

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 3, 2016

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

Guest: President Elect Mark McCoy

Mark McCoy accepted the notes and minutes from our last meeting with him. Pam will see that the minutes are posted to the university's faculty governance website.

We had an informal, interesting discussion of the "culture of busy-ness" among administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In addition, President Elect McCoy mentioned the problem of the "Camp College" drinking culture that students encounter during their first week on campus, which often leads some of our academically strongest students (who aren't interested in partying) to leave. We aren't going to get rid of Greek life, but how can we redefine it to focus more on leadership. Student Life and Residence Life are behind this: moving from our reputation of DePauw as a social place and to DePauw as an academic place. We need to build a greater sense of community among the Greek houses, do an education program for our alumni, provide options other than drinking in Greencastle, increase our academic expectations (including Friday morning classes).

David Alvarez indicated that he is in favor of this, but questioned how we might be able to make a stronger connection between Student Life and Academic Life. How can Faculty Governance play a role? McCoy responded that the Student Academic Life Committee is the place where this *could* happen, but not sure if it *is* happening. He is working with Myrna Hernandez, and they will then bring this to SAL. Governance Committee can then charge SAL to address this.

Glen Kuecker commented that he believes we put students in a bind with mixed messages: we tell them that academics come first, but then they exist in a community where they get a different message (e.g., athletics, Greek life, culture of busy-ness). McCoy—two schools of thought on change: 1) John Kotter, 2) Heath brothers He would like to suggest that the goal is to shape the path, making it easier for students to do the right thing. We need a unified agreement that this is what we expect. "We're not going to attract good students with bad students." Our current academic expectations are not so high that they are preventing students from partying. Help students to understand that we're doing this for their own good and success.

Lori Miles offered that we don't have a lot of discussion regarding teaching rigor; it's not just about "low grades" or giving longer assignments. Not all of our faculty know what good teaching is. Student opinion survey questions don't correlate with the tenure and promotion criteria for teaching evaluation. McCoy—need to

operationalize this and then execute. What he would like the Governance Committee to help us do: identify, strategize, operationalize, and execute. As an institution, we tend not to be so good at the latter steps. Lori Miles—tenure should be a process of identifying excellence rather than just weeding out the lowest common denominator. Timeliness of feedback from faculty is still a huge problem for students. Sometimes Posse students pick courses based on what they can afford (e.g., based on lab fees and textbook costs). McCoy—responsibility falls on all of us: faculty, administration, staff, and students. We need to hold each other accountable.

David Alvarez suggested that, as an institution, we tend to recognize faculty more fully for their professional successes (e.g., putting them on the website) rather than their teaching successes. Glen Kuecker commented that Review Committee did have a proposal for raising the bar for tenure and promotion criteria last year, but it got caught up in a black hole and never passed. He suggested that there is a culture within the faculty that may disagree with raising the review criteria. Also need to clarify how we define the mission of a liberal arts institution in the 21st Century. It's not just about training you for a career and making money, but we need to approach learning as if our survival as a species depends upon it. McCoy—We do have to be thinking about the future. The challenge facing us is that survival of liberal arts in 21st Century depends on changing the conversation. How does the liberal arts translate to the public today? "We believe liberal arts education is best education for the 21st Century and we will make it relevant to you." We are at a tipping point and we will not see unending increases in tuition. With regard to admissions this year, McCoy offered that we missed the mark; we will get 600 students, but not the revenue we want. He believes DePauw is not distinctive enough.

Lori Miles—lots of ways for schools to get reputations. Maybe do something new and radical. McCoy—We've had a huge shift in students saying they know what they want to do, what they want to major in, from 20% up to 80% in just the last 5 years.

Bridget Gourley—Given that such a huge number of our faculty are tenured and fully promoted, we have to align our reward structures with what we value. Pam Propsom—need for post-full professor review to hold people accountable. McCoy—he guarantees that that would have full administrative support, but the initiative needs to come from the faculty.

Pam Propsom asked President Elect McCoy whether he would support continuing to have faculty representatives at the Board of Trustee (BOT) meetings. McCoy—Absolutely. Only voting trustees vote on the board, so he suggested that we not ask for a vote. Is it possible that every faculty member could come to a Board meeting at some point? How do we make it happen? Propsom—at least two mechanisms: 1) official faculty representatives to Board meetings, the four directly elected members to the Strategic Planning Committee; 2) more opportunities for informal interactions. There are lots of examples on p. 85 of the Bahls book for how the board, president, and faculty can more effectively share information with each other. Gourley—need to get BOT meetings on the calendar so people know when they are.

McCoy—let's brainstorm ways to make this informal interaction happen, especially when the board is on campus. Kuecker—is it possible to get student and staff representation on the Board? Someone from the Greencastle community? He also suggested that the Board is insular; what about getting non-DePauw people on the Board? McCoy—the latter is a hard sell because it's a no pay job. When the board discusses community issues they bring community people in.

Gourley—referred to the question that came up at the most recent faculty meeting regarding faculty salaries. Faculty usually don't get their appointment letters until the summer and we don't know until then what any raise we might get. Can we get into a mechanism where we regularly get information benchmarking faculty salaries? McCoy related how we stood overall in total faculty salary expenditure relative to GLCA schools, as well as the mix of assistant, associate, and full professors within the salary pull. If we look at the total blend, we are second highest in the GLCA in average salary and third in total comp behind Oberlin and Kenyon. His preference is that we plan ahead, perhaps in the following way: "if revenue is X, raises will be Y." We've got to continue to build our endowment.

McCoy left and we discussed nominees for the Campus-Community Liaison Committee. Alvarez encouraged us to continue to think about the race issue that was central to the September incident. Beth Benedix and Steve Timm were our appointments.

Next week—final meeting. Discuss having School of Music faculty representative on the Governance Committee. Confidentiality document. New draft of hiring and review of administrators document.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee
Sept. 9, 2016

Present: Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker, Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman

Howard graciously agreed to run the meeting until all members were in attendance and we could select a chair.

Minutes from last year. There are three sets of meeting minutes from last year that have not been finalized. Glen and Pam (continuing members) will make sure these get approved, also checking with Anne Harris and Mark McCoy, given that they were present at the meetings as well.

Annual Report for Academic Year. Glen sent a note adding an action from the draft Annual Report for Academic Year 2015-2016. Pam will revise.

Selecting a chair. Glen was elected as committee chair for the year.

Meeting time. Fridays from 1:40-2:40 in the future, in Julian 372 (the room is reserved for the remainder of the fall semester's meetings). We plan to meet weekly, but we'll see what is necessary. We have adopted a practice of meeting with VPAA and President once a month to coordinate our shared governance activities.

Arts Advisory Committee. Craig Hadley has raised the issue of there being two overlapping/conflicting arts committees. Glen will contact Craig requesting a written proposal for resolving this and creating one committee.

Membership of Committee. Membership of the Faculty Governance Committee is to include the Chair of Chairs; however, the previous Chair of Chairs couldn't find anyone willing to both run the Chairs' Meeting and attend this meeting. Howard Brooks already attends the Chairs' Meeting and therefore it might be unnecessary to have another rep from Chairs' Meeting on Governance Committee. In addition, last year's committee thought it would be important to have a designated position for a School of Music (SOM) representative on the Faculty Governance Committee. Bob reminded us that the new SOM Dean is sitting on Review Committee for some of the cases. Francesca asked if the same process is used for personnel reviews in SOM as in the CLA. Bob indicated that this is one reason the new SOM Dean is sitting on Review Committee. There are ongoing Academic Handbook revisions to clarify SOM roles in the review process. One guiding principle is that no one should participate at more than one level of review. These Handbook revisions will probably come back to the Governance Committee for review and then eventually come before the faculty as a whole for a vote. It would be a good idea for our committee to have a meeting with the new SOM Dean to talk about shared governance. When we discussed how the SOM rep to the Faculty Governance committee should be selected, the proposal was to have this person elected by the faculty as a whole. We would need to officially change committee membership in the Handbook and bring this before the faculty for a vote.

Agenda for Faculty Meeting. Our committee sets the order of items on the Faculty Meeting agenda so we can rearrange it for the September meeting to invite the president to speak early on regarding the recent racial event on campus.

Global Crossroads Initiative. David Alvarez sent a request asking for volunteers or an ad hoc committee to work on defining the new “International Experience” general education requirement. Governance Committee will direct Curriculum Committee to address this issue.

Faculty salaries. The issue of faculty salaries used to be addressed by COA, but within the new governance structure it doesn't really seem to have a home. We will send this issue to the Strategic Planning Committee. Might be worthwhile to have a continued discussion of workload, compensation, etc.

Academic freedom. Forwarded by Michael Roberts and the Psychology & Neuroscience Department. First went to the Chairs Meeting and then was suggested that we use one of the Open Meetings for a discussion of academic freedom and balancing this with having a safe and inclusive learning environment. Given the recent racial incident on campus and the upcoming DePauw Dialogue, it may be wise to wait and see what happens and perhaps have this topic at a later Open Meeting. We would need to make sure that we have informed people who can facilitate the discussion. Governance Committee will be a steering committee for this Open Meeting.

Issues for the future. Philadelphia Center situation (need info from VPAA). A system for the administration to inform the university community about bias incidents. Faculty role in hiring and review of senior administrators. Confidentiality and shared governance.

Submitted by Pam Propsom

16 Sept 2016 Minutes of Faculty Governance Committee Meeting

=====

Present: R. Hershberger, H. L. Brooks, G. Kuecker (chair), T. Good, B. Hanson, F. Seeman.

P. Propsom is away.

0. Glen provided, via e-mail, updates on action items from the previous meeting. There was no call for further discussion on these items at the meeting.

1. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

2. Glen reports that the Dean of the SOM is agreeable to the idea of having an SOM representative on this committee. The committee decided that the representative does not necessarily have to be an SOM faculty member. Glen will prepare draft handbook language for the committee to discuss. After revision this can go to the entire faculty for the usual approval process.

3. The issue of the Class Dean and Advising Committee (AC) system was discussed. Several faculty members have pointed out to one or more committee members that the AC was developed without proper faculty committee input, nor any general faculty input. Some committee members felt the issue probably should have gone to the Curricular Committee for input.

This new system was developed late in the academic year and over the summer as the administration was being re-organized by the incoming president, McCoy. In addition to the AC system, Dave Berque now reports to Alan Hill, and not the VPAA, Anne Harris. This change effectively moved grade grievances and academic integrity processes out of the VPAA's area. Apparently the VPAA is not bothered by these changes, as they are strictly procedural. In addition, the handbook apparently says the VPAA may be consulted on these kinds of matters. However, some members of the committee wondered if this should read "must" rather than "may."

The faculty members who raised this issue, as well as members of the committee, are concerned about the principle of shared governance. The Handbook is clear that topics such as advising are a faculty issue and faculty committees should be consulted extensively, and possibly provide leadership on this issue.

The committee discussed the current situation, how it should have been handled, and how to move forward. There is apparently no particular objection to the programs put in place, but rather the manner in which they came to be. Glen, in his role as chair, plans to have a few strategic conversations to clarify the concerns and perspectives of different stakeholders, and the committee's discussion will need to continue. At the minimum, as of this meeting, it appears that the committee feels as if resolving this is properly the responsibility of this committee, and eventually the committee will have to make some sort of statement on this issue.

4. There was a brief discussion of a "confidentiality memo" that circulated last year within the Governance Committee. The policy memo/brief was authored by Kuecker, Hahn, Fancy, and Cameron. Three current members of the committee have seen the memo in their roles serving on various committees last year. This memo will apparently be coming to this committee in the near future for discussion. The chair advised that the memo was sent to the VPAA and President McCoy over the summer for their consideration, and the President instructed the VPAA to initiate a process for discussing the policy memo. The Chair of the Faculty advised that the VPAA meet with him to discuss a process. The first step is to send it to the university lawyer for review and input and the memo is in the lawyer's hands. The chair advised committee members that after the lawyer's review, the committee will most likely read and discuss the memo.

5. Part of the confidentiality memo pertains to on-going governance discussions about faculty voice in recruitment, review, and retention of members of the administration, whose work directly impacts faculty and the academic program (the relevant titles are the VPAA, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the SOM, the VP for Student Academic Life, and the Dean of the Library). Some (a sufficiently vague term for now) have argued that faculty should have a role on the search committees, and in evaluating these posts (possibly in a manner similar to how department chairs are currently evaluated). Historically, from time-to-time faculty may have served some of these roles, but there appears to be no systematic and consistent practice. This is something this committee can discuss further, intestinal fortitude allowing. To at least get a better view of the new administrative organizational chart, B. Hanson has requested from C. Babington, the president's Chief of Staff, a current organizational chart. This was provided in short order and has been shared with the committee via e-mail.

Minutes prepared by B. Hanson

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes September 23, 2016

Howard Brooks chairing the meeting as Kuecker is in Tucson for Border Studies Advisory Board Meeting.

Attending: Francesca Seaman, Pam Propsom, Bob Hershberger, Howard Brooks, Bryan Hanson, Tim Good

Convene at 146pm

Minutes approved from last week Sep 16

Chair update (written notes from Kuecker)

- Committee members emailed with report on chair's conversations with several protagonists in Spring 2016 process leading to formation of Class Dean system. Chair spoke with VPAA (part of discussion about committee agenda), Rebecca Schindler (member of SAL and placed on "ad hoc" group that wrote report), David Guinee (Chair of Curricular). Chair of SAL was contacted, but no reply.
- Chair spoke with Jacob Hale, chair of Advising Committee. He reported that Advising was approached by administration (VPAA and maybe Dean of Academic Life) in April (a little fuzzy but it was not earlier in the semester, like February). Advising was asked to participate in a group to look at class dean concept. Hale was not aware that Advising needed to report to Curriculum. Hale reports that when Alvarez asked his Sept faculty meeting question, he realized that there was an obvious flaw in the process.
- Chair spoke with Alvarez and Fancy to update them on status of the landscape.
- Chair has not received new business items from the faculty.
- Chair will work with Faculty Chair to send email to chairs of committees reminding them to produce and post minutes, report to appropriate committees, report out to faculty at large (their main agenda items), and provide an annual report to the Chair of the Faculty.
- No updates on Confidentiality policy memo, still with university lawyer.
- Draft Handbook changes circulated to committee members.

Tim Good volunteered to take minutes.

Minutes approved from Sep 16.

Approved SOM Handbook changes for committee member.
Howard will recirculate and we will finish next week

Discussion of the process that led to Class Dean system, advising software, and grade grievance.

Report from Tim Good Student Academic Life Committee discussion

- a. the Class Dean system and advising software should not have been instituted without a vote of the faculty, or at least
- b. they should not have been instituted without more input from the faculty.
- c. Liaison appointment and reporting procedures specified in the Academic Handbook were not followed, and consequently
- d. the existence and activities of the Advising Committee were not reflected in relevant committee meeting minutes and so
- e. faculty were less informed about, and less able to comment on, these changes than they should have been.

It was emphasized that the Class Dean system and new software are administrative changes and therefore not subject to faculty vote, though the administration may seek faculty input, and did.

Re (c), (d), and (e): these concerns appear justified to some extent.

- i. The Advising Committee has been active for at least five years, though its activities are not always reflected in meeting minutes.
- ii. Some breakdowns in communications may have been due to the overall change in faculty governance structure.
- iii. Not all liaisons specified in the Handbook were appointed, so there was less communication than there should have been, and less faculty awareness.
- iv. Student Academic Life discussed how much input faculty ought to have, regardless of whether changes are under faculty control.
- v. We discussed whether Student Academic Life ought to take over the Advising Committee's duties. In any case, the AC's charge includes promoting/communicating, which hadn't been happening as it should.

Further conclusions:

Need to demand annual reports from Core committees to Chair of the Faculty

Be sure Chairs post their minutes, especially from Core committees

Howard Brooks will use the handbook to construct a governance organizational chart

Adjourn 240pm

Faculty Governance Committee Meeting
Minutes
Oct. 7, 2016

Present: Howard Brooks (chair of faculty), Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker (chair), Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman (note taker)

Anne Harris (guest). VPAA. Institutional Academic Affairs Initiatives.

Teams: who should the administration be working with, and how?

Where do we want these initiatives to go?

Outcomes?

Emerging academic initiatives: finance and accounting minor out of economics, museum studies has been discussed, and urban studies.

Dynamic flow of ideas: we have a diverse market.

Summer programs: language programs, interest in these programs from finance and administration not as a revenue generation, but as connected to admissions. We are looking at high schools, studio art, global health, and music camps as additional summer programs.

Conversation with admission: interdisciplinary programs, new minors. Thinking about events that can promote programs beyond the web page.

Inclusive pedagogy and DePauw dialog: lots of work in order to keep the dialog going. We need to keep a clear sense of purpose as we continue to work. Motivated by the fact that 81% in 4 years (66% of African – American). Mentoring, advising: but we have urgency of addressing problem of race.

Shifting the rhetoric from diversity and inclusion to race. Making race a priority in the discourse.

Question: What can we do to support the work that you are trying to accomplish? How do we facilitate this process? If there is something we need to do institutionally, is it better for it to come out of Governance rather than from the VPAA's office?

Unaddressed, biased statement: sounds small but it is major in terms of students' response.

We have shifted from why to how we can talk about this.

We will add it to the Governance agenda to talk about it.

STEM communities. Be strategic in a community-based way.

Co-curricular conversations at DePauw. Students can gain extra skills outside of class.

Nature park: it is not funded, where does it belong in the conversation?

Reviewing the tenure-line hiring process.

Outcomes of students learning: 34% of faculty work 3/3. Strategic Planning Committee is discussing this also.

Mark McCoy (guest), President. Institutional Academic Affairs Initiatives.

Question: What voice might faculty have in recruitment, review, and retention of administration?

We should find a way to give the faculty voice in the appointments and reviews. The Handbook has some language that says that during the initial term of the first appointment, if a product of a national search, the administrator is subject to a review by the faculty.

When it comes to review, the faculty should have a voice in the review process for administrators who applied directly. We need to come up with a process, and the challenge is in the details of the language. We need a time frame, so that we have a rotation between reviews so they do not happen at the same time. We need to understand where the review goes, and what happens. It would be realistic to look at the constituents with whom the administrator is involved, and then give the administrator a chance to weigh in.

Part of the question is the consideration of faculty voice in administrators' recruitment. Faculty should have a voice in the recruitment process, such as faculty serving on search committees and participating in open sessions with candidates. Students and staff should have similar voice. Factors that go into this: chemistry of the team, and opportunities for everyone to have an input. In every case, the appointment was in line with the faculty. It might be a challenge in cases of extreme urgency.

Appointments for internal candidates: concerned about confidentiality. A faculty voice in that recruitment process might be nomination.

A search firm reports that 80% of presidential searches are closed. The closed search practice assures the best candidate pool as most sitting administrators are unwilling to damage their current position by publicly searching for another. A closed search may look bad, but it is the best thing for the institution.

Minutes of Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee

14 October 2016

Members present: H. Brooks, T. Good, F. Seaman, P. Propsom, B. Hanson, G. Kuecker. R. Hershberger was absent.

T. Good mentioned items under discussion by the Student Academic Life committee:

-- a policy about demonstrations on campus

-- background/history of the Bias Incident Response Team (BIRT)

The committee discussed whether any of these items were within the committee's purview. The general consensus was "yes". T. Good also mentioned that there appear to be items in the Student Handbook that this committee should probably review. G. Kuecker agreed but felt that the items listed above were more important at this time.

B. Hanson reported that FDC was not currently working on anything of interest to this committee.

F. Seaman reported that Curricular Policy and Planning has been discussing and fine-tuning the revised RAS process. The new policy is effective immediately. No handbook changes are anticipated. As part of this new process, members of CPP (is that the acronym?) will visit with departments to discuss their staffing requests much as the Review Committee visits in regard to choosing department chairs. The new process appears to be an improvement with regard to long-term planning.

Proposed handbook changes were brought by H. Brooks. The main changes relate to DSOM (Dean, School of Music) language. However, additional language has been inserted so that the description of the DSOM position is consistent with the corresponding language related to the VPAA position. These changes are the result of conversations that have been going on since last spring, and are intended to ensure that the Handbook reflect current practice and address issues in the SOM.

Homework: Committee members should read this document with fresh eyes for 1. general clarity and 2. parallel structures between the CLA and SOM. For example, the intent is that the DSOM and VPAA are comparable in role, the Associate Dean in the SOM is like a department chair, and so forth. In the CLA there are also assistant or co-chairs in some departments (communication, biology, English). Not sure how this would translate in the SOM situation. We also need to think about it from the RAS point of view, i.e. how the RAS process will operate in the SOM. Once we have

reviewed it, the document will go to the SOM faculty members and then the full faculty.

In regards to these matters, this committee will be meeting with the DSOM on governance matters in the near future. Besides the issues in the Handbook (just above), there are also questions of who has voting rights in the SOM. Part time faculty members with a certain number of semesters of service have voting rights in faculty meetings, but may not have them in the SOM internal processes. This should be checked and corrected (made consistent) in the relevant documents.

Homework 2: Please review the draft document that G. Kuecker provided. This will be discussed as soon as the Handbook document can be finalized.

Minutes submitted by B. Hanson

Faculty Governance Committee
DePauw University
Friday 4 November 2016
140pm
Julian 372

Attending: Bryan Hanson, Howard Brooks, Francesca Seaman, Pam Proppom, Glen Kuecker (Chair), Tim Good (recorder)

Minutes approved from Oct 28

We have motions that will come to the floor of the faculty on Monday. No issues are anticipated.

Howard sent Handbook language to DSOM and Assoc DSOM, with no response. Howard will now send Handbook language to the full faculty of SOM.

Confidentiality policy brief is being vetted. Faculty Governance should expect contact relating to this document after November 7.

VPAA Anne Harris will be with us again November 18. We will talk about a report concerning the four DePauw centers. We should be given access to the report beforehand.

Discussion of SOM Governance recommendations.

Can we agree on a draft set of recommendations to send to Dean of SOM? She was not available to meet with us today. We wish to agree on a draft to have something more concrete to be working with.

Definition is needed for what sections are, section heads, how section heads are chosen, etc. SOM sections are currently divided along the lines of instrument or voice. SOM calls these "areas." Some areas oversee only one or two people.

When there is a violation, who mediates or follows up? What is the relationship between DSOM and VPAA? Is SOM part of the larger university along with CLA, or stand-alone? We need a specified relationship between the positions of VPAA and DSOM.

Associate DSOM – is this equivalent to a department chair? If so, does this person need to be chosen by the same process as department chairs, going through [the big committee]

Will we turn toward Oberlin or Lawrence? Oberlin has parallel structures for everything. Lawrence has a DSOM that reports to the Provost. Do we want a structure that is fully parallel or more integrated.

We have to define the roles of DSOM, Assoc DSOM, Director of Operations, 21CM Director – how many other roles need to be more clearly defined, and then clearly and transparently communicated to faculty and staff. Roles and governance need to be specified, then transparently communicated.

Assoc DSOM has a lengthy list of duties. Might be comparable to a larger department.

Governance structure suggest for SOM. SOM meetings might be similar to department meetings, but they are ill-defined in purpose and goals.

Should there be a governance committee of SOM? If so, how are areas determined?
How are area heads appointed?

Can we consider ADSOM be appointed by the same process that Chairs are appointed, in terms of recruitment and review?

If a SOM governance committee is constituted, it is both a steering and policy committee. Such a committee should be constituted in a representative way. SOM governance committee should not replace SOM meetings as a whole. Current organization of Areas and appointment of Area Coordinators is unclear at this time.

The Academic Handbook specifies voting rights only in the full faculty meeting at this time. We should consider language about voting rights in other areas, such as departmental decisions.

Should SOM meet as a whole, or should this SOM governance committee work as a decision-making body?

We need to define voting rights in different situations more clearly.

Glen will update the document, bring in some of concerns that have been expressed to this committee, and develop a “senate” model and a full SOM meeting model. Next week we should be able to use this document to round out our recommendations. We finalize this discussion next week, then get DSOM on our schedule after Thanksgiving break.

Adjournment 2:40pm
Next meeting Friday November 11, 1:40pm
Julian 372

Respectfully Submitted,
Tim

Faculty Governance Committee Meeting
Minutes
November 11, 2016

Present: Howard Brooks (chair of faculty), Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker (chair), Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman (note taker)

Report about changes to the Handbook: need to clarify some of the language, especially regarding obligations of deans. The changes will be reviewed by the Review Committee and the School of Music.

Faculty vote approved representative of the School of Music in Governance. Call for nominees will go out from the chair of faculty.

Discussion of recommendations for internal governance of the school of music.

Concerns to address?

Placement of the document: internal or in the handbook

Keeping language more open to collaboration

Our charge is to provide a set of recommendations that will go the dean of the SOM. She will have her process to review our document. Overall, our document will be supportive of her direction. We can recommend her that she shares it with the faculty after her own review.

We see some need for handbook language that better clarifies the definition of the SOM constitutionally. The handbook needs to be adjusted in structure so that there is logical sequence for the SOM. Recommendations for departments might also need to be considered.

Future item for agenda:

There is a potential need for handbook changes on how things work in departments

We could consider to propose a precise time for departments' meetings so that we can free time for faculty forum and teaching roundtables

Schedule for next semester?

Faculty Governance Meeting
Minutes
Dec. 2, 2016

Present: Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker, Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman

Guest: Ayden Adler, Dean of the School of Music

Announcement. A Working Group is forming to consider the issue of DePauw becoming a Sanctuary Campus.

Discussion regarding School of Music governance. Dean Adler reported that she believes the School of Music (SOM) is making real progress on governance issues and the movement is consistent with recommendations the Faculty Governance Committee made. SOM faculty meetings occur once a week, for business and also search and personnel committees. They are working to clarify some things that were previously not explicit (e.g., what constitutes a quorum, what is consensus). Next will authorize working groups and determine how these groups will share their recommendations with the SOM faculty as a whole. Curriculum review is an ongoing process. Clarification of the 21st Century Initiative and how it relates to curriculum, etc. Need to establish transparency and trust, and then make sure that any procedures instituted are actually followed.

Governance Committee members asked questions of Dean Adler:

Will permanent working groups or subcommittees be constituted? Perhaps in the future. The idea is that the full SOM faculty will issue the charge to the working groups, decide on their time frame for work, and they will report back their recommendations for a full vote.

What role will long-term part-time faculty members play in SOM governance? We are looking to align SOM voting eligibility with that of the full faculty. Also will make sure that they get agendas so they can decide if they want to attend meetings, giving them the opportunity to vote. Dean Adler has moved faculty meetings to Mondays when more part-time faculty can attend.

Governance Committee is considering whether *all* departments should have a governance document similar to the one the SOM is developing (e.g., frequency of departmental meetings, who gets to vote, what constitutes a quorum).

Dean Adler has held a number of open forums with various SOM groups, discussing what has gone well and that they would like to continue, and what needs to be done differently. Three themes emerged: building a culture of trust and transparency, aligning around a shared mission that coheres with 21CM Initiative, admissions (last year was one of their smallest classes and this has a negative effect on morale and adequately filling performance groups).

What recommendations did the Governance Committee make that weren't a good fit with how the SOM operates? Dean Adler appreciated our recognition of the difference between a department and school. Area coordinators for some groups are more useful and necessary (for example, Voice Department) than for others. Dean Adler may convene the areas twice a year to discuss the important issues; some duties will probably be rotated. Depending on what people are teaching, they will attend the relevant area meetings during that semester.

How do you view the Associate Dean of the SOM position and what is the relationship between this position and Dean of SOM (DSOM)? Howard Brooks explained that he and Review Committee are working on creating parallelism: Associate Dean will be a parallel position to department chair and program director or coordinator. People in all of these positions are appointed for a 3-year term, undergo review, and typically there is the option of reappointment once. The Associate Dean of the SOM has a huge job given that the DSOM has many external responsibilities; not every faculty member could step into this position (e.g., it involves understanding accreditation requirements).

How do you view the relationships between the SOM and the CLA? She thinks students in both the CLA and SOM benefit greatly from interaction in both schools. We want liberally trained musicians, and also CLA students who can express their passion for music. Dean Adler is looking forward to finding additional ways that we can work together.

Going forward: in the spring semester, a representative from the SOM will be joining the Governance Committee.

Submitted by Pam Propsom

Faculty Governance Meeting Minutes
Feb. 1, 2017

Present: Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Elissa Harbert, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker, Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman

We welcomed Elissa Harbert, the new member representing the School of Music.

Minutes. Minutes from the Dec. 9 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Reports from committees. Francesca reported that Curriculum Committee is working on implementing the new RAS procedure. Howard reported that we have a consensus document for Handbook revisions, primarily addressing School of Music issues and also cleaning up some other language. Election cycle for next year's committee positions has begun. Student Academic Life will be trying to address the issues of food insecurity, a possible honor code, and student demonstration policy.

Tenzer Center Search Committee. An appointed faculty member stepped down because of workload issues and a replacement is needed. Consistent with what we did last year, we will put out a call for interested faculty members to serve. Current search committee members are Berque, Carol Smith, Provine, O'Dell, Lafontant, Harms, Goins, Menzel, Stasik, Gurnon.

Centers discussion with VPAA. Next week Anne Harris will join us to discuss the Centers. Issues that we would like to bring up: concern about the resources being used for these potential hires, short length of the positions. Is the proposed "Centers Task Force" being given a genuine mission or has the outcome already been determined? Do the Centers need to be parallel and does their work need to be integrated? After we talk with Anne, we thought it would be good to discuss these issues with faculty with experience in these areas: Michele Villinski in Management Fellows, Jonathan Nichols-Pethick in Media Fellows. Glen will give Anne a preview of the questions. We would like to see the job descriptions as well (Bryan found it online and sent it to all of us).

Future work. Big agenda items for us this semester:

- Faculty voice in recruitment, review, and retention of administrators. There is a Google Doc on this topic and Glen encouraged us to add text and comments. Ideally, this would go to President McCoy and could potentially be implemented by the end of this semester.
- Confidentiality document. The Handbook says surprisingly little about this issue. What business is confidential and what can be shared? Bryan Hanson asked that everyone have access to the draft document.
- Handbook additions regarding internal department governance?

Glen will be in contact with the president about a future meeting; perhaps one topic for discussion would be the Centers.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes December 9, 2016

Meeting time: 12:30 on Wednesdays, starting on February 1st

1. Updates from Committees
 - a. Curriculum Committee--adding 4 people to assist with new RAS mechanism
 - b. SLAAC—Future topics: food scarcity; honor code; sanctuary status-
 - i. Glen added that the administrative group has been formed including faculty and students; Glen will share.
 - c. FDC –Reports lots of reading and worries about budgets
2. DePauw Centers
 - a. Anne provided framing questions; Are these appropriate? Will these spark the needed feedback from departments?
 - i. Questions 1 and 2 seem to be more directed to the Centers themselves. Maybe the questions should be more forward oriented. Maybe the questions need to ask in terms of **should**.
 - ii. Question 3 strikes us like a question that all departments could speculate about
 - iii. Some committee members felt that these centers were closed to all but a special population
 - iv. Problematic talking about a technology center when there is no evidence of one yet.
 - v. Some committee members expressed cynicism about the likelihood of say an art student visiting the McDermond Center
 - vi. Perhaps question 3 should read How can the centers be more fully integrated into the Academic program?
 - vii. Committee members expressed concern about timeline and size of taskforce. Is this a fool's errand? What is the best way to invite faculty input to the shaping of these centers?—Glen will communicate this to Anne.
 - viii. Why was McDermond center split from Management Fellows? B/c McDermond center only served Management Fellows.
 - ix. Who is running the Hubbard Center? Is it Mandy? Is it Alan?
 - x. Ask Anne about the timing for the hires for these centers.
 - xi. Do these centers really need to be connected?
 - xii. Glen will invite Anne to meet with us again in February.
 - b. Glen reported that Anne and Glen will go to Chairs' meeting in February so that Chairs can get feedback from departments. That will lead to the creation of a task force. Governance will likely have some role vis-a vis the taskforce.
3. DSOM talk
 - a. Perspectives about the DSOM: confidence-inspiring; she seems to be moving in a productive direction.

4. Handbook
 - a. Committee felt that, in general, things look good
 - b. 2 lines have to go back into it
 - i. policies and procedures are not contractual
 - ii. University reserves the right to
 - c. idea that faculty have a say on the hiring of deans/administrative position is not really a part of it. We might need a motion to that effect—look at it in the spring.
 - d. Review committee is continuing to look at the handbook, especially as it pertains to DSOM.
5. Meeting adjourned.

Faculty Priorities & Governance Committee
DePauw University
Wednesday February 8, 2017
1230 – 133pm
Jullian 327

Pam Propsom, Glen Kuecker (Chair), Bryan Hanson, Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bob Hershberger, Elissa Harbert, Francesca Seaman. Guest VPAA Anne Harris.

Updates on positions for committees:

Veronica Pejril – Tenzer Search Committee – approved

RAS members – Emmitt Riley, Africana Studies – Social Science. Are we comfortable with untenured status? Humanities member is also not tenured. Committee sees no problem. Approved.

Suman Balasubramanian from Math – Science and Math. Approved.

Meredith Brickell – Art. 2 proposals coming from Art and Art History. Caraher (Chair of Curriculum) says preference for someone not from department coming forward. Approved if no better option from Arts by the end of today. If someone from Arts comes forward by the end of today, we will put that person forward.

Approved minutes from Feb. 1 with one correction.

Updates from committees.

Review: Student Opinion Surveys – the endless search for better forms

SoM internal governance, faculty eligibility to vote at SoM meetings now in line with university eligibility. Unanimous decision. Quorum = 2/3 of full time faculty, and 2/3 of eligible full time to pass any motion.

At this point in the meeting, the VPAA joined the meeting.

Discussion of Centers.

VPAA indicated that a Centers Task Force is not necessary at this point in time. In the future, perhaps the Strategic Planning Committee could serve this purpose or Governance could appoint a Task Force. VPAA summarized recent changes. Asked for more immediate communication with Faculty Governance. VPAA now provides bi-weekly updates to current Center Directors and donors. Could ask Chairs of Tenzer and McDermond searches to report out to Faculty Governance. VPAA reported that Donors are very present in the Centers, and deeply involved in conversations about mission, purpose, and funding. However, Centers are not exclusively donor driven, since there is faculty engagement and, ultimately, administrative and faculty oversight. Faculty lines and curriculum in the Centers is not currently being supported. Out of Pulliam model, new excitement about co-curricular models. From November to now, there have been many conversations and changes in directions from administrative level. Search firm

being used for McDermond Center Director. Tenzer search already under control in house via Dave Berque and Carol Smith's co-chair. Pulliam Center will remain with same director for Center and for Media Fellows. McDemond and Tenzer Director searches already in progress. There will be no search for a new Pulliam Center. Alan Hill, VPAA Student Academic Life, is in charge of search for Career Center Director in the Hubbard Center. Now seeking a co-curricular model for all Centers moving forward. This is the primary benefit for the students. Secondary benefit is marketing the Centers for Admissions. Currently the Centers are "silos of excellence." The VPAA is in favor of a "leadership" bond between the five Centers, in terms of seeking grants. Seeking wider student engagement with the Centers. The VPAA reviewed the status of the directors. Pulliam led by full time, tenured faculty member with reassigned time. Will stay that way. McDermond and Tenzer Directors will not hold a tenure line. Prindle Director holds a tenure line, but is not reviewed like other faculty members. Hartman Director still being talked through. Hartman House currently works under Student Academic Life. All Fellows programs will remain under control of faculty, and will not be run by the Center Directors. What is now ITAP will become Tenzer interns.

A committee member asked: for areas not directly connected to the Centers, will they take a back seat in priorities? The VPAA answered: Ideally, Centers will focus on co-curricular, and ask students to find connections to the Centers as they cross curricular lines. Another member asked: What is the mechanism for bringing in new Centers? The VPAA responded: Operationally in the past, it has been donor will, donor interest. Some committee members discussed the perception that faculty have not been forward thinking enough in our curricular planning to attract donor interest.

The committee discussed if it should add reviews of Directors of Centers to our list of Administrative Review processes as we move forward. For contractual and proprietary reasons, it was recommended that we needed to leave Prindle out of any such review.

Dean of Faculty appointment process.

The VPAA shared with the committee the process for selecting the next Dean of the Faculty. Before, the Dean of Faculty has been appointed by VPAA. Now moving more toward shared governance. A process used at Kenyon for organizational transparency and participation is proposed by VPAA. Partnership and priorities. Partnership = VPAA can work well with this person. Priorities = worked out with Faculty Governance. VPAA would like to bring a name forward for our consideration. VPAA brings name forward. Seek feedback from Faculty Governance for questions and priorities. Committee brings forth what we see as academic priorities. VPAA and nominee come before Faculty Governance. Faculty Governance endorses nominee, or not. VPAA stated that if Faculty Governance voted "no" on her candidate for Dean of the Faculty, she would not proceed with the nominee. Discussion of pros and cons of this proposed process followed. Discussion of faculty voice in review and recruitment of academic administrators is still in discussion. The current Dean of Faculty process now is an interim process only. VP of Marketing and VP of Admission searches currently have one

faculty member each, chosen from existing committees. Committee is comfortable with VPAA's process for appointing the next Dean of Faculty as an interim process. We are moving forward with this process.

VPAA will attend next week to continue agenda items we were not able to address.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Good

Faculty Governance and Priorities Committee
Minutes of 15 Feb. 2017 Meeting

Present: B. Hanson, G. Kuecker (chair), T. Good, H. Brooks, P. Propsom, E. Harbert, R. Hersberger, F. Seaman.

Minutes from the 8 Feb. 2017 meeting were approved.

1. Brief updates from committee liaisons were shared.
2. H. Brooks reported that the online version of the faculty handbook is now considered the official version of record. In addition, the definition of a full time faculty member in the CLA is described as "12 hours". This probably ought to be changed to three courses.
3. Discussion of the VPAA's proposal for Dean of Faculty selection process: At last week's meeting, VPAA described her proposed selection process for the next Dean of Faculty. The committee discussed the proposal and how we should respond, as well as what the process should be or could be in the future. Anne will attend our meeting next week.
4. The Centers: After last week's meeting, it is apparent that the emphasis and direction of the Centers has shifted. We will need to discuss the issue with the VPAA at next week's meeting and try to clarify faculty role in the Centers.
5. Discussion of confidentiality memo (Chaired by Brooks). The memo was discussed in general terms: for instance, how would the two definitions of confidentiality be applied in various situations typically encountered at DePauw? How does confidentiality affect faculty governance and faculty autonomy? How does it affect faculty-administration relations? Further discussion will be needed. The university lawyer has apparently reviewed the document and that response will be shared with the committee in the near future.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes
February 22, 2017

In attendance: Jackie Roberts, Mark McCoy, Anne Harris, Tim Good, Pam Propsom, Howard Brookes, Francesca Seaman, Elissa Harbart, Glen Kuecker and Bob Hershberger.

Glen pointed out the need to bring Governance Committee members not in attendance on Monday up to speed on the President's Strategic Plan.

Glen stated the need for Governance to understand its role in the roll out of the Strategic Plan.

Governance might also be consulted as the Strategic Plan connects to the discussions surrounding the Centers.

Jackie, attending on behalf of the Strategic Planning Committee, mentioned that Governance could be consulted to help identify existing committees as needed by the roll out of the Strategic Plan.

Anne mentioned that the 'priorities' strand of our committee's definition should also be relevant to future work/interpretation of the Credo outcomes.

[Committee Chair note]At this point of the meeting, President McCoy provided an overview of the Strategic Plan. As the plan is not yet public and it remains confidential within the university community, the committee is suspending the posting of this portion of the minutes until the Strategic Plan is fully public.

The balance of the meeting was spent on discussion of the Strategic Plan.

Faculty Open Meeting February 23, 2017

Dean of the Faculty Priorities Discussions

-Minutes by Elissa Harbert, member of Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee

~15 people in attendance, including Governance members, Title IX Coordinator, Dean and Associate Dean of the SoM, and VPAA

Chair of Faculty convened with announcements about faculty elections.

We have candidates for all core committees except the following:

Still no candidates for:

- Curricular Policy and Planning (social sciences)
- 2 at-large members for Review
- 1 from Arts for FDC
- Student Academic Life 1 at-large

Some faculty members are opting to use Grievance Committee as their elected service, which often means they do nothing. Others volunteer for Grievance and another committee, which violates the 1-elected-committee rule.

Chair details the history of the Dean of the Faculty position (DoF)

No administrative academic positions are described in the Handbook. We've recently added some language about the Dean of the School of Music and VPAA not serving on search committees, but otherwise there isn't language about how these positions are selected or their charges.

Governance Committee will be working on codifying the process for recruiting, appointing, reviewing, etc., such positions.

For now, the VPAA has proposed an interim process. The VPAA will nominate a Dean of the Faculty candidate, who will then meet with the Governance Committee.

It is of the utmost importance that the DoF can work well with the VPAA and vice versa. The Governance Committee will either endorse this candidate or not after a thorough interview with the candidate. If the candidate is not endorsed, the VPAA may take nominations for other candidates.

The current DoF (Carrie Klaus) wrote a *de facto* job description of the position, which was shared with the faculty.

What are the important qualities of the DoF position: person, tasks, challenges?

Q: Has DoF taken over the role of FDC coordinator? What, then is the role of FDC coordinator? Is the position needed?

VPAA: Each DoF has put her imprint on the position. Carrie Klaus's imprint was to emphasize more outward-facing grants, Jeff Kenney as FDC coordinator has focused on

inward-facing grants. Discussions about the next FDC coordinator are underway now. Sabbaticals need to happen at the DoF level because they have to do with confidential processes.

Chair: Is there something the DoF ought to be doing that they haven't previously or that isn't in Carrie's job description?

Comment: A previous DoF had more duties to do with coordinating and developing chairs. They could also facilitate program assessments and assist with centralizing assessments under one administrator.

VPAA: There may be a larger assessment program at DePauw coming, perhaps a professional assessment company?

Comment: For confidentiality issues, it would be helpful to have DoF oversee.

What priorities should the DoF pay attention to?

-Mentoring and developing of Chairs

How are the VPAA's priorities different from the DoF's?

Who is the chief faculty advocate? VPAA or DoF?

VPAA: My advocacy is for the full academic program, which is full of human beings, but also includes budget, fundraising, things like that. The DoF should be the advocate for faculty experience, faculty teaching assignment conversations.

What's the chain of command? Who do you talk to first if you have an issue?

VPAA: It's all rules of thumb, but for confidential matters and budgetary matters, retirements, course overload issues, leaves, come to the VPAA. The DoF should be the first person for any other faculty concerns.

Comment: Idea of DoF as advocate for the faculty is important, but the role has become reinforcing rules (don't do this or that), without a feeling of flexibility and creative problem solving. It would be better if they really advocated for the faculty and questioned the rules.

It's not easy to be the person responsible for holding people accountable and *also* trying to advocate for resources for them and for helping people get what they need. There's a tension in that role, which means the DoF can never be a *purely* advocacy role. The faculty is not unitary, so there will be tensions.

VPAA- There's a difference between advocating for the faculty as a whole versus advocating for individual members.

Comment: There's power at the VPAA's level, but then no power below that (chairs, DoF have no power), so faculty members seem to go directly to VPAA because she's the one who has the authority to carry out what you need. Chairs have almost no power, but lots of responsibility. They cannot coerce anyone to do anything—they only coordinate and oversee, they don't control any budgets, which is where the real power is. If DoF's purview is the faculty, and the VPAA's is the academic program, why isn't the DoF on

Review Committee instead of VPAA? It seems like the DoF is an assistant to the VPAA or an extension of her rather than someone who has her own sphere. This is also the common perception—that the position doesn't have any power, so why would we go to her?

In recent conversations about working with faculty to rally enthusiasm for First-Year Seminars, etc., the DoF can help get people excited about Gen Eds and development that goes along with that, even if it falls to the person who controls the budget. And where does the innovation and creativity rest? Is the DoF someone who just reads the handbook and tells faculty what they're responsible for and how to behave as a chair, etc., or is that office a place where innovation can happen? Curricular change? I would like to see the next person in this role have a stronger coordination role in faculty development. It is currently too disparate, there are too many chefs, there are too many people who are "assistant faculty development coordinators" (Quantitative, Writing, FITS, etc.), and it's not well coordinated. It's fine to have multiple people, but when it comes to people on campus it would be helpful to have one person oversee the calendar and make sure there isn't too much schedule overlap, etc.

When we renamed the FDC, it *could be* the FDC coordinator, the coordinator for writing, FITS, etc., all getting together to plan out what will happen with faculty development, together with the DoF who might have initiatives she wants to bring to the table.

VPAA- That partnership between DoF and FDC will be a priority.

Mobilizing and inspiring the faculty, crystalizing initiatives, more diversity and inclusion work (particularly inclusion), diversity and inclusion in recruiting and retention of faculty, coordinating efforts related to DEC, PPD.

Chair: How has the role of the DoF changed, if at all, with the moving of the Dean of Academic Life to Dean of Student Academic Life? There used to be VPAA and two separate deans.

VPAA: There's a dotted line between Student Academic Life and VPAA, and of course they coordinate. SAL is dossier-driven, always helping students graduate. The DoF is focused on advocating for individual faculty members rather than faculty as a whole. But we gather to talk about the big picture.

Could the DoF become in charge of the curriculum? Since the chairs don't have teeth, could the DoF have more teeth?

VPAA- The fact that I have to negotiate tensions between chairs and faculty members who refuse to teach during specific time banks is a massive implosion for me. They both call me in! Many universities have a Dean of Curriculum, but we don't, so if we're doing long-term curricular planning our committees change every year. It's so often a year-by-year process at DePauw instead of long-term. I'm not calling for another dean, though.

Does this job description effect the registrar's job description?

VPAA- There are multiple ways to understand the registrar's position. One is transcript driven, another is graduation oriented, another is helping students put CVs and resumés together. Ours is a transcript-driven registrar position.

VPAA- There's a cultural problem around time-bank assignments.

We are a university, we are a community, and people owe the university something. We need more of a sense of shared purpose.

DoF could be something more visible and innovative.

The DoF almost never speaks in front of the faculty, maybe twice a year to announce award nominees and the winners.

Could the DoF be Chair of Chairs? Couldn't that person chair the chairs meeting?

The power of the chairs is an untapped partnership. Right now their meetings are just a list of announcements. If we're going to meet once a month, let's do something important!

VPAA likes this idea—establishing conversations in partnership with chairs. FYS strategies, etc. The quickest path to power for chairs is merit pay, but we're not a merit pay schools and we will never be. The second path is elected chairs, it rotates, etc. Chairs advocate for their departments but also end up in opposition to their department members.

At a liberal arts college, decisions should be made by conversation and consensus, deans should not be traffic cops, but they should be shepherds.

VPAA- We'll be there when we have our shared values, when it's not a struggle to show up to teach. That's where we're striving to go—to be able to articulate our shared values. Once we have them, those traffic cop moves will be needed less and less. Do we have enough of a shared sense of values that people want to be here?

Timebanks discussion continues.

It's the students we're supposed to be taking care of, not the professors!

The timebank issue is one of equity. In languages, we have to teach five days a week.

Have we become a collection of independent contractors?

Discussion of Credo and Dartlet.

VPAA- The DoF should be able to speak to Love of Teaching, so that Faculty Development isn't just about "what can I get for myself," but what can I give back to the students?

At DePauw, teachers should be there in the building on days when you don't necessarily have a class with them. When we're looking to hire someone, we need to be clear in that expectation. But how do you codify that? That's one of the ways we should differentiate DePauw from other institutions where hot shot faculty fly in.

CTL is fairly minimal here. We get one email a week and it's almost empty. If we're going to have a CTL, it should be meaningful.

New Faculty mentoring orientation, etc. DoF can do more of this.

Suggestion of a weekly lunch meeting for new faculty, lead by maybe Dean of Faculty, to be oriented, foster inclusion, have university values instilled, etc.

Chair thanked attendees and we adjourned.

Faculty Priorities & Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 8, 2017

Present: Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Elissa Harbert, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker, Pam Propsom (recorder), Francesca Seaman

Minutes. We will address approval of previous meeting minutes at the March 22 meeting.

Glen announced an additional agenda item concerning the university Strategic Plan, which is the committee is asked to constitute a working group to address the wording and content of part of the plan. This needs to happen very quickly, prior to the April 4 launch. A committee member indicated that President McCoy has a draft, but that it seems “too legalistic;” the working group will probably need to “refine” what this says. Concerns were expressed that this is not a fair task, given the short timeframe and with Spring Break coming up, and because no one has seen a written document yet. On the other hand, given that this whole idea is new and rapidly moving, it is understandable that the timeframe will be challenging.

Potential faculty members—Rebecca Schindler, Leslie James, Eric Wielenberg (who may need to be informed about confidential portions of the plan), Nayhan Fancy, Alex Puga (who may need to be informed about confidential portions of the plan), Angela Flury, Ayden Adler, Doug Harms, Meryl Altman, Jackie Roberts.

Recommended staff members—Aliza Frame, Renee Madison, JC Lopez, Myrna Hernandez, Cara Setchell, JLL, Kelley Hall, Julianne Miranda.

Questions for Dean of the Faculty candidate. We will meet with the VPAA and the candidate at our next meeting. A committee member will make a Google doc to which we can all contribute questions. Ideas:

- What is your view on faculty role in recruitment, selection, and review of administrators?
- How do you define the role or job of Dean of the Faculty?
- In what ways would you be an advocate for faculty?
- Your perspective on equity issues among faculty with regard to workload.
- How do we develop leadership ability in other faculty members?
- Relationship between Dean of the Faculty and Faculty Development Coordinator positions?
- Where do new ideas, innovation and creativity come from? How can the faculty and the Dean of the Faculty be more proactive rather than reactive?
- What would you like to see change?
- Where does power rest in the administrative structure? Relationship between VPAA, Dean of Faculty, department chairs?

Confidentiality draft document. Challenging to get committee work done if we can't inform current members about past issues. Could there be some understanding that confidentiality might widen to include those currently discussing relevant issues? Hard for faculty members to

carry out their representative role without a range of confidentiality existing (strict confidentiality vs. “lesser” confidentiality). Can there be a range of confidentiality or is it a dichotomous construct: either it exists or doesn’t? How can we serve the best interest of the institution? When VPAA communicates with a committee chair, should the entire committee be included as well? Do we need a sit-down with the university counsel? If the VPAA can have conversations about confidential issues with former VPAA’s, why don’t faculty members also have that prerogative (e.g., Chair of Review committee consulting with previous Chairs of Review committee)? The goal is consistency in committee decisions. And currently, we have created a committee structure in which people serve on multiple committees (people on FDC serving on Governance Committee); can’t they communicate with each other? Need to define why we have confidentiality; that might help us proceed.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee
Minutes for March 22, 2017

As this meeting engaged confidential topics, the committee has opted for a summation of items covered during the meeting. The summary excludes material that has confidential content.

The Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee met with President McCoy. All committee members were present except for Elissa Harbert, who was away from campus. Regardless, She is recused from recent discussions concerning School of Music.

The meeting opened with a statement from the committee to President McCoy concerning the dismissal of the Dean of School of Music, the challenging state of the university, a request for the president to share his views about the current state of affairs, a call for enhanced shared governance in the recruitment, review, and retention of senior administrators and a reform of university confidentiality policies.

President McCoy provided an explanation to the committee about the context for the dismissal of the Dean of School of Music, which included his analysis of the internal issues within the School of Music, his experiences as Dean of School of Music, university processes for reviewing the Dean of School of music, and his view on how to move forward. President McCoy shared confidential information about the events and processes leading to the dismissal of the Dean of School of Music. The President shared that the decision was neither quick nor rash and was in response to concerns brought to him from various constituents within the music school.

Committee members explained that they had been under the impression that the School of Music was moving in positive direction, and therefor the leadership change came as a surprise. The committee stated how this surprise reflects deeper issues with university shared governance and confidentiality policies, and it advocated for continued work on shared governance.

President McCoy endorsed a process of mediation as a step forward with the School of Music. President McCoy also affirmed Dr. Adler's continuing faculty status.

The committee and President McCoy agreed to continue working on creating formal processes for including faculty in the recruitment, review, and retention of senior administrators whose positions pertain to the academic mission of the university and to reform university confidentiality policies.

At the end of the meeting President McCoy requested that the Chair of the Faculty and Chair of Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee send an email to the Board Chairman advising that he had meet with the committee. The chairs sent an email that afternoon.

Submitted by Glen David Kuecker, Chair of Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee.

Faculty Governance Committee Meeting Minutes April 5, 2017

Present: Howard Brooks (chair of faculty), Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker (chair), Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman (note taker), Elissa Harbert

We discussed issues of confidentiality and what can be put on the faculty agenda as written or oral announcements.

Summary of meeting with the President will be in the agenda or oral report of the faculty meeting, so that the President has a chance to answer questions.

Governance's main focus is to let the faculty voice be heard.

VPAA Anne Harris met with Governance today to discuss the status of innovative programs for the University, and the status of the present working group. The announcement has been postponed and the board will vote on when the new initiative will be announced. The best reason for this is that we have been working on a strategic plan as a university.

Two things:

1. There will be a series of open meetings where the strategic map/paln idea will be presented. The new initiative will be presented in its components and with a pertinent timeline.
2. The theme team: 4 faculty members from the strategic planning committee, each working on one of the themes of the strategic plan. On April 12, at the end of the day, we should have a sense of commitment to the plan. The theme team basically figures out how to work with other committees and faculty members. The theme teams will figure out how to implement each idea, dividing up the work among faculty and across campus.

We are looking for sustainable working model. The theme teams will give us also a sense of priority.

Board of trustees will vote on whether to implement the new initiative, and when. We are moving toward an institutional commitment that pulls on the initiatives that have always been important to the institution.

ADSOM Jetton joined the meeting at this point to discuss SOM business.

The recommendations Governance made to the School of Music last fall were not shared with the SOM faculty. VPAA and ADSOM meet with Governance today to honor the President's request that the DSOM is substituted at this time by the work of VPAA with ADSOM, in conjunction with Governance.

The ADSOM shared information about difficulties with the search for a voice position 2016/17. Due to the confidential nature of searches and sensitive material, the details of the discussion are not provided in these minutes. The committee was informed about the history of the search, challenges with the applicant pool, the internal SOM discussion, and the current status of the search. The VPAA and ADSOM requested input and perspective from the committee regarding the continuation of the search.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 12, 2017

Present: Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Glen Kuecker (via Skype), Bryan Hanson, Elissa Harbert, Bob Hershberger, Pam Propsom (note-taker), Francesca Seaman

We iterated that we were all gobsmacked to find that the document Governance Committee wrote regarding SOM governance issues was never shared with the entire SOM faculty. Howard will make sure that the final version of the document gets emailed directly to the entire SOM faculty. Glen has the document and will send to all of us as well.

Draft Handbook language on Recruitment, Review and Retention of Administrators

Some questions about who is elected versus who is appointed to the committee. Howard explained that the rationale for election versus selection was to make sure there was a representative each from Governance and Review, and that no one has a conflict of interest with the person under review.

What is the role of HR? Howard said it would deal with the staff side of the 360 degree review.

With regard to the following: "An executive summary report, including recommendation, is provided to the faculty. The report is confidential and provided to the university administration and Board of Trustees as appropriate."—Question of how much detail would be in this "executive summary report," given that this is a *personnel* process. Question of audience and hierarchy is an important one; to whom does the report go? There are two reports: full report that would go to "supervisor" and the executive summary is brief and goes to broader community. Maybe Executive Summary is too broad a term; just indicating that the committee conducted the review and made a recommendation? Concern regarding where this report goes.

If everything from faculty to the Board of Trustees (BOT) is filtered through the President, can we be confident that our message is accurately conveyed and received? BOT is appropriate body for all cabinet levels positions: President, VPAA, VP of Student Academic Life, Dean of SOM. Dean of Faculty and Dean of Student Academic Life report would go to next level down: to the person's supervisor.

Question about when this review occurs. As written, occurs year before individual's potential reappointment. But what if an egregious event occurs: can a review be called outside of the normal timeline? Or at least could this Ad Hoc committee be consulted when the supervisor reviews the situation? Or would this be taken up afterwards through a Grievance Process? Maybe the document as written would refer to "regularly scheduled reviews"; might have to have another procedure for "emergency" situations.

What is the utility of the review, if a person is only taking the administrative position for the 3-year term? It could provide substantiation of the person's valuable contributions. Even if someone may be completing his or her term, it would still be useful to identify campus issues for the next person. Perhaps the value of this procedure is more on the *recruitment* end than the *review* end. Might need to be more specific on the timeframe (separate procedure for President on 5-year term and other administrators in a 3-year term).

For this document to be approved, the administration and trustees must accept it. It could open up more lines of communication between faculty and trustees.

May need to divide this into two documents:

Recruitment—principle that faculty should be involved in selection process.

Review—more complicated and different processes and timeframes for different administrative positions.

Specify size of committee, at least the minimum size.

Glen and Howard will work on a document in the mean time.

SOM Update

Pam updated regarding her meeting with President, VPAA, ADSOM, and Title IX Coordinator, and the meeting with SOM faculty regarding interim SOM dean search. Seems to be a genuine move to involve SOM faculty in determining the process for hiring an interim dean. Will hire a mediator for SOM, regardless of interim dean selection.

Confidential material was discussed pertaining to the mediator. Their accreditation process may be approaching, and this might be another opportunity to review SOM issues.

Concern about the difference between a one-year term and a two-year term for interim SOM dean. If it's two years, then the SOM is still in a holding pattern and not moving forward.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Meeting Minutes April 19, 2017

Present: Glen Kuecker (chair), Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Pam Propsom, Elissa Harbert (note taker), Francesca Seaman, Bob Hershberger

We approved the minutes from April 5 and April 12.

Howard Brooks gives update on status of open elected faculty committee seats: we are missing two full 2-year term positions for Review Committee. We are 7/9 of the way to a full Review Committee.

The Parliamentarian position remains open.

We will do the committee assignments fairly soon. Howard will send a notice of positions for which people can express interest.

Discussion of Handbook Language for Faculty Role in the Recruitment and Review of Senior Administrators

How many members will be on these committees? We suggest an ideal number of five members. Are recruitment and review separate committees? (Yes.) Does the composition change depending on who is under review? (Yes.) Membership to the administrative review committee will be appointed by Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee based on who is under review. For faculty tenure and promotion reviews, people put together a huge file. Will administrators submit a file? What does their review consist of? Soliciting feedback from the faculty.

-Should this process be a confidential, anonymous process, with unsigned documents, complaints, letters? This would mean the administrator has no right to confront their accusers. This is a potential conflict. Is this an open file? Or should we assemble a committee and have them submit evidence in a form where we interview particular people, who can air grievances confidentially? You would solicit representative voices who have something to say, such as people who have worked on initiatives and committees that directly answer to said individual. The ad hoc committee would determine who to interview, come up with a roster, and submit it to the person being reviewed. This would mirror other processes that we have a history of doing. That would make it more comparable to a chair review rather than a DPC process with a file. We can't expect the person under review to prepare any sort of file. But perhaps we should solicit letters in the same way the faculty review process solicits letters. Each committee will be individually constructed for the purpose of the individual review, so they can customize who to interview. It does seem appropriate to show the person under review the list of who will be interviewed, but they won't have veto power. The ad hoc committee would interview representative voices from the faculty in areas relevant/pertinent to their work. We'd solicit letters from the faculty at large, in which the open-file rules will apply.

Does the person under review write anything or have any input along the way? Should they share their goals, CV, etc.? And then should they have a chance to respond?

They could be invited to provide a statement and have an opportunity to respond to any letters in the open file. Or should letters from faculty have names kept confidential, only available to the Review committee? That is not an open file policy. Would anyone write positive letters, unless they have ambitions of being part of the Cabinet?

What about student evaluations? That's the only anonymous thing in faculty files. What if we had a brief survey in which people could anonymously provide feedback? All of these should exist at the same time: signed letters, confidential interviews, maybe a survey. People should be able to ask the committee to be interviewed if they had a serious issue. The totally anonymous survey should not carry much weight, because as we know the student evaluations are unreliable and problematic.

The candidate should see only a report, not all of the gathered materials. The candidate can respond to the report. It will say positives, negatives, concerns. It can be developmental or evaluative. The committee will write a report to reflect what's in the evidence.

If we're going to have an open file for faculty but not administrators, we need a strong, explicit rationale. You don't give up rights to privacy or the ability to defend yourself just because you are an administrator. Many of them have been faculty and may return to being faculty. We want to ensure the candidate has substantive rights in the process. What if we have the open file, letters, mechanism to respond to those, but then we also have a dropbox for particular concerns but won't be visible to the candidate. We could justify it as input to help shape the conversations we might want to have to move forward. People who are in weak positions in the system should be able to express their concerns completely confidentially.

People are accepting and beginning these high-level administrative positions without any idea of what their review process will be. This puts them completely at the whim of the administrative process. However, this comes with the turf and you accept these positions with a considerable salary and risks, the risk of job insecurity. Still, they should not have to give up rights.

Faculty Opinion Survey as well as interviews? The surveys would show patterns and themes. People without tenure protections will want their names anonymous unless they are glowing letters. It would be helpful to have an anonymous Faculty Opinion Survey.

Should students have any voice in reviews of people they interact with directly?
-Maybe through interviews? Students who are bold and want to be heard will self-select. If you are reviewing Dean of Student Academic Life, President, DSOM, or other positions, it would be helpful to have student input. We could open a survey to all students. The response rate might be very small.

Which faculty members can participate in the process? It should be all faculty—PT, FT.

What about students? Open up a survey for everybody. The Review Committee can also interview a few students. Perhaps the candidate could provide a list of some students to interview, too. Keep student comments separate from faculty.

Would it be possible to suggest that no dismissals take place during the summer? They happen when nobody's here and there's no faculty oversight.

-If they do it in the summer, our mechanism kicks in so that the eligible members of Administrative Review Committee will respond.

-This would also help the President and protect them.

-It will help with recruitment because people will be more likely to be interested.

Do these people have job descriptions? -Cabinet level positions have job descriptions in place. Other positions don't.

-How will the results of the Administrative Review be reported out to the faculty? A summary report will be provided with a general sense of the findings without getting into confidential material.

-But what if faculty members feel the summary report does not reflect their serious concerns?

-The committee can only say they saw patterns in the contextualized evidence. Much like the Review Committee does with student opinion surveys.

-If a person feels they weren't well represented in the review, they should run for a committee.

The Chair will continue working to polish the document. The goal is to get the document ready for advance notice in May.

School of Music Update

The conference call with the executive director of NASM (Karen Moynahan), VPAA, ADSOM, and Governance rep. NASM exec suggested names for the Interim Dean position. She said the situation is more common than you would think. SOM faculty want input, but this isn't a standard search with a call for applications, etc. How can we do this in an expedient fashion?

We will likely form a faculty search committee and give them the names, allow them to research them, potentially have phone interviews. It's unclear if anyone would be interested in the position. We could also have someone come in and out for a month at a time as well as a consultant working with the faculty. What would make this more attractive to a candidate? They are trying to listen to faculty voices.

At what point does President McCoy come into the process? It is his prerogative to hire the Dean, and he likely knows most of the candidates.

Some faculty members are asking for access to the previous NASM self-study and accreditation documents from 10 and 20 years ago. ADSOM says that it's in a Box and faculty have access to it. We need to find out and make sure people have access.

Strategic Planning Process

We may be tasked to constitute a summer working group. Who, what, when, where, and what will be the working group's charge? There's a lot to get done by August.

Minutes submitted by Elissa Harbert.