

Faculty Governance Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Oct. 13, 2015

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

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

**Reports from committees**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hubbard Center Task Force.

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

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

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

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

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

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