 242, PHIL 340**, or a topics course (PHIL 209 or 309) in moral philosophy or in the philosophy of art and aesthetics.

# 300 and 400 level courses: Four, including either PHIL 419 or 469

Senior requirement: The senior requirement consists of the completion of PHIL 490.

[Note that the course renumbering detailed below has already been applied; the requirements for the major in Philosophy bridged to another discipline are also affected by the renumbering, but without any other changes.]

The Chair of MAO noted that part of this process was to group courses that are similar in content by numbering, and adding and subtracting a couple courses from the list. Since the motion comes from a standing committee, no second was needed.

A faculty member asked for clarification: should it be "Value courses" or "Values courses". Also, does every course between PHIL 230 and 242 count, or just those two courses? The Chair of MAO responded that "Value courses" is what the department submitted, and it is intended to include every course number between 230 and 242.

There was no further discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The following courses have had a change in course number, title, description, and/or prerequisites (details will be provided on request):
  - PHIL 102 God, Evil and the Meaning of Life (was PHIL 106)
  - PHIL 209 Introductory Topics (was PHIL 206 Topics; description changed)
  - PHIL 210 History of Philosophy: Chinese Philosophy (was PHIL 218)
  - PHIL 212 History of Philosophy: Ancient (was PHIL 215 History of Western Philosophy: Ancient)
  - PHIL 213 History of Philosophy: Medieval (was PHIL 351 Medieval Philosophy; description changed)
  - PHIL 216 History of Philosophy: Early Modern (was History of Western Philosophy: Early Modern)
  - PHIL 220 Existentialism (was PHIL 219)
  - PHIL 230 Ethical Theory (was PHIL 213; description changed)
  - PHIL 231 Leadership and Responsibility (was PHIL 221)
  - PHIL 232 Environmental Ethics (was PHIL 209)
  - PHIL 233 Ethics and Business (was PHIL 207)
  - PHIL 234 Biomedical Ethics (was PHIL 208)
  - PHIL 240 Philosophy of Art & Aesthetics (was PHIL 214 Philosophy of Art; description changed)
  - PHIL 242 Philosophy of Sex and Gender (was PHIL 211)
  - PHIL 251 Logic (was PHIL 202)
  - PHIL 260 Cosmology (was PHIL 203)
  - PHIL 309 Topics (was PHIL 307; description changed)
  - PHIL 342 Philosophy of Law (was PHIL 315; prerequisites changed)
  - PHIL 351 Advanced Logic (was PHIL 309)
  - PHIL 352 Epistemology (was PHIL 311)
  - PHIL 353 Metaphysics (was PHIL 312)
  - PHIL 360 Philosophy of Science (was PHIL 305)
  - PHIL 361 Philosophy of Language (was PHIL 317; description changed)
  - PHIL 363 Philosophy of Religion (was PHIL 310)
  - PHIL 364 Death: Philosophical Approaches (was PHIL 313)
  - PHIL 419 Major Philosophers (was PHIL 430)
  - PHIL 469 Philosophical Problems (was PHIL 433 Philosophical Problem; description changed)
  - PHIL 470 Advanced Independent Study (was PHIL 490 Independent Study in Philosophy)
  - PHIL 490 Senior Seminar (was PHIL 439; description changed)
  - PHIL 491 Senior Thesis (was PHIL 440)

*Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

CAPP's report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions for the Chair of CAPP.

*Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The Chair of COF gave advance notice of COF's intent to bring up for a vote at the May faculty meeting the following changes to the By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty and Personnel Policies sections of the Academic Handbook. The changes suggested to the Personnel Policies sections are in those sections approved by both the Faculty and the Administration.

Deletions are ~~struck through~~, additions are in **bold**.

- a. The following change limits the service on personnel committees to individuals with an on-going obligation to the University.

*By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)*

For a faculty member with an appointment in a single department or school, the Personnel Committee shall consist of all tenure-track faculty **members** and **all** term faculty members **in appointments renewable without the limitation of a maximum of six years (such as faculty librarians and term faculty members with substantial administrative duties that preclude appointment with tenure)** of the department or school except the person being reviewed and those in the first year or last year of service. Non-tenured members and those on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. For a faculty member with an appointment in two or more departments or programs, the Personnel Committee will be constituted as stipulated in the letter of appointment in keeping with the general spirit of the preceding provision.

- b. The following changes simply clarify existing standards with regard to term and interim reviews. First, the changes clarify that the term review standard is the same as the interim review standard. Second, the changes move language about terminal degrees forward from Appendix 3.

*Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)*

In the case of a term review, make an assessment about the evidenced strengths and concerns of **with regard to the candidate's job performance, clearly stating areas of desirable or necessary improvements** and a recommendation regarding an extension of the term, subject to the needs of the department or school.

*Personnel Policies V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status (from 2004-05)*

- **Term review. Required: Strong teaching during the period under review, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**
- **Interim review.** Required: Strong teaching during the probationary period, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. **Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**

- c. As part of COF's work creating new guidelines to reduce file size, COF also recommends a change with regard to COF's file review process. The DRAFT of the revised file guidelines will be available on the faculty governance website by the completion of the Monday April 6, 2009 faculty meeting. While the file guidelines themselves do NOT require faculty approval, COF invites comments from the faculty. To be most useful these comments should be received by Wednesday April 15, 2009 at 4:00 pm.

*Personnel Policies IV.D. Committee on Faculty Procedure*

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 **at least** the **entire core** decision file before making recommendations. **File guidelines established by COF clarify the core decision file includes everything except the scholarly and artistic work appendix.**

**5. If the PC report is unanimous and positive, and if the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for the Committee on Faculty to reach a positive recommendation, COF may proceed to examine the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalize the recommendation. However, if even a minority of the Committee on Faculty reaches a negative conclusion based on the core file or if the PC report is not unanimously positive, all members of the Committee on Faculty must return to the decision file and read the appendices before COF examines the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalizes the COF recommendation.**

56. 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.

*(and renumber the rest of the subsections in IV.D.)*

The Chair of COF asked that the faculty please keep in mind that these suggested changes are a result of the cumulative wisdom of several years worth of reviews and not linked to any specific case addressed by COF. She then noted that she would be providing a brief rationale for the changes, but she believes that, other than clarifying questions, debate or dialogue should be held until the next meeting. If you have any questions or concerns, she encouraged faculty members to contact her before the next meeting. She can be contacted directly via e-mail ([bgourley@depauw.edu](mailto:bgourley@depauw.edu)), phone (x4607), dropping by her office (Julian 354), or through the COF coordinator.

- a. The first recommended change is to *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)*, which is the section that describes personnel committees. The purpose of the change is to limit membership to those with an on-going obligation to the University.
- b. The second recommended set of changes is to clarify the existing standards with regard to interim and term review. This is not an attempt to change these standards – just want to make the language clearer. The change to *Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)* and first part of the change to *Personnel Policies V.* clarify that the standard for term review is the same as the standard for interim review. The second part of the change to *Personnel Policies V.* moves forward the language about completion of the terminal degree from Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies. It reminds candidates and personnel committees that there is a requirement of clear progress toward the terminal degree required at the time of interim or term review. These sections of the Personnel Policies are sections that are mutually agreed upon by the Faculty and the Administration and these have been discussed with the Administration since the VPAA meets with COF.
- c. The third recommended change that COF gives advance notice about also falls in the Personnel Policies of the Handbook in the sections mutually agreed upon by the Administration and the Faculty. This change is a result of COF's work to reduce file size.

The goal of the changes is that in cases where there is unanimous agreement of positive review by the personnel committee and the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for COF to reach

unanimous agreement of a positive review, COF does not have to read all of the scholarly and artistic materials but rather just a subset of them thus reducing workload for those on COF when there are no concerns. However, if there is any disagreement on the departmental personnel committee or even a minority of COF has any concerns, all members of COF will read the complete scholarly and artistic materials.

The Chair of COF then stated that COF's guidelines for the construction of personnel files do not require faculty action. COF has spent the last two years discussing the file size reduction memo forwarded to us by COA, and has come up with DRAFT guidelines that we will be finalizing in advance of the April 22 COF meeting with candidates being reviewed in 2009-2010. Those DRAFT guidelines should be available on the COF website starting later today. COF has taken into account feedback received from faculty members last year and during the fall semester as result of our call for feedback. Additionally, COF members have drawn on their experience reviewing files. In the last two years alone, COF has reviewed approximately 60 files. COF invites the faculty to provide input one last time before the guidelines are finalized. This input would be most helpful if received before Wednesday, April 15.

The Chair of COF then noted that, in short, the guidelines recommend limiting materials **submitted directly by the candidate** to a 2-3" binder for teaching materials, a 1-1.5" binder for scholarly and artistic materials, and at most a 1" binder for service materials.

A faculty member requested that the Chair of COF clarify the size of the binders, and discuss the importance of the different sizes of the scholarly and artistic and service binders. The Chair of COF repeated the sizes, and stated that the guidelines are not making a statement about the relative merit of scholarly and artistic work versus service work, but about the difference in size of the documentation required for those areas.

Another faculty member questioned her understanding that the DPC would read the scholarly material, but COF members would not? The faculty member also asked if this contradicted the current dialogues about intellectual life by implying that scholarly work was less important. The Chair of COF clarified that COF members would read the core binder for scholarly work, but maybe not the entire volume of work. She gave an example of a file that contains an entire book, where perhaps a chapter is included in the 1.5" binder but the remainder of the book would be in an appendix; under the new guidelines, COF would not always be required to read the entire appendix. She reiterated that COF was in no way trying to diminish the importance of scholarly work but rather recognizing that personnel committees are in the best position to read the complete body of scholarly work and put it in context; if that was done effectively COF would likely be able to confirm the decision by reading a subset of the scholarly materials and thus reduce COF's workload.

The Chair of COF finished her report by reminding tenured faculty of the vacancies next year on COF. She stated that she realizes service on this committee has a measurable workload, but it is also important work, both to our untenured colleagues and those tenured colleagues coming up for a promotion review, and to our students. Also, in the event that COF doesn't get a full complement of colleagues serving on this committee, any personnel decision COF might make is put in jeopardy by making those decisions automatically appealable. She encouraged tenured faculty members to consider running for this important committee. She then offered to answer questions about the details of the ebb and flow of workload on the committee.

There were no further questions for the Chair of COF.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- COF continues its work reviewing files.



*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC invited Dean Marnie McInnes to report on academic integrity.

Marnie stated that her main goal in making this report is a practical one: to encourage faculty members to follow through with reports of academic dishonesty and to remind us about the process of reporting and settling a case, as laid out in the academic integrity policy. An outline of the settlement process and a copy of the settlement form are on the two-sided yellow handout; statistics from the past several years are included in the agenda. [They are also included here].

<b>Academic Dishonesty Charges 2003-2009</b>					
<b>Semester</b>	<b>First-Year</b>	<b>Sophomore</b>	<b>Junior</b>	<b>Senior</b>	<b>Total</b>
Fall 2003	4	7	5	5	21
Spring 2004	9	6	1	1	17
Fall 2004	10	0	5	4	19
Spring 2005	13	8	4	7	32
*Fall 2005	3	2	5	0	10
Spring 2006	2	1	1	4	8
Fall 2006	0	4	4	7	15
Spring 2007	6	3	4	4	17
Fall 2007	5	2	3	0	10
Spring 2007	12	2	1	4	19
Fall 2008	6	6	2	2	16
Spring 2009					None so far
* First year in which Charles Lipson's <i>Doing Honest Work in College</i> was distributed to all new students (first-years and transfers).					

Marnie indicated that the chart shows a fair amount of fluctuation in the number of cases from semester to semester: the average is 16-17, if the rather odd phenomenon of zero reports this spring is not counted. She believes that the zero is about to change, since waves of reports usually roll in toward the end of the semester. She also believes that the number of reports per semester may have as much to do with faculty members as it does with actual incidents of academic dishonesty. Whether or not faculty members report incidents has to do, for example, with our level of distraction by other work, our willingness to carry through with the often difficult meetings with students, and even with our individual interpretations of the wording and expectations of the integrity policy.

Marnie continued by stating that she has decided that two apparently contradictory things are true: first, that the vast majority of DePauw students are honest, hardworking, and trustworthy; but that, at the same time, certain types of casual dishonesty, especially mosaic plagiarism and cheating on exams, are rampant and easily rationalized by students who consider themselves honest. A Duke University study from a few years ago reported that “on most campuses, 70% of students admit to some cheating,” and Marnie said that she did not think our campus was an exception. [Duke University study quoted in the *Yale Alumni Magazine*, Jan/Feb 2007, pages 61-63.]

Marnie then asked: what should DePauw be doing about this? She was puzzled over this contradiction – honest students who are plagiarizing or cheating with fair predictability. She stated that a colleague has sent her an excellent article from *The Chronicle* by a faculty member at Notre Dame named Susan Blum (February 20, 2009). She will send faculty members a link to the article, but she wanted to summarize its main point here, because it's a useful one.

Marnie pointed out that Blum argues that “the two main approaches” we (faculty members) use to deal with academic dishonesty have serious drawbacks. We tend to see dishonesty alternately as a moral failing or as a crime, and we react by creating honor codes or rules and regulations. Blum proposes that we focus instead on “academic integrity as a constellation of skills” that students must learn not just once and forever, but in nuanced ways in courses across the curriculum. Different disciplines have very different expectations for the citing of sources; even within a discipline, colleagues may differ sharply on how much citation is adequate and on what form it should take. “Students need to be shown,” Blum argues, “how to do what we, their teachers, are asking of them,” and we need to let them know about the lack of absolute agreement over the rules of acknowledging sources. No brochure of instructions, no simple admonishment in the syllabus, no one-size-fits all prohibitions will do the trick. “Rules are historically determined,” Blum reminds us; moreover, “rules about intellectual property are in flux.” It might be good to have a faculty development session on this issue in the near future.

Marnie concluded by noting that this is not to say that we should tolerate intellectual short cuts. Our faculty policy is a decent one; its rules were created for good reason and we should follow it as consistently as we can, using our best judgment to decide what sorts of problems must be reported and penalized. Academic integrity is key to a strong intellectual life. Faculty members are welcome to call Marnie if you have questions and to contact the chair of SLAAC, Greg Schwipps, if you have suggestions about how our policy could be strengthened or clarified.

A faculty member stated that she seemed to remember that, at the end of last semester, students were talking about creating a structure in which they were interested in contributing to honest work at college. The faculty member was wondering what happened to that idea. Marnie replied that she is not sure – the idea of a student academic council came up in SLAAC, but they have not continued those discussions due to the focus on intellectual life. She hopes that this idea will come up again from student leaders.

The chair of SLAAC had no further report, and offered to answer questions. There were no questions.

### ***Reports from Other Committees***

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

COA’s report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions for the Chair of COA.

The following announcement appeared in the agenda, but was not read in the meeting:

- COA has met with Jana Grimes, Felice Herrera-Kish and Tom Dixon to discuss possible health insurance plan changes for next year. Conversations are still at a preliminary stage, but to date, the proposed changes appear to be positive ones that DePauw employees will welcome. Discussion of a standard 5-course workload is on hold while details of next year’s health insurance plan are worked out.

#### *Report from the Faculty Governance Steering Committee (Chair: Dave Berque)*

The Chair of the Faculty, speaking on behalf of the FGSC, stated that he wanted to provide a brief overview of the next part of the timeline for the intellectual life discussions, including information about the process for selecting faculty members to serve on a summer working group to continue the

process. After that overview, the FGSC will invite responses on the topic “Which ideas from the proposals are most exciting in terms of their potential to enhance intellectual life?”

The Chair of the Faculty continued by stating that 32 proposals were received a week before spring break. These proposals were discussed in a series of nine open meetings. The FGSC thanks each of the students, staff members, and faculty members who contributed to the proposals and/or to the open meeting discussions. If you were not able to participate, he asked that you please consider reviewing the meeting notes that are posted on the Intellectual Life Moodle course, which currently has an enrollment exceeding 400 people.

The Chair of the Faculty noted that some teams are now working on refined, revised, and new proposals informed by the input gathered before spring break. The schedule for submitting these second round proposals, as well as for the second round of open meetings which will take place next week, can be found on the time line document provided as a handout today. The second round meetings are open to everyone, even senior administrators, and the FGSC hopes that many faculty members will attend. The time line also reviews the schedule for conducting a series of “in principle” straw polls in late April, leading up to at least one vote during the May faculty meeting.

The Chair of the Faculty stated that, as first announced at the March faculty meeting, the FGSC intends to bring a motion to the faculty for a vote during the May faculty meeting. If passed, the motion, which is found in the agenda [the motion is included after this paragraph], will create a summer working group to build on our collective work this year. The additional written materials on the agenda [this material is also included below] outline plans for selecting this working group with six members to be elected (one from each division and two at large) and up to eight additional members to be appointed by the FGSC to ensure continuity and various types of balance. The FGSC recommends that each member of this group receive a \$1,000 summer stipend, equivalent to a department chair’s summer stipend, assuming that external funding could be found to support this. As you heard during President Casey’s remarks he has, indeed, found this funding. The FGSC’s plan is to announce the full working group membership at the May faculty meeting so this information will be available to the faculty as it considers the May motion.

Text of the motion to be brought to the faculty in May:

*The FGSC gives notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote on the following motion at the May 2009 faculty meeting. “That the faculty charges a summer working group to study carefully the benefits, drawbacks and implications of the proposals that have emerged from faculty discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year. The group’s work should be informed by campus discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year that are expressed, in part, by resultant proposals that have emerged. The summer working group should consider these proposals in light of the “in-principle” straw polls, the open dialogue at the April and May 2009 faculty meetings and any additional votes that may be taken at the May meeting. In addition, the summer group’s work should be informed by relevant literature and DePauw historical documents. The summer group must present the faculty with a written report no later than 14 days prior to Faculty Institute 2009. The report, which should include one or more concrete recommendations to the faculty along with associated rationales, will form the basis for discussions during Faculty Institute 2009 with subsequent faculty action to be taken as appropriate.”*

Description of summer working group structure and process for determining membership:

*Membership of the summer working group will consist of at most 14 faculty members. Six faculty members will be elected and up to eight will be appointed by the FGSC to ensure balance and representation from the School of Music and from committees (for the purposes of continuity).*

*The election is open to tenured and tenure-track faculty and those who serve with “rank of”. Nominations (with permission of the nominee) and self nominations may be made to Divisional Officers in time for them to present a slate to the Chair of the Faculty by 5pm on Monday April 13th. Each nominated candidate is invited to supply a maximum 150 word statement (submitted as a Word document) explaining why she or he is interested in serving on the summer working group. Statements are due to the Chair of the Faculty by 10 pm on Tuesday April 14th and will be made available to the faculty as part of the election process.*

*A divisional election will be run from April 15th through April 17th with each voting member of the faculty permitted to cast one vote in his or her division. The highest vote getter from each of the four divisions will be named to the summer working group, with results to be published on April 18th. Remaining candidates will be entered in an at large election to be conducted between April 20th and the 22nd. This phase of the election will be used to bring the total number of elected faculty members to six. If each divisional election successfully elects a candidate then two additional at large candidates will be elected. If one or more divisions fail to elect a candidate due to a lack of nominees, these positions will be filled through the at large election. The results of this election will be announced on April 23rd.*

*The FGSC will accept expressions of interest from tenured, tenure-track, and “with rank of” faculty until 4pm on April 28th. Expressions of interest may be accompanied by a maximum 150 word statement (submitted as a Word document) explaining the candidate's interest in serving on the summer working group. The FGSC will appoint up to eight additional faculty members to balance the group. The complete working group membership will be announced at the May faculty meeting.*

*The summer task force will begin its work with a two day on-campus meeting starting at noon on May 20th and then again all day on May 21st. The Chair of the Faculty will convene the first day of this two-day meeting and other members of the FGSC will attend this initial meeting as well. The summer working group will elect a chair from its membership at the end of the first day. The elected Chair will convene the meeting on the second day and is charged to report regularly to the Chair of the Faculty throughout the summer.*

*The summer working group will determine its own schedule and mechanisms for carrying out its work during the summer. Roughly one day per week of work during the summer (not necessarily all during meetings) is anticipated. The summer working group will present a written report to the Faculty no later than two weeks prior to Faculty Institute 2009 and will be involved with planning and facilitating the discussions during the Institute. The group is expected to have largely completed its work by the time fall semester classes begin. The FGSC recommends that a \$1,000 stipend (equivalent to Chair's summer stipend) be provided for each member of the summer working group assuming that external funding is available.*

The Chair of the Faculty then stated that if there are any questions about this process, they are welcomed. If not, he would like to ask for responses to the question “Which ideas from the proposals are most exciting in terms of their potential to enhance intellectual life?” The FGSC knows your responses will be useful to groups who are working on second round proposals currently.

A faculty member asked if people from the working groups could tell us how things are working – do you feel comfortable with the feedback you have gotten and the schedule? She also wondered why there were eight appointed positions to the summer working group. The Chair of the Faculty responded that, given the fact that election results are variable, the FGSC wanted to make sure that the group had

continuity – including members who have been working on the topic this year, and who will be working on it next year. Additionally, the FGSC wants to make sure the group is balanced with regards to gender, tenure status, etc. He then called on the other members of the FGSC to comment.

The Chair of CAPP stated that the members of CAPP have been discussing this issue a lot, and have commented to the Chair of the Faculty about what is working and what is not. She then asked the faculty at large to share what they think is working and what is not. The original faculty member stated that she read the proposals, but did not attend the open meetings. She was interested in hearing what CAPP had been talking about; what have the people that have been involved in the process talked about and have concerns about. The Chair of CAPP responded that everyone on CAPP is involved in the discussions via a cross-committee team; they have talked about some of the themes that emerged from the proposals. Her team is charged with crafting the holistic proposals – they have focused on what themes have emerged thus far, and which of them are the most compelling.

The Chair of the Faculty stated that he would summarize the comments that he had received throughout the process. Some people think that the process is moving too quickly, and it is hard to assimilate the information thoroughly. Other people think that we have been talking about this for almost a year and nothing has actually happened. He said that it was important to note that we are not going to have a road map in May for exactly what we will be doing next year. He hopes that the meeting in May will inform the discussions and plans over the next year – we are one iteration into a three iteration process, plus the work to be done over the summer. He asked faculty members to continue to send the FGSC feedback on the process. He then asked for input from the faculty about which proposals are the most exciting in terms of enhancing intellectual life.

A faculty member stated that she was excited about the number of times that the word interdisciplinary came up in the proposals. She said that the holistic proposals had a lot more inter-connections than she expected. One of the things that came up in a lot of proposals was the ENG 130 question, and whether it should be merged with some other way to satisfy a competency. She wondered if ENG 130 should be merged with the first-year seminar program – it would make the first-year seminar more interdisciplinary. She asked if there were things built into the curriculum currently that make interdisciplinary explorations more difficult? A lot of proposals were trying to find a way to make these sorts of things more accessible. Addressing the ENG 130 issue sends a message to the students about why they are here, or what they will be doing while they are here.

A faculty member stated that he was wondering how some of the pieces of the puzzle might be fitting together (or not). He commented that the idea mentioned by the President about pursuing a marketing analysis of high school student preferences – what they are looking for and what they want – seems like a great idea; will we (faculty members) actually have access to that data? Will any of that data come in time to inform what we are doing to transform our curriculum? He then noted that the transformation of our intellectual life seems to relate to a point made earlier in the meeting about the relative values of scholarly and artistic work. Will that value play any role in how it is that we decide to say what we are? Fundamentally, the problem is that we have not been able to say clearly enough what it is that we stand for – to say this is what we are. For as long as he has been here, there have been heated conversations about what the role of scholarly and artistic work and its relation to our teaching obligations – will that fit into the conversation about intellectual climate?

The President responded that he would be more than happy to share the information from the materials that come out about what prospective students think, and that it should be available in about two weeks. He then stated that the role of scholarly production in the university is most acutely associated with the issue of tenure and promotion, and he does not want to wade into those waters. He noted that there was a proposal from the History Department about this issue.

A faculty member from the History Department then commented that one of the proposals makes excellence in teaching a tenure requirement, and links it to excellence in scholarship, and also requires external peer review of scholarship for personnel decisions. The exact language of this issue can be found in the proposal.

A faculty member stated that she found three things exciting about the proposals. First, there seems to be an interest in loosening up graduation requirements; she felt that this gives students more agency in charting their own curriculum, and it seemed to come up a lot in the proposals. Second, the idea of making Winter Term for credit; several proposals touched upon it, and it is compelling for two reasons: it gives academic credit where it is due, and it could give teachers a 3/1/2 teaching load. Third, lengthening the interdisciplinary aspect of the first-year seminar; it helps us think of our students as problem solvers, and gives students more academic agency.

A faculty member stated that he is excited by the idea of the office of undergraduate research; it would be a place where students can go, centralized on campus, and get guidance about internships and research. Winter Term could be folded into this larger office. He finds this idea compelling because it models what we as faculty members do, and because it provides a central place that celebrates student research. Having that sort of entity, centrally located, would go a long way to show students what and who we are.

A faculty member stated that he was concerned about whether or not people are really agreeing with these proposals – how much support is there really for some of these proposals? Or will we get the same old support for the same old things. How can we tell if there are a few very vocal people supporting an idea, or if there is wider support? Is there some way to get quantitative data about how much support there is for these ideas?

The Chair of the Faculty responded that polls are soon to come, but we are waiting for ideas to emerge and get discussion going about them before we do them. The faculty member noted that polling, as it is usually done, is not very scientific, because only people who have strong feelings either way will actually respond. Has there been any thought about this? The Chair of the Faculty responded that the FGSC would think about this.

A faculty member stated that he likes the reduced graduation requirements, and he likes the idea of a year-long first-year seminar experience, but faculty members only have a finite amount of energy and time, and we cannot keep adding things to our schedule. He noted that these discussions give us a possibility to look at things and say, what do we really want to do and do we have time to do these things really well. If we change the graduation requirements, can we remap them in such a way to make the workloads more manageable? It would allow us to work more efficiently? He stated that there is a tendency to ignore the fact that faculty members have a finite amount of time available.

A faculty member stated that he found the idea of two courses at a time a compelling proposal. It would help to address the workload issue in a unique way. It would also give students and faculty more time off that was shared, thus giving more opportunities to meet and collaborate outside of class. He found this proposal really interesting.

A faculty member stated that she also found that proposal [two courses at a time] very interesting. She stated that what is compelling about these proposals is that many of them let us streamline and get rid of the pileup that we have done to ourselves. It would be really helpful to find a way to streamline things, and reevaluate why we are doing what we are doing – and this is already embedded in the proposals.

The Chair of FDC wanted to pass on congratulations to the student summer research award winners. The FDC received the most summer research applications that they have ever received – 21 faculty members proposed 24 projects with 32 students. The FDC received many excellent proposals that they could not fund. They only had funds to give awards to seven non-SRF faculty members, three SRF faculty members, and a total of sixteen students; SRF faculty members' stipends come from SRF funds, so FDC only has to pay for the students' stipends for those awards. There was one administration-funded project. The Prindle Center was not able to fund an award.

The Chair of FDC then stated that since FDC had no more money to give away, they would begin reviewing general policies.

### **2009 Faculty Development Student/Faculty Summer Research Awards**

Project Title: Cloning of High Copy Suppressors of a Mutant H4 Protein in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Lynn Bedard** (Assistant Professor of Biology)  
 Student: Jenna Whitbeck '11

Project Title: Epitope tagging and Localization of the Chromatin Assembly Factor, Cac1p, in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Lynn Bedard** (Assistant Professor of Biology)  
 Student: Joo Young Park '11

Project Title: Geology Beneath the Great Wall of China, Continued: Development of "the Cradle of Chinese Geology"  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Tim Cope** (Assistant Professor of Geosciences)  
 Student: John (Jay) Wellik '10

Project Title: Team-Building and Empowerment Workshops of Putnam County  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Tim Good** (Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre)  
 Student: Minnu Paul '11 and Mackenzie Travers '10

Project Title: Knowledge Creation: Archaeology, Memory and Narrative Through the Conover-Cochran Collection  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Marie Hopwood** (Instructor of Sociology and Anthropology)  
 Student: Lindi Conover '10

Project Title: Analysis of VERITAS Observations of High Energy Gamma Ray Sources: A Comparison of the "Maximum Likelihood Method" and the "Ring Background Model"  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Mary Kertzman** (Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
 Student: Akanksha Chawla '12

Project Title: Romancing the Chat Room and Roaming the Internet  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Sherry Mou** (Associate Professor of Modern Languages and Asian Studies)  
 Student: Lisa Poole '12 and James Workman '12

Project Title: Neurophysiological Processing of Cognitive Maps  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Michael Roberts** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
 Student: Dillen Wischmeier '11

Project Title: Novel and Familiar Stimuli in Categorization/Perceptual Representations with Memory  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Michael Roberts** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
 Student: Amy Sato '10

\*Project Title: Café Con Leche: An Enabling Myth of Venezuelan Racism?  
 Faculty Sponsor: **Kellin Stanfield** (Assistant Professor of Economics and Management)  
 Student: Yang Chen '11

Project Title: Measuring Ultrasonic Backscatter Coefficient  
Faculty Sponsor: **Timothy Stiles** (Assistant Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
Student: David Everson '11

Project Title: Nonlinear Effects in Measuring Ultrasound Backscatter  
Faculty Sponsor: **Timothy Stiles** (Assistant Professor of Physics and Astronomy)  
Student: David Good '10

Project Title: Documenting the Oral History of Ghost Ranch  
Faculty Sponsor: **Steve Timm** (Professor of Communication and Theatre)  
Student: Kristen Mitchell '10 and Sara Ketterer '11

Project Title: Research in Psychosocial Oncology  
Faculty Sponsor: **Christina Wagner** (Assistant Professor of Psychology)  
Student: Kelly Garringer-MacCabe '10

\*Funded with Administrative supplement funds.  
No ethics-related awards given for Summer 2009.

### ***Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA began his remarks by calling the faculty members' attention to announcements circulated earlier by e-mail regarding April and May faculty activities:

- The Academic Awards Convocation: Monday, April 27, at 7:30 p.m., in Meharry Hall, East College. Followed by a reception for students, parents, faculty members, and donors.
- The Faculty Achievement Recognition Program/Reception (sponsored by FDC): Thursday, May 7, from 4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m., at the Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics
- The Faculty Recognition Dinner (sponsored by President Casey): Friday, May 8, reception begins at 5:30 p.m.; dinner and short program from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; at the Walden Inn Student Social Center

All faculty members, including emeriti faculty members, and their spouses and partners are invited to the Faculty Recognition Dinner where we will note faculty achievements and awards and honor retiring tenured faculty members Bob Stark and Tom Hall.

- Commencement: Sunday, May 17, at 1:00 p.m.

The VPAA noted that, in light of there being no further comment on the COF-proposed removal of the "time in rank" requirement for eligibility for timely promotion to Associate Professor, that change is now approved by the Administration and effective immediately. The VPAA and his staff will review all cases of delay of previous decisions for reason of the prior rule and propose remediation steps to those whose promotions might have been delayed by this requirement in the past. The adjustments to the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook will be made on the version on the web site shortly.

The VPAA then provided an update on our current searches and the size of the faculty for next year. DePauw has made appointments in 5 of our 8 tenure-track searches. In one case there is still an offer outstanding. Two searches have been closed without making appointments. We will wait until early Fall before deciding whether these searches will be re-started in 2009-2010. We now do not expect to make any tenure-track appointments through the opportunity hiring process this year.

The VPAA continued by noting that faculty numbers for next year continue to be fluid; we currently expect the faculty to have 13 fewer benefit-eligible faculty members next year (and 20 fewer part-time faculty members), which is roughly an 11% reduction; and we will have about 60 fewer courses each semester, which is about a 10% reduction. Class sizes will have to be correspondingly higher



(currently the average class size is 16; the increase will probably be about 2 more per class), particularly with fewer and larger sections of multi-section courses. The student to faculty ratio is currently slightly below 10:1, and next year will be slightly more than 10:1.

The VPAA concluded his remarks by stating that a strong pool of tenured faculty candidates interviewed for the position of part-time Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs for next year. He was pleased to report that Carrie Klaus, Associate Professor of Modern Languages (French), has accepted appointment to that position. He then opened the floor to questions.

A faculty member asked if first-year seminar sizes would be rising to 20 students, as she had heard. The VPAA responded that the average first-year seminar enrolls 14 students, and it will probably be 3-4 students higher than that next year, so we might expect an average size of around 17 students. Noting that to achieve the average increase some classes would have to go up in size more than others, since some classes cannot increase in size, the VPAA concluded that the size of first-year seminars would have to increase more than the average increase in class size.

There were no further questions.

***Old Business***

There was no old business.

***New Business***

There was no new business.

***Announcements***

The Chair of the Faculty announced that election results were available as a separate handout at the meeting.

***Adjournment:***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 PM.

**Minutes for DePauw University Faculty Meeting  
Monday, May 4th, 2009**

***Call to Order:***

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty at 4:03 PM.

***Verification of Quorum:***

Quorum is 86 faculty members this semester. More than the necessary 86 ballots had been distributed by the beginning of the meeting, so quorum was verified. A total of 175 ballots had been distributed by the end of the meeting.

***Approval of Minutes from the April 2009 Faculty Meeting:***

The minutes of the April 2009 Faculty Meeting were approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

***Conferring Degrees:***

Professor Marcia McKelligan made the following motion:

*I move 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 2009.*

This motion was seconded by multiple faculty members. There was no discussion, and the motion carried.

***Faculty Governance Steering Committee – Intellectual Life Discussions:***

The Chair of the Faculty, speaking on behalf of the FGSC, stated that he wanted to open the intellectual life agenda item by inviting President Casey to speak to the topic. After the President finishes his remarks, the Chair of the Faculty stated that he would describe the process that will be used to conduct the straw polls and to vote on a formal motion to officially form a summer working group.

The President approached the podium brandishing a machete, stating that it had been given to him by faculty member Jeane Pope. Jeane took the floor and explained that the machete was a gift to DePauw from a farmer in Costa Rica named Don Juan that she had met during a winter term trip. The machete was a symbol for “El Jefe,” and Jeane had thought it should be given to DePauw’s “El Jefe.”

The President then began his remarks, which are quoted here:

In August I went before this Faculty to ask about the state of DePauw’s intellectual life and I offered three related questions:

1. What can we say is the current state of intellectual life at DePauw?
2. How do you believe it can be enriched most effectively and how may it best be communicated to potential and current students, and to the world at large?
3. What do we do well, and what can we do better?

My thought then was that these were the most important questions I could ask, and if I wasn't willing to ask them, then I had absolutely no business standing up there as President of this University.

I have never regretted asking these questions. I've had moments of concern, moments when my own energy has seriously flagged, and moments when I was deeply concerned about this faculty's own energy. But I was always certain that this was the most important conversation for us to have.

These past few weeks, as we headed into this meeting, I re-read all the reports of the Faculty Institute break out groups. I also re-read the surveys and comments submitted by the faculty throughout the fall.

I want to read two paragraphs from one of the Faculty Institute committee reports. I will not identify the writer of this summary, but welcome him/her to identify him/her selves should they feel the need:

*"The essential sentiment of [our] group was of needing to breathe; that without oxygen to the brain and the heart and the hands, faculty and students find it hard to live and love the life of the mind. Both groups are too busy with the little things that eat away at our energy and attention, and which we do in part because they are required, in part because they look good to outside expectations, and in part because we feel a sense of accomplishment by finishing them even as the larger and greater projects that we really covet remain frustratingly out of reach... Right now there are wonderful pockets of life in all areas of the university, which we need to expand into a full-fledged and vibrant ecosphere..."*

*"Out of the discussion came some concrete actions that the university could take to give the breathing space and the time that could allow us to share in an atmosphere of discovery. There was a strong sense that now was the time to do something, before we fall back into a kind of comfortable, institutional complacency that will ultimately suffocate this vital spark."*

What followed, in this report and in the others, were lists of specific things DePauw might do. Some large, some small. We've done several already... every Faculty Institute break out group, for example, spoke about the need for a University web site to better celebrate our students and faculty, which we have done. Not perfectly, but we've started.

As with those reports, we are faced today with what seems to be an unusual situation in which we are considering some specific modifications to our curriculum and our co-curriculum while we are also thinking about what broad changes we might consider that could greatly enrich and expand our intellectual life.

It is my clear intention that the broader discussion will continue intensely for years to come. I have already put the Board of Trustees on notice that this conversation will continue so long as they feel satisfied to have me serve as President.

I want to report that much of the broader discussion is already well on its way – even beyond the questions and polls of this faculty meeting.

With the generous support of the Board of Trustees, we have already begun intensely reviewing our admissions materials and web presentations so that we can attract students who are intellectually curious and alive.

With the support of Board of Trustee, we have just engaged perhaps the finest campus planning firm in the world – Ayer Saint Gross out of Baltimore – which has been hired quite specifically to help us think about how we may better use our spaces to create lively venues, both indoors and out, for planned and unplanned encounters among students and among students and faculty.

We are also going to begin a very serious conversation next year with a new cabinet, and with your input, about how we can arrange our administrative structures and financial processes to best support intellectual and community life. We will establish a clear budgetary process that ensures that our still-quite considerable resources are applied in service of our highest priorities.

The broad shifts have already begun, and the markings of those shifts will become even more clear – through my work with you – in years to come.

So, while we will, today, be considering the five charges, and specific potential changes in our curriculum and in the supporting co-curriculum, the broad discussion about what DePauw is and what it can be will continue.

In fact, so long as DePauw remains vital and relevant and ambitious, the question of “What do we do well, and where can we do better?” will always be with us.

It’s been a long year. And sometimes it seems that in a year in which we as a campus and we as a nation we have spoken almost constantly about change, that the mere mention of change can be both troubling and exhausting.

But this has also been a thrilling year. On a Tuesday night not that long ago, we had several hundred students sitting in this very room having a conversation about DePauw’s curriculum.

I have had over 25 dinners in dining halls and in Greek houses. That alone has been exhausting. At every one of those dinners, students have come to me and raised questions about what they study and why they study what they study.

This has been thrilling.

The world changes, and our students have changed, and our academic structure and our co-curricular structure have actually changed quite dramatically over ten and even twenty years.

So, the moment before us now is not a choice about change, it’s a decision about how we are to address the changes that have occurred at DePauw and the inevitable changes facing those students we will welcome next year and the years after that.

If the classicists and Philosophers will forgive me, I would like to offer a small quote from the ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus who stated:

*You cannot step twice into the same river, for other waters are continually flowing in.*

I would like to thank this faculty for their energy, their strong opinions, and mostly for their concern for this institution. It has been an honor to have been part of this conversation with you and I look forward to many many more.

The President then passed the floor to the Chair of the Faculty, who made his remarks, as quoted here:

Thank you, Brian. And thanks to everyone else who has written proposals, contributed to discussions, and provided feedback and suggestions about how to improve our process. I have learned a lot from working with you and look forward to taking these next steps today.

A few days ago the FGSC distributed two sets of straw poll questions to the faculty via email. As noted on your agenda, the bulk of the FGSC report today consists of using these polling instruments to gather input from voting faculty members.

We chose to administer the polls at this meeting, instead of electronically prior to the meeting, because attendance rates at faculty meetings have been higher this year than participation rates in our online polls and survey monkeys. It is great to see a strong turnout today.

To review briefly the polling process:

On Friday morning Survey Monkey versions of the polls were distributed to only the twenty-six faculty members who are on approved leaves this spring. Twelve responses were received and will be considered as part of the polls we conduct today.

In a moment we will distribute the first poll to voting faculty members (all those who were given a ballot when they entered the meeting today). This poll has one question corresponding to each of President Casey's five charges. Each question asks for you to provide feedback, based on your participation in the process this year and your own opinions, as to whether you recommend no change, minor adjustments, moderate adjustments or significant changes with respect to the corresponding charge.

This poll will be completed using bubble sheets. The responses from the twelve responding faculty members who are on leave have been manually converted to bubble sheets and will be added to the responses gathered today. When you see me adding these twelve bubble sheets to the stack, rest assured that I am not stuffing the ballot box!

When the polling is complete, Bill Tobin, Director of Institutional Research, will take the bubble sheets across the street to be processed. We should be able to announce the results approximately fifteen minutes after the polls are completed.

While the first poll is being processed the FGSC will request further input via a second, more detailed poll. The second poll contains forty questions – you will indicate your responses directly on the sheets in order to respond. Members of the FGSC will remain in the ballroom after the meeting adjourns to receive polls from those faculty members who want a little more time to complete them. Results will be tallied after the meeting and announced later this week.

The polls completed by voting faculty members during the meeting today will be considered the "official" straw polls. Soon after the faculty meeting today we will provide unofficial polls to three additional groups: non-voting faculty and other faculty members

who were not at the meeting today, staff, and students. Input received through these polls will also be shared with the summer working group.

As I conclude this report I would like to emphasize that the polls we are about to distribute are not being put forward as a motion to be debated and voted on. Rather, the polls ask the faculty to indicate, in principle, how they feel about various issues. Therefore, the results of these polls should inform, but not completely constrain, the thinking of the summer working group.

If there are any questions I would be happy to answer them with help from other members of the FGSC. Otherwise, we will proceed to the polling. When the polling is complete, John Schlotterbeck will make the formal motion to form the summer working group on behalf of the FGSC.

A faculty member asked to speak in rebuttal to the issue; she did so by making the following comments:

I'd like the faculty meeting minutes to reflect that at least some of us on the faculty feel that this survey mechanism is seriously flawed and will be likely to generate results ranging from "difficult to interpret" to ambiguous to downright misleading. I'd like to make these comments in the spirit of collegiality.

First, the questions on page 1 are so vague and so is the scale, that even though I know what I would like to change in the Core, I have no idea how to answer the questions. For example, would adding grades to winter term be considered a "minor change" or a moderate change? Won't our answers be pretty difficult to interpret? Also, this question, like many others, seems to "require or presuppose" change, which I didn't know we had already decided. I thought that was some of what this survey was supposed to determine.

Second, I'd like to point out there are problems in the survey with compound statements. So, while one can be in favor of one part of the statement, one might reject the premise of another part. In fact, there are many premises listed in the questions that seem unlikely to occur or so abstract they couldn't be implemented. In short, the framing and construction of some of the questions seems preordained to push toward particular outcomes.

I'd like to give an example from Section V about the competency programs, which you all know that I care about. The fact is, I don't know how to vote in this section, simply because there isn't an option provided to reflect my opinion.

The original draft of the survey had two questions about the Q, S and W requirements which allowed one to vote to maintain the current W, Q and S or to eliminate it: The first question in the original draft asked for a response to the statement: "Maintaining the W, Q and S requirement in their current form is important to DePauw's intellectual life", and then there was a second question about eliminating the current requirements. These two questions would have generated interesting information.

So the question I'm asking is why does this current draft offer no option to vote to maintain the current competency requirements? Each option listed starts with the premise of eliminating the W or Q or S – again, as if change is required or presupposed. In addition, the second part of the sentence says, "while continuing to emphasize writing skills at all levels of the curriculum has the potential. . .". So, if I don't believe that eliminating the W competencies will improve DePauw's intellectual life, I can vote that I

strongly disagree. Yet, if I vote that I strongly disagree, then I appear to be voting against continuing to emphasize writing at all levels. That is not a sensible combination. Also, I don't believe we currently do have W, Q and S at all levels so how can I endorse continuing it? Nor do I think we can realistically have W, Q and S at all levels without a requirement of some kind. Thus, the survey question leaves me and others stymied. I know that we have different opinions about how to proceed, but there ought to be a genuine choice reflected in the survey. We ought to have good survey questions to generate good information.

I have read the articles on Moodle, I have seen the research from the first three years of the W Program study and I have followed research on W intensive classes for 20 years. There is clear evidence on this campus and across the country that these programs work. MAO's and CAPP's reports recommended not to eliminate these programs: they are effective ways to require and maintain institutional support for faculty development.

I know better than to take this oversight on this survey personally, yet I admit I find it professionally disturbing that the faculty is being given no clear choice to vote for continuing W, Q or S, either together or separately. This has the appearance of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee, or someone else, having already decided that we are eliminating these programs and replacing them with some vague "hope and a promise of doing it across all levels." (And this is just one example from one section of the survey.)

It appears to me that all I can do to vote to maintain the current Q or S or W is to write this in the comment section. I guess I plan to do that (and I hope others will join me.) But, I hope the summer working group will certainly take the results of this survey with a big grain of salt. As with any write-in ballot, the write in "candidate" has very little potential for a good showing.

Finally, I find this whole process since February, as metaphorically exemplified today by asking us all to fill in bubble sheets during a faculty meeting, has had the feel of treating the faculty like we are cattle being herded into the corral of curriculum change. I am for change, but I believe the process should allow for a free and open exchange of ideas, and certainly for collecting data that is not seriously flawed.

So to be clear, my questions has two parts, have we already decided that certain changes are required? (like eliminating Q, S or W?) And second, if not, if one wants to vote to maintain or strengthen the current competencies as in proposal 10, how does one do it on this survey?

Another faculty member stated that change is already happening – she has heard that we have a large number (772 deposits) of students this year, and fewer faculty members. She wants to be able to talk about changing how she is going to teach when she has forty students instead of fifteen. She doesn't know the results of the surveys, but it is important to her that we continue to talk to each other – we don't want to shut down the conversations. She stated that she cannot wait to meet the students when they get here. She wants to trust that we can continue the conversations. Change is here; write comments – they will be read. Our pedagogy will have to change – we have a lot more students and a lot fewer faculty members than we have had before.

The Chair of COA addressed the first faculty speaker's comments about the competency programs by stating that faculty should bubble in the "no changes" answer on the first set of questions, and the "strongly disagree" answer in the second set of questions.

A faculty member stated that it is difficult to design an instrument like these polls; no one should say that the FGSC is attempting to bias the results – the framing effect is unintentional. The statement “strongly disagree” could mean that you think it will have no effect, or that you think it will hurt DePauw. If there is ambiguity, he urges faculty members to write in responses to those questions.

The Chair of the Faculty responded that he also encourages people to write comments, and stated that he knows that the surveys are not perfect. However, we are not voting on any actions – we are just providing the summer working group with more information than from a wider range of faculty members than they might otherwise have heard from.

A faculty member asked if these questions should be considered in the context of intellectual life of the faculty, or of the students. He noted that the two are not mutually exclusive. The Chair of the Faculty responded that you should consider the union of both ideas – consider if the question could improve intellectual life for either group.

There were no further comments from faculty members. The Chair of the Faculty member stated that now voting faculty members would be filling out a five question survey using scantron forms – number 2 pencils can be distributed as needed.

The Chair of the Faculty clarified that voting faculty members are all full-time faculty members, as well as emeritus faculty that are teaching this semester. Part-time faculty members are not included; neither are administrators.

Surveys were completed by voting faculty members.

When surveys were finished, the Chair of the Faculty announced that the Director of Institutional Research would take the sheets across the street to scan the responses. The FGSC then distributed the second survey, noting that the responses on the sheet itself should be circled, and that faculty members should feel free to make comments as well. Again, only voting faculty members could fill out surveys.

Faculty members took some time filling out surveys.

The Chair of the Faculty continued with the agenda until the Director of Institutional Research returned. When the Director returned, the results of the poll were announced, after noting that there were between 181 and 183 responses to each question (from 175 voting faculty in the meeting and twelve responses from those on leave who had completed polls before the meeting):

“How much change do you recommend with respect to DePauw’s approach to **graduation requirements?**”

- No change (4%)
- Minor adjustments (24%)
- Moderate adjustments (39%)
- Significant changes (31%)
- No opinion (2%)

“How much change do you recommend with respect to DePauw’s approach to **Winter Term?**”

- No change (5%)
- Minor adjustments (13%)
- Moderate adjustments (23%)
- Significant changes (58%)
- No opinion (1%)



“How much change do you recommend with respect to DePauw’s approach to **internships?**”

- No change (8%)
- Minor adjustments (31%)
- Moderate adjustments (26%)
- Significant changes (16%)
- No opinion (19%)

“How much change do you recommend with respect to DePauw’s approach to its **Programs of Distinction?**”

- No change (7%)
- Minor adjustments (29%)
- Moderate adjustments (34%)
- Significant changes (23%)
- No opinion (7%)

“How much change do you recommend with respect to DePauw’s approach to **first year programs?**”

- No change (10%)
- Minor adjustments (32%)
- Moderate adjustments (34%)
- Significant changes (19%)
- No opinion (5%)

The Chair of the Faculty Development Committee made the following motion on behalf of the Faculty Governance Steering Committee:

That the faculty charges a summer working group to study carefully the benefits, drawbacks and implications of the proposals that have emerged from faculty discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year. The group’s work should be informed by campus discussions during the 2008-2009 academic year that are expressed, in part, by resultant proposals that have emerged. The summer working group should consider these proposals in light of the “in-principle” straw polls, the open dialogue at faculty meetings and any additional votes that may be taken at the May meeting. In addition, the summer group’s work should be informed by relevant literature and DePauw historical documents. The summer group must present the faculty with a written report no later than 14 days prior to Faculty Institute 2009. The report, which should include one or more concrete recommendations to the faculty along with associated rationales, will form the basis for discussions during Faculty Institute 2009 with subsequent faculty action to be taken as appropriate.

The motion was seconded, and there was no discussion or questions. The motion passed.

The following written documentation on the report and the motion were provided in the agenda, but were not read in the meeting:

- The membership of the summer working group:
  - Nicole Brockmann (School of Music)
  - Howard Brooks (Physics and Astronomy)
  - David Gellman (History)
  - Anne Harris (Art)
  - Joe Heithaus (English)
  - Howard Pollack-Milgate (Modern Languages)
  - Jeane Pope (Geosciences)

- Kerry Pannell (Economics)
- Bruce Sanders (Library)
- Rebecca Schindler (Classical Studies)

### **Reports from Coordinating Committees**

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/)

#### *Report from the Committee on Management of Academic Operations (Chair: Brian Howard)*

The chair of MAO moved that the faculty approve the following revision to the minor in Chinese, effective for incoming students beginning in the fall of 2009. Additions are in **bold**, and deletions are in ~~strikethrough~~:

Total courses required: Five

Core courses: None

Other courses: Five credits in Chinese language courses at the 200-level or above ~~or four courses in Chinese language at the 200-level or above plus HIST 107 or HIST 108.~~ For the HIST courses, supplementary readings in Chinese are required for Chinese ~~minors~~. Only one of these courses may be taken off-campus.

# 300 and 400 level courses: ~~One~~ **Two**

The chair of MAO pointed out that the essence of the change is that there was a provision for taking a history course with supplemental readings in Chinese; it is felt that this was no longer needed.

There was no discussion or questions. The motion passed.

The chair of MAO then moved that the faculty approve the following new courses:

- *ANTH 251, Latin American & Caribbean Cultures, 1 course, Group 2*  
This course introduces students to the diverse cultures and societies of Latin America and the Caribbean via a multi-disciplinary approach. Through historical, ethnographic, and literary study, we will explore relations of power, ideology, and resistance from the colonial conquest to the present, including economic dependency, development, political institutions, the military, social movements, religious expressions and ethnic and class relations.
- *ANTH 360, African Diaspora Religions, 1 course, Group 2*  
This course is designed to explore the history, functions, and communities, which encompass religions of the African Diaspora such as Santería, Vodou, and Candomblé. Lectures, discussions, films, and a range of ethnographic literature will introduce students to these religious systems. Among the topics and themes to be addressed in relation to religion are issues of identity, ethnicity, gender, performance, and class. Case studies in Brazil, Cuba and among Latinos in the U.S. will illuminate the multivocality of the religious beliefs and practices found in the African Diaspora.
- *ENG 115, Writing Seminar for Non-Native Speakers of English II, 1 course*  
This course is aimed at challenging incoming international students more than ENG 110. This course focuses more on academic writing proficiency and critical thinking in preparation for the advanced level of challenge offered by ENG 130. *English 115 may not be counted toward a major in English. See Writing Program for details.*

There was no discussion or questions. The motion passed.

The chair of MAO then announced changes in course titles and descriptions, specifically noting a modification to ENG 110 and a revision and clarification of the placement process for ENG 110 and ENG 115, as follows:

Announcements of changes in course titles and/or descriptions:

- *ENG 110, Writing Seminar for Non-Native Speakers of English I, 1 course (was College Writing for Non-Native Speakers of English)*  
This course develops and strengthens the level of English language fluency of incoming international students who begin to write, speak and read proficiently and rigorously at an academic college level. *English 110 may not be counted toward a major in English. See Writing Program for details.*
- *FREN 110, Intensive Elementary French (was Review of Elementary French)*

Announcement of changes to catalog text: Section II/Explanation of Graduation Requirements/Competence Requirements/Writing:

Modify the following paragraphs from the description of the writing competence in Section II of the catalog (additions in **bold**, deletions in ~~strikethrough~~):

**All English composition courses begin with critical thinking. Their aim is to teach college level thinking through college level writing. Courses are designed to position students for academic success.**

The writing program at DePauw has a range of levels to meet students' needs. Students are placed into the writing program based on a variety of factors: standardized test scores (SATV and ACTE), Advanced Placement in Writing (AP) score, writing samples, portfolios of previous college-level writings, transfer credit and college professors' recommendations. They may be placed into College Writing I, College Writing II, ~~College Writing~~ **Seminar** for Non-Native Speakers of English **I or II**, or a W course. W courses may not be taken on a Pass/Fail basis, and certification of writing competence is separate from the grade earned in the course.

~~College Writing~~ **Seminar** for Non-Native Speakers of English **I and II** (ENG 110 and 115) ~~is are~~ offered **as prerequisites to College Writing II (ENG 130)** for students whose first language is not English. **English courses for non-native speakers of English are aimed at strengthening existing language skills and developing new skills necessary for academic success. Placement in the appropriate English courses is made based on three criteria: 1) English language assessments administered on campus during orientation, 2) recommendation from the English language coordinator, and 3) confirmation by appointed faculty representing the English department (department chair, W Center director, etc.). Successful completion in each course is required to advance to a higher level course.**

College Writing I (ENG 120) stresses the development of writing skills fundamental for expressing ideas, imagination and opinion. By means of short essay assignments, some of which may be reflections on their own experience, students will build fluency in written expression, clarity of style and proficiency in the use of language. ENG 120 is offered on a Pass/Fail basis.

College Writing II (ENG 130) refines and builds writing skills. It stresses the development of critical thinking skills, logical development of ideas and a coherent and readable style. In the course, students base their writing on both personal experience and the critical reading and viewing of materials from a variety of disciplines.

Students are expected to complete ENG ~~400~~ **110, 115, 120** or 130 in the semester assigned. They may withdraw from these courses only under exceptional circumstances, such as extended illness, with the permission of the Petitions Committee.

Finally, the chair of MAO pointed out a proposed change to the transfer credit policy (included as an Appendix in the agenda, and as Appendix A in these minutes). MAO would like comments from faculty members on this proposed change.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- Announcement of one-time group designations (Fall 2009):
  - *M L 295, Topics in Modern Languages: The Words of German Music: Text and Tone in Song, Opera, and Society, Group 3 Literature*
  - *REL 290, Topics in Religion: Jerusalem: The Holy City, Group 4*
  - *REL 370, Advanced Topics in Religion: Modern Islam, Group 4*
  - *ARTH 390, Advanced Topics in the History of Art: Monster and Marvels in Medieval Art, Group 4*
  - *PHIL 347, Philosophy of Law, Group 4*
- MAO approved the academic calendar for 2012-13; see <http://www.depauw.edu/admin/registrar/cal1213.asp>
- In preparation for the Higher Education Opportunity Act, which takes effect in July 2010, MAO has been discussing several issues with the Registrar:
  - Book lists for courses will need to be available at registration time, linked (with expected prices) to the schedule of courses. The bookstore, through Barnes & Noble, has a system to support this that will probably be ready to go by this fall.
  - The Registrar has proposed a set of refinements and clarifications to the Transfer Credit policy (see Appendix A). MAO will be acting on this proposal in the fall and invites feedback to the changes.
- The chair of MAO for the 2009-2010 academic year will be Harry Brown.

#### *Report from the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (Chair: Rebecca Upton)*

The chair of CAPP's report consists of an offer to answer questions.

There were no questions for CAPP.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- CAPP welcomes Pam Propsom as the Chair of CAPP for next year.

#### *Report from the Committee on Faculty (Chair: Bridget Gourley)*

The chair of COF noted that she has several motions for the faculty during this report. She pointed out that the suggested changes COF brings before you are a result of the cumulative wisdom of several years worth of work by COF members. Additionally, she noted that some of these changes result from inquiries and referrals from individuals and other committees.

As usual, all suggested handbook changes have deletions shown with a strike through and additions in bold. The first recommended change is to *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)* which is the section that describes personnel committees. The purpose of the change is to limit membership to those with an on-going obligation to the University.

The chair of COF moved that the faculty adopt COF's recommend change to the *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)* about the composition of personnel committees. The exact language is before you in your agenda under the COF agenda item capital A, little a. It is included here:

*By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.a.1(a)*

For a faculty member with an appointment in a single department or school, the Personnel Committee shall consist of all tenure-track faculty **members** and **all** term faculty members **in appointments renewable without the limitation of a maximum of six years (such as faculty librarians and term faculty members with substantial administrative duties that preclude appointment with tenure)** of the department or school except the person being reviewed and those in the first year or last year of service. Non-tenured members and those on leave may excuse themselves from any case without prejudice. For a faculty member with an appointment in two or more departments or programs, the Personnel Committee will be constituted as stipulated in the letter of appointment in keeping with the general spirit of the preceding provision.

The chair of COF then stated that as a friendly amendment, COF would like to amend the motion to make a parallel change to the *By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.b.1(a)* about the composition of search committees. The exact language is before you in your agenda under the COF agenda item capital B. It is included here:

*By-Law and Standing Rules of the Faculty IV.A.5.b.1(a)*

A Search Committee shall consist of all tenure-track **faculty members** and **all** term faculty members **in appointments renewable without the limitation of a maximum of six years (such as faculty librarians and term faculty members with substantial administrative duties that preclude appointment with tenure)** of the department except those in their first year or last year of service; there will be additional members, one from each of two other departments, chosen by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Committee on Faculty, from a list provided by the department. Additional members from other departments are not required in searches for positions lasting one year. In special circumstances, at the request of the Search 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, such as those who are in their first or last year of service. Non-tenured members and those on leave may excuse themselves from any search without prejudice.

The rationale for this friendly amendment is the construction of these committees should happen in parallel ways and it was inadvertent that COF didn't give advance notice about both of these changes last month. If anyone objects to this friendly amendment, COF will withdraw the amendment and simply give advance notice of the change to be voted on in September and call for a vote only on the change with regard to personnel committees.

The Chair of the Faculty asked if there were any objections to considering the amended motion. There were none, so the motion to be voted upon includes both sets of changes. Since the motion comes from a standing committee, it needs no second. The Chair of the Faculty then asked for questions or discussion about the motion.

A faculty member from the School of Music asked if the chair of COF could elaborate on the reasoning behind the changes. In his experience, people in fixed-term positions have contributed greatly to personnel and search committees – frequently, people in term positions are the only one or one of a few people with expertise in the area in question.

The Chair of COF responded that COF has seen an awkwardness when a person who does not have a long-term obligation to the University is making long-term decisions about the University.

The faculty member responded that his concern is with both sides of the issue. In the past, the University has not been willing to make a commitment to people in term positions until after they have served six years in a term position. Six years is a long-term commitment on the part of these faculty members. He is speaking against this motion.

Another faculty member spoke for the motion. He noted that when a search committee starts their work, they describe the position, so there is a potential for a conflict of interest.

Another faculty member stated that the School of Music might be a different situation than another department at the university, so maybe this should not be a university-wide policy.

The original School of Music faculty member pointed out that the handbook is very clear that the position request committee is made up of only tenured and tenure-track faculty members, so there is no chance that a term faculty member could be involved in crafting the position requirements; thus, that particular point is not an issue.

A faculty member who is also a member of COF spoke by noting that a term faculty member serving on a tenure committee has an inherent interest in how that decision goes – for example, setting the bar for tenure requirements. A term faculty member could have a self interest in serving on search committees as well. There are significant chances for a term person to be biased in their opinions.

There were no further comments. The motion passed.

The chair of COF stated that COF's next recommended change is to *Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)* and *Personnel Policies V.* These changes clarify the existing standards with regard to interim and term review, making more explicit that the standard for term review is the same as the standard for interim review. The second part of the change moves forward the language about completion of a terminal degree that currently is found only in Appendix 3 of the *Personnel Policies.* The statement reminds candidates and personnel committees that there is a requirement of clear progress toward the terminal degree at the time of interim or term review. These sections of the Personnel Policies are sections that are mutually agreed upon by the Faculty and the Administration and these changes have been discussed with the Administration.

The chair of COF moved that the faculty adopt COF's recommended change to the *Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)* and *Personnel Policies V.* clarifying the standards for interim and term review. The exact language is before you in your agenda under the COF agenda item capital A, little b. It is included here:

*Personnel Policies IV.C.4.(a)*

In the case of a term review, make an assessment about the evidenced strengths and concerns of **with regard to the candidate's job performance, clearly stating areas of desirable or necessary improvements** and a recommendation regarding an extension of the term, subject to the needs of the department or school.

Personnel Policies V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status (from 2004-05)

- **Term review. Required: Strong teaching during the period under review, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**
- **Interim review. Required: Strong teaching during the probationary period, promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service. Candidates who have not yet completed the terminal degree must show clear progress toward completion of the terminal degree for a satisfactory review as noted in Appendix 3 of the Personnel Policies.**

Since the motion comes from a standing committee, it needs no second. There was no discussion about this motion. The motion passed.

The chair of COF then stated that COF's next recommended change also falls in the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook in the sections mutually agreed upon by the Administration and the Faculty. Again, these changes have been discussed with the Administration. As was noted last month, this change is a result of COF's work to reduce file size which came out of a request by the Committee on Administration to have COF address this issue as part of COA's on-going efforts to address areas of burdensome work in the hopes to free-up more faculty time for teaching and scholarly or artistic pursuits.

The goal of the change is that in cases where there is unanimous agreement of a positive review by the personnel committee and the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for COF to reach unanimous agreement of a positive review, COF does not have to read a colleague's complete set of scholarly and artistic materials but rather a subset of them. Personnel committee members are best positioned to do a detailed analysis that can be done by reading a colleague's complete scholarly and artistic materials. COF's role is to overview the materials and to create a check of the personnel committee process. COF feels in cases where a review is uniformly positive, that overview is possible after reviewing a subset of the materials. This change would reduce workload for those on COF. If there is any disagreement on the departmental personnel committee or if even a minority of COF has any concerns, all members of COF will read the complete scholarly and artistic materials to be as thorough as possible in reaching conclusions.

The chair of COF reiterated that COF in no way sees this as a statement about placing any less value on scholarly and artistic work but rather recognizing that those who are best positioned to do a detailed analysis will read the complete scholarly and artistic dossier and COF feels confident they can complete their role after reviewing a subset of those materials, thus making workload more manageable. Given that there are nine faculty members on COF, this would save considerable faculty time for other teaching, scholarly and artistic pursuits.

The chair of COF moved that the faculty adopt COF's recommend change to the Personnel Policies IV.D. about the Committee on Faculty procedures with regard to reading of files at the COF level. The exact language is before you in your agenda under the COF agenda item capital A, little c. It is included here:

Personnel Policies IV.D. Committee on Faculty Procedure

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 **at least** the ~~entire~~ **core** decision file before making recommendations. **File guidelines established by COF clarify the core decision file includes everything except the scholarly and artistic work appendix.**

**5. If the PC report is unanimous and positive, and if the evidence in the core decision file is sufficient for the Committee on Faculty to reach a positive recommendation, COF may proceed to examine the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalize the recommendation. However, if even a minority of the Committee on Faculty reaches a negative conclusion based on the core file or if the PC report is not unanimously positive, all members of the Committee on Faculty must return to the decision file and read the appendices before COF examines the buffer file (see section IV.D.6 below) and finalizes the COF recommendation.**

56. 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.

*(and renumber the rest of the subsections in IV.D.)*

Since the motion comes from a standing committee, it needs no second. There was no discussion about this motion. The motion passed.

The chair of COF noted that COF has one additional recommended change to the Academic Handbook; thus, COF gave advance notice of its intent to bring the change forward for a vote at the September faculty meeting. A brief rationale for the change will be provided, and clarifying questions answered, and you are encouraged to share any comments or concerns you may have with the chair of COF later so that COF can be ready to address your concerns during the discussion in September. You are welcome to call or e-mail the chair of COF, or contact her through the COF Coordinator.

The chair of COF gave advance notice that COF recommends the faculty delete Appendix 2 of the Personnel Policies in the Academic Handbook and add language to Section IV.B.1 concerning the quantity of student opinion surveys a faculty member undergoing a promotion review not linked to tenure must provide. The exact language of the suggested change is in your agenda, COF agenda item capital C. It is included here [with the typographical error mentioned below fixed]:

Deletions are shown with a ~~strike through~~. Additions are in **bold**.

#### ~~Appendix 2: Evidence of Good Teaching for Tenured Faculty Members~~

~~Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student opinion surveys for than three or four semesters. "Complete sets" means all forms that have been filled out by students, the original jackets supplied by the Office of Institutional Research (which includes data on the number of students present and completing the forms) and the statistical reports of the OIR. If such evaluations are not provided, other evidence of teaching effectiveness (including broadly based student input) may be submitted. Such "other evidence" might include the following procedures conducted by the DPC or by appropriate evaluator(s) external to the department or the University: systematic peer observation and evaluation of classroom, laboratory, and studio teaching; thorough and representative sampling of the judgments of former students; in depth interviews of students; and detailed evaluation of syllabi.~~

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



....

## 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 A.3 above. With the exception of materials generated during investigative mode (as defined in C.3 and D.3 below), 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 Article 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 Article II: the faculty member's annual reports, the chair's or dean's responses to the annual reports, peer observations, and student opinion forms. **The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file for the review of faculty members for promotion not linked to a tenure review all of the student opinion forms from the most recent semesters of teaching at DePauw sufficient to make the total amount of teaching covered at least eighteen full credit courses (or equivalent).**
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 Article III.F.3.
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 Article III E.

The chair of COF noted a typographical error in the text that was provided to the Chair of the Faculty; the additional sentence should read, "The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file for the review of faculty members for promotion not linked to a tenure review all of the student opinion forms **FROM** the most recent semesters of teaching at DePauw sufficient to make the

total amount of teaching covered at least eighteen full credit courses (or equivalent).” The word ‘from’ between student opinion forms and the most recent semesters was inadvertently omitted.

The chair of COF pointed out that COF is suggesting this change because the language in Appendix 2 has been interpreted inconsistently and COF finds that too little of any one kind of evidence makes it difficult to evaluate a file. In particular, too few student opinion forms can lead to an unnecessary uncomfortable feeling about what someone is trying to hide. With a broader collection of opinion surveys in evidence that concern is quickly put to rest. COF struck a balance between the nine courses to twelve courses that might be represented by the three or four semesters currently required in Appendix 2 and the likely 33 courses covering 11 semesters typically found in a timely tenure dossier.

The chair of COF stated that she should also note that suggestions about dealing with this issue have been coming to COF from personnel committees for several years, and last year two former COF chairs worked on a recommendation for COF that suggested all student opinion forms since the last review be required. COF feels that the language before you represents an appropriate balance.

This completes COF’s business items for the faculty with regard to the Academic Handbook. The chair of COF opened the floor for questions or comments.

A faculty member asked a clarifying question – when would these changes take effect? The chair of COF stated that, if this was approved in September, it would be in effect for anyone coming up for promotion that year. In other words, it would take effect next year.

A faculty member asked that the chair of COF verify that the policy would have the VPAA assembling all of the student opinion forms, starting at the current semester and going back until eighteen courses has been reached. The chair of COF agreed, and added that COF believed it was more convenient to place this within the purview of the VPAA; she also noted that it is within the VPAA’s power to add any student opinion surveys he wishes to the file.

The chair of COF stated that COF released revised guidelines about the construction of personnel files as was announced last month. The chair of COF reminded faculty members that binder size has more to do with volume of evidence required to make a case and not the relative importance of any particular category, teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and service.

Once again, the chair of COF reminded the tenured faculty of the vacancies next year on COF. She realizes that service on this committee has a measurable workload but it is also important work, both to our untenured colleagues and those tenured colleagues coming up for a promotion review, and to our students. Also, in the event COF doesn’t get a full complement of colleagues serving on this committee any personnel decision COF might make is put in jeopardy by making those decisions automatically appealable. If you have tenure please consider running for this important committee. If you have questions about the details of the ebb and flow of workload on the committee, the chair of COF would be happy to discuss it with you.

Finally, the chair of COF asked if there were any other questions on COF’s other written announcements or questions.

A faculty member asked about requiring background checks on finalists for faculty searches; why is this necessary? The chair of COF stated that the legal counsel for the University has recommended that DePauw do criminal background checks before hiring any new faculty members. She simply wanted to inform the faculty that the conversation was on-going.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- COF reminds tenured faculty members of the importance of service on this committee, not only to our un-tenured colleagues but also to those tenured but being reviewed for promotion.
- COF continues its work reviewing files.
- COF has been asked by the Administration to consult about requiring background checks on finalists in searches for faculty colleagues. That work is on-going.

*[At this point, the Director of Institutional Research returned with the responses to the poll, and the motion regarding the summer working group was made and passed. This was reported earlier in the minutes.]*

*Report from the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (Chair: Greg Schwipps)*

The chair of SLAAC's report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- SLAAC welcomes Tiffany Hebb as the chair of SLAAC for next year.

**Reports from Other Committees**

Note: A complete committee membership list is available at [www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/).

*Report from the Committee on Administration (Chair: Marcia McKelligan)*

The chair of COA's report consisted of an offer to answer questions.

A faculty member asked for clarification; when we received notice about our benefits, the information stated that we would be reducing the amount that DePauw would pay to the emeriti faculty. Does this mean that we are going back on our word to those people?

The chair of COA stated that the notice came to COA as an announcement. It was felt that it would be wise to have one year reduction to VEBA contributions, with a promise that they would be made up for later on. There are two possible models for this "making up" – increasing contributions across the board, or carrying out contributions for an extra year.

The VPAA indicated that there was some confusion about the term emeriti. A company named EMERITI coordinates our programs for both current retiree health insurance and our program for pre-retirement health saving accounts for current employees. What is being reduced for next year is the contribution to the EMERITI funds for current employees. Currently, retirees receive a subsidy from DePauw of their health care premiums. DePauw's premium subsidy for retirees has been raised at the same percentage that the employee payroll has been raised. There has not been a cut in the subsidy for retirees, but that subsidy will not increase next year, since employee payroll has not increased for next year.

A faculty member stated that she was told at the chairs' meeting that COA would be discussing recommendations for the soon-to-be vacant VPAA position. She said she would be interested in more information. The chair of COA stated that COA had met with President Casey once, and there is another meeting soon, with hopefully a third meeting after that. She said that it is fair to say that there has been some brainstorming; we have not made a lot of progress; she wishes that she could be more helpful.

The following announcements were in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

- The Committee on Administration has completed its work on health care insurance options for next year and has made its recommendations to the administration. Information will be sent to all employees soon, if it has not already been made available by the time of this faculty meeting. COA urges all employees to educate themselves thoroughly on the new array of health insurance options. The Committee has resumed discussion of the standard 5-course workload and hopes to send a brief document to the Intellectual Life Summer Working Group which might be helpful to that group as it does its work. The COA has also met once with President Casey at his request to discuss the process by which a replacement for Neal Abraham will be made. We expect there will be at least two additional meetings on this topic.

*Report from the Faculty Development Committee (Chair: John Schlotterbeck)*

The chair of FDC pointed out to faculty members that hold faculty fellowships in their first or second year that reports are due to Terry Bruner by Thursday, May 7. He also stated that the last day of class is on Thursday, so the faculty accomplishment reception is on Thursday beginning at 4:15. Finally he stated that the new budget year begins on July 1, which means that FDC will have new funds. Faculty members are invited to apply for these funds – faculty development funds will be higher next year than in previous years. He noted that payments from various funds will be monitored more carefully.

*Report from the Library Advisory Committee (Chair: Doug Harms)*

The chair of the Library Advisory Committee's report consisted of an offer to answer questions. There were no questions.

The following announcement was in the agenda, but not read in the meeting:

*To the Faculty (from Rick Provine):*

*For several years you have helped us wrestle with the rising cost and changing models of scholarly publication. The publishing industry continues to pass along yearly increases of 7-15 percent to libraries. Coupled with the recent financial environment, and the prospect of several years of flat budgets, we need to address our current subscriptions.*

*We invite you to look over the following lists and share with us any particular concerns you may have. Keep in mind that we currently have (and will maintain) access to about 20,000 journal titles through our electronic licensing and subscriptions.*

*Our priority is to maintain the most and best access in support of teaching and research at DePauw. The librarians and I have studied closely our usage data and recurring commitments. We have met with the Faculty Library Advisory Committee and incorporated their thoughts and concerns. We have developed the recommendations for cancellation observing the following principles:*

**1. Eliminate duplication first.**

*We receive many titles in both print and electronic form. Duplication may not mean a perfect one-to-one correspondence, but with recent advances in ILL and varieties of electronic access, we will work to achieve the maximum access to journals for our budget dollar.*

**2. Maximize our flexibility to respond to book requests.**

*Our faculty and curriculum change over time. Books are still an important part of your teaching and research. It is imperative that the library respond to these changes and continue to build collections that are timely and relevant.*

### **3. Preference materials that are used over materials that are not.**

*Some items in our collection simply receive little to no use. Canceling some of these titles will allow us to better respond to your requests for new titles. (We recognize that not all use is accounted for in our data, making it crucial to get your input.)*

*Our goal is to provide you with the resources necessary for teaching and learning. We need your help to ensure that we meet this goal. I will be happy to meet with you individually or as a department to discuss this further. Please respond with any changes you wish to suggest by Friday, May 15.*

*Thanks for your cooperation and assistance.*

*Rick Provine  
Director of Libraries*

View online at <http://www.depauw.edu/library/deselection/2009/>  
Or link from the library homepage at <http://www.depauw.edu/library>

- *List 1 includes titles that we receive in multiple formats. To achieve savings, we will cancel the print subscriptions but retain electronic access. In some cases, this may mean that we no longer receive the most current issues. We can, however, retrieve them for you quickly via ILL. (We will maintain print subscriptions to titles with substantial visual content, such as art journals.)*
- *List 2 includes items that receive little to no use, and we propose cancellation. There will be no electronic access to these titles. They can be borrowed via ILL.*
- *List 3 includes electronic indexes proposed for cancellation. Each entry contains an explanation of the rationale for cancellation.*

### **Remarks from the President**

The President began his report by asking the Vice President for Admissions and Financial Aid to give a brief report.

The VP for Admissions stated that when she volunteered to share information with the President for the faculty meeting this week, she did not fully anticipate giving the report that she was about to make. Through informal conversations with colleagues from GLCA schools today via email, we have learned that most of these schools, as has been predicted by many as a national trend, are lagging behind their enrollment goals. Fortunately, for us, this is not the case.

She stated that DePauw did intentionally admit more students this year, like many schools did, in anticipation of a challenging year, and we were able to do so with very little impact on our selectivity as we received a record number of applications for admission. As you are likely aware, while DePauw has discussed the extensive budget cuts we have implemented across the University, we did not reduce the financial aid budget, in anticipation of more students demonstrating more significant financial need, which has indeed proven to be the case.

As of 3:30 PM today, DePauw has received enrollment deposits from 772 students, including 750 first year students. 48 are students in the School of Music. 44% of these students are men, and 56% are

women. 17% of the students are domestic students of color, and 11% are international students, representing a total of 19 countries. 38% of the students are from Indiana. We have 21 students enrolled in the Summer Ecuador program, 21 Posse students, 62 Holton Scholars, and 11 Rector Scholars. 28 students have committed to the Honor Scholar program, 22 to ITAP, 44 to Management Fellows, 23 to Media Fellows, and 19 to the Science Research Fellows program.

Importantly, at this point in time, DePauw has exceeded our net tuition revenue goals, though there are still outstanding considerations which will impact all of the numbers I have cited. The State of Indiana has not yet determined if its very generous state grant program will continue to be as generous as it has been in past years, and that could have an impact on students in all four class years, which in turn would impact the overall budget. Additionally, each summer DePauw tends to lose between 30-50 students, for a wide variety of reasons, and many in admission circles anticipate greater than normal "summer melt," as it is called, this year. So, while some challenges are inevitable as a result of what looks to be a large class, and meeting our goals by enrolling a large class is not a long-term, sustainable enrollment model, this year having the flexibility to do so has provided us with a much appreciated and necessary cushion as we head into the summer with questions yet to be answered, and the actual, final enrollment number still very much up in the air.

The Vice President shared her thanks, on behalf of the admission staff, for the faculty members' support of our efforts this year. We have already seen over 800 more visitors to campus to date this year than we had seen in the whole of last year, and it is largely because of the many positive interactions with so many members of the DePauw community that we have achieved the results we have to date. Thanks again for your support.

The President then returned to the floor for his report. He began by stating that the last couple of days have been shocking. DePauw has been modeling our yield numbers based on what has been happening in the GLCA. Oberlin, Kenyan, and DePauw are doing well, but the others are in trouble. The yield numbers have dramatically swung this year.

The President noted that DePauw has revamped the admitted student weekends – thanks to the faculty for that. What will happen to the state of Indiana will have an impact on DePauw, but we have flexibility now. We do need to monitor what this will do to our classroom experience – we will pay attention to this and do what we can. We need to know where these students are going to go, and how classes are going to work. He is very happy that Oberlin, Kenyan, and DePauw look desirable to people in the Midwest. As soon as he gets further data, he will get it out to the faculty.

The President said that in regards to COA, they have had one discussion about the new VPAA; he thought it was productive, and that they have made some important decisions about naming someone to the permanent position. Neal has agreed to stay on until August 1, and we will have an interim strategy in place before then. If you have any thoughts about interim or permanent appointments, please contact him. He will be meeting with COA again on Thursday.

The President stated that he was pleased to report that the Board of Trustees has endorsed a preliminary budget. Finalizing the budget was very difficult, particularly the VEBA decision; we have abided by our attempt to not lay off any permanent employees. He acknowledged the work of Tom Dixon, particularly in the review of the health insurance plan and the change in management styles at the Walden – this year's Walden Inn operating deficit is expected to be \$600,000; next year it should be \$482,000.

With the big incoming class, the budget might have surpluses; we still need to watch it carefully, there could be a few more bad years coming up. The surpluses should be used to leave a contingency cushion. Our situation looks a lot better – it is now OK, instead of dire. The budget will be formally approved in October, when we know the enrollment.

The President wrapped up his report by thanking Neal Abraham. The President stated that he only had the benefit of working with Neal for one year, but Neal has worked tirelessly and fully for this University. He has been relentless in his desire to do all he can do for DePauw. The President stated that Neal has been a wise and steady hand for him, and he always knew that Neal had the institution's interests at heart. After the faculty gave a long standing ovation for Neal, the President stated that once we get through commencement, there will be a party to thank Neal in a more casual manner.

The President then opened the floor for questions.

A faculty member asked the President what is DePauw's ideal class size? The President responded by saying that he actually thinks that DePauw should be slightly smaller than it already is. In every model of planning for the next year, we were aiming for a class of 635. We were actually shooting for a little larger than that, since every consultant was saying that it was going to be difficult to make our class.

Another faculty member asked the President to comment on how we will deal with the large student class. The President noted that, even if we enroll all the incoming students, we will not have the largest student body ever at DePauw. The VPAA stated that we do expect some melt of students, so perhaps around 735 first-year students. This would be around 100 students more than usual, which would make up for the past two classes that came in about 30-50 students lower than usual, so our student body will actually be around the usual size, although unbalanced towards the first-year class. We may have to be less tolerant of classes with only 8, 9, or 10 students, and move to create more spaces for first-year students. We will be about 2320-2350 in total students, which is close to our highest total. There could, of course, be remarkable changes – maybe we will receive more deposits, and have no melt at all.

The President added that we don't have this option for multiple years – we can't keep admitting more huge classes like this. The VPAA noted that this is a great thing for the future; with this class size and this discount rate, we can manage things toward a more balanced class in the future. We have room to think progressively about how to balance the class, all to the betterment of intellectual life at DePauw. The President concluded by stating that he is looking at the numbers daily, and we will have to see what is happening, even well into July. He said that he would rather be coming at this problem from the angle we are coming at it than from what some other GLCA schools are facing.

### ***Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs***

The VPAA told the faculty about a note that had been sent to department chairs and interdisciplinary leaders. Some academic buildings will not be air-conditioned this summer, part of a comprehensive set of economies to avoid layoffs and salary cuts. Space will be offered to affected faculty members in air-conditioned buildings. He also asked that faculty not spend money that may remain in this year's budget except for things that are definitely needed this year – please don't buy things before June 30 that are needed next year; those purchases should come out of next year's budget.

The VPAA noted that since we will have more students than we expected; we need to think about how we will accommodate for this, particularly in terms of class sizes. Since there will not be much chance (or funding) to add faculty members to address this need; we will need everyone's help for this task in accommodating the new students in larger classes.

The VPAA brought to the faculty's attention that there is a reception celebrating faculty professional accomplishments on Thursday, and Friday is the faculty recognition dinner sponsored by the President to recognize retirees and faculty award recipients, and to present the most prestigious awards.

Finally, the VPAA stated that it took five institutions to attract him away from DePauw, and he looks forward to taking pride in what we will do in the years to come.

***Old Business***

There was no old business.

***New Business***

There was no new business.

***Announcements***

There were no announcements.

***Adjournment***

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 PM.



## Appendix A: Proposed Changes in Transfer Credit Policies from MAO

### Transfer Credit

DePauw students who take part of their work at another institution with the intention of transferring the credit to DePauw should obtain advance approval through the Office of the Registrar, from the advisor and the department chairs concerned. Final transfer credit evaluation will be made only after DePauw has received an official transcript of the coursework directly from the issuing school.

DePauw generally accepts course credits earned at accredited institutions as elective credit, if the grades are C or above and the subject and level are appropriate for a DePauw liberal arts degree. However, the University does not accept credit awarded at another institution by national tests or departmental examinations. Other transfer credit policies are:

- Courses are evaluated on the basis of equivalent course offerings at DePauw and, if accepted, may be counted toward meeting graduation distribution requirements. Department chairs determine those courses that meet major requirements.
- DePauw records, without credit, physical education activity courses taken if an institution does not give credit for those courses. However, the classes may count toward the graduation distribution requirement.
- The University may accept courses taken Pass/Fail, if the grade P indicates that the student has done C work or better in accordance with the grade standards of the institution or if the student can prove through the institutional authorities that the course performance was a C grade or above. A grade of P in PE activity courses is accepted up to the equivalent of one course credit.
- Students transferring to DePauw from another school at which January or interim session courses are a part of the regular curriculum that is offered during the academic year may receive credit for the courses. DePauw students wishing to attend another school that gives credit for a January interim session normally receive Winter Term credit only. Exceptions allowing for credit transfer may be arranged through the Office of the Registrar.
- DePauw accepts course credits from junior or community colleges when the quality and extent of the work prove to be the equivalent of DePauw work. **Students who have completed the equivalent of four semesters may not transfer credit earned at a community college.**
- When credit allowed for work taken at another institution is not justified by the quality of subsequent DePauw work, the credit may be rescinded.
- Students may not earn transfer credit from courses offered concurrently with their DePauw enrollments except by permission of the Petitions Committee.

### Online and Distance Learning Transfer Credit

Online courses with a fixed beginning and end date which allow regular interaction with the class members are treated the same as other transferred classes. For correspondence or open ended online courses, a maximum of one course credit may be earned. All policies governing transfer credit apply to courses taken online or by correspondence: they must be sponsored by an accredited institution and be accepted for credit by that institution toward its own bachelors degree; they must be on a liberal arts topic; and they must be pre-approved by the chair of the department into which the course transfers, the student's academic advisor, and the Registrar's Office. Normally, the University does not award credit for modern language or laboratory science courses taken online. Students may not earn transfer credit from online or correspondence courses offered concurrently with their DePauw enrollments except by permission of the Petitions Committee.

## **Summer School Credit**

~~The University evaluates credit earned in summer schools on the basis of equivalent work at DePauw; however, the credit given by DePauw may not exceed that granted by the original school. No grades below C are accepted. Any student who wishes to apply for credit for summer school courses must have the approval of the department concerned.~~

### ***Transfer Credit Approval***

*DePauw students should complete the transfer credit approval form, available in the Registrar's Office, prior to enrolling in any course of study intended for transfer credit. This includes summer school courses, summer study abroad programs, and online courses. This form requires the signatures of the department chair or program director in the academic area in which the course will count, the student's academic advisors, who will approve the course for credit toward a major or minor, and the registrar, who will approve the amount of credit to be awarded and the applicability of the course to general graduation requirements.*

## **Policy for Summer Study Abroad**

~~There are additional steps for obtaining approval to earn credit on an international program during the summer. Contact the Registrar's Office.~~

## **College Credit for High School Students**

**~~Students who earn college credit while attending classes in a high school setting will not receive credit until they are evaluated by the appropriate department or program at DePauw. Generally, students should perform at the B level or higher if they expect to earn transfer credit.~~**

If the student is attending classes on a college or university campus with students who have already matriculated and the course is taught by a regular college or university faculty member, DePauw will allow credit if the student receives a grade of **C** or higher and provided that subsequent testing at DePauw, when appropriate, indicates satisfactory learning.

*Unassigned, elective credit will be awarded for courses taken in a dual enrollment program with the high school. Unassigned credit is listed as University Studies (UNIV) credit and is applicable to the credit required for graduation but not to majors, minors and distribution requirements. To receive such credit the courses must be at a level equivalent to DePauw courses and the student must earn at least a C in the courses. To receive assigned credit (i.e., credit that is assigned to a particular department and counts toward a major or minor) the student must meet with the appropriate department chair or program director within the first semester. He/she will review the course content and the student's performance in it.*

## **Credit for Training in Armed Forces**

In the evaluation of credit for training and educational experiences in the armed services, the University considers the recommendations in the American Council on Education *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services* and the appropriateness of the work toward a liberal arts degree.

One course credit may be granted for the completion of a specific military program in the Reserve Officers Candidate Schools. The University does not give credit for such a program in addition to credit for military service and/or ROTC.

## **Transfer Credit from Other 4-1-4 Schools**

Students wishing to take a course at another university for transfer credit during January may do so if:

- the student has completed the First-Year Winter Term requirement successfully;
- credit is authorized by the appropriate department at DePauw and the Office of the Registrar;
- it is not taken concurrently with a DePauw Winter Term; and
- it is not used as one of the three required Winter Terms.

## **Advanced Placement**

First-year students may earn a maximum of eight courses through a combination of the following programs:

1. **Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board.**  
Students who have passed the CEEB Advanced Placement (AP) examination with ratings of 5, 4 and sometimes 3 may enroll for those higher-level courses for which the department concerned determines them to be qualified. Any student who receives a score of 5 or 4 on an examination is granted one course credit toward graduation, except for studio art and economics. Students must take both microeconomics and macroeconomics in order to earn a full course credit in economics. In some cases, an additional course credit may be granted upon recommendation of the department concerned and the approval of the Office of the Registrar. Students with ratings of 3 may receive credit at the discretion of the department concerned. The full AP Policy is available at the Registrar's web site: <http://www.depauw.edu/admin/registrar>.

## 2. **College-level Courses Taken While a High School Student.**

~~Students who enroll in college-level courses taken in the high school must establish credit by subsequent evaluation at DePauw. See transfer credit in this section for more information. High school students who take college classes taught on a college campus with other college students and earn a grade of C or higher may receive credit. (College credit taken on a college campus is not included in the eight course limit.)~~

If the student is attending classes on a college or university campus with students who have already matriculated and the course is taught by a regular college or university faculty member, DePauw will allow credit if the student receives a grade of **C** or higher and provided that subsequent testing at DePauw, when appropriate, indicates satisfactory learning.

*Unassigned, elective credit will be awarded for courses taken in a dual enrollment program with the high school. To receive such credit the courses must be at a level equivalent to DePauw courses and the student must earn at least a C in the course. To receive assigned credit (i.e., credit that is assigned to a particular department and counts toward a major or minor) the student must meet with the appropriate department chair or program director who will review the course content and the student's performance in it.*

## 3. **Departmental Placement Examinations.**

Students may qualify for ~~credit or~~ admission to higher-level courses on the basis of departmental placement examinations given on campus during the orientation period. Departments have established examinations to evaluate the competence and preparation of new students in their respective fields and will assign them to courses on the basis of the examinations. *In some cases credit for lower level courses will be awarded when the student completes the higher level course.*

## 4. ~~Credit by Examination.~~

~~Each student has the right to take a departmental examination in any given subject during the first semester at DePauw. If the results of the examination warrant, the department concerned may grant up to two course credits subject to the maximum number of courses of advanced credit. The department may grant the advanced credit without requiring the student to take additional work in the requirement area.~~

~~There is a non-refundable fee for each examination that is constructed, administered and graded by a departmental representative of DePauw University at student request.~~

## 5. **International Baccalaureate.**

(IB) credit may be awarded for subjects taken at the higher level upon departmental review and recommendation. A student normally receives at least one course credit for each higher-level examination with a score of 5, 6 or 7, subject to departmental approval. Students may receive one course credit for higher-level examinations with a score of 4 following further departmental examination. Advanced credit or exemption from requirements is also available through regular University placement and testing.

## **6. ~~Cambridge A-Levels~~**

~~Up to 2 course credits (8 semester hours) may be granted, based on department review of course/exam content, for each A Level subject with marks of C or better. Credit is not awarded for AS Level subjects.~~

### ***International Advanced Placement Programs***

*Credit for British A-Levels, French Baccalaureate, German Abitur and other international advanced study program is awarded based on individual review. In general, students may earn up to two course credits (8 semester hours) for each A-Level subject passed with a grade of C or better.*

## Appendix B: Board of Trustees Resolution

### RESOLUTION OF THE DEPAUW UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**WHEREAS**, the Trustees are pleased and impressed with the progress the faculty has continued to make in its discussion of DePauw's intellectual life; and

**WHEREAS**, the Trustees share with the faculty the sense of historic importance for DePauw University's future that these conversations lead to curricular and co-curricular revisions;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Trustees urge the faculty to continue to think boldly about the future of DePauw University as the intellectual life discussions and planning processes continue.

**APPROVED** this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2009.