

## Meeting of September 8, 2003

1. **Call to Order** - 4:06 p.m., Union Building Ballroom

2. **Announcement of Number Constituting a Quorum for this semester** -- (N. Abraham) 87 faculty members needed for a quorum this semester.

3. **Verification of Quorum** at least 109 present

4. **Approval of Previous Minutes**

Minutes approved

5. **Reports from Coordinating Committees**

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning** (H. Pollack-Milgate)

Announcements, including description of process for General Education (Gen ed) reform of which CAPP is a part (along with MAO).

Agenda continues last from last year. Minutes of CAPP's meetings are on the faculty governance webpage, available through faculty e-services.

Howard Pollack-Milgate reviewed the work of the Gen ed taskforce last year in increasing the number of courses that count for group requirements.

This year the agenda of the Gen Ed task will focus on the definition of the groups. Results of survey during faculty institute on this item were discussed(lime colored handout). The Gen Ed task force will develop several models for definition of the groups to be discussed in open forums.

Hilary Eppley, a member of CAPP, added that individuals are encouraged to submit their own proposals for the groups.

**Committee on Faculty** (K. Ahlm)

Art Evans rose to ask that Section X of the Faculty By-laws which states "Officers shall serve only one year. No person shall serve two years in succession.." be suspended, so that Karin Ahlm may continue as chair for this academic year. (This suspension of the rules applies only in this particular case.)

Passed by voice vote.

Karin Ahlm rose to announce that nominations for promotion are due by September 15 to Brenda Reed in Academic Affair. In addition the following announcements were made.

Tom Musser in economics was to be added to those up for interim review.

Letters for candidates of a term review are due by Sept 15. Letters for candidates of interim review are due by Oct. 5.

**Committee on Management of Academic Operations** (E. Wielenberg)

A. Motion to count the following courses for Group Two designation:

ED 170 -- Foundations of the Educational Process

ED 222 -- Educational Psychology

ED 230 -- Introduction to Exceptional Children

Motion tabled.

B. Motion to Approve the Proposed Time Bank System (detailed below)  
Motion tabled.

***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee*** (S. Thede)

Scott Thede made the following announcements:

SLAAC has had a number of agenda items forwarded from Student Congress.

Volunteers are needed for faculty members to serve on grade grievance and academic integrity hearings.

**6. Reports from Other Committees**

***Faculty Development Committee*** (T. Hall)

Tom Hall made the following announcements:

1. Introduce Committee:

Tom Hall (Division IV) Chair

Bridget Gourley (Division III)

Jeff Kenney (Division II)

Carrie Klaus (At-Large) Fall

Robert Kingsley (At-Large) Spring

David Gellman (At-Large)

Tim Good (Division I)

Terri Bonebright (Ex Officio) Coordinator

Neal Abraham, Administrative Representative

2. Deadlines --See web page, which Ken Kirkpatrick is updating.

Program Applications

Faculty Fellowship Application Deadline: 9/17/2003; For Projects Beginning: 7/1/2004

Fisher Fellowship Application Deadline: 10/8/2003; For Projects Beginning: either fall or spring of following year

Fisher Time-Outs Application Deadline: 10/8/2003; For Projects beginning either fall or spring of following year

FITS Grants with Released Time Application Deadline to FITS 10/8/2003; To Fac Dev 10/8/03

Sabbatical and Pre-Tenure Leaves Application Deadline: 10/15/2003

Pre-Retirement Leaves: Application Deadline: 10/15/2003

Faculty In-Residence Leaves: Application Deadline: 10/15/2003

PLEASE NOTE: FDC requires if you apply for more than one type of award, you need a SHORT paragraph explaining the relation, or lack thereof, of the various awards.

3. Sabbatical Lunch Sept 17, 12-1:30

4. Comments by Barbara Whitehead, Catalyst for Mellon Grants.

Description of Mellon grants available at the Faculty development website.

Book clubs have been proposed as part of Mellon grant; list is posted on website.

***Committee on Administration*** (S. Tremblay)

Sheryl Tremblay reported that COA is still forming its agenda.

***First-Year Seminar Committee*** (J. Bruggemann)

Julia Bruggemann introduced the members of the committee, thanked those participating in the FYS program and announced that further details on the committee's work would be forthcoming.

## **5. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Neal Abraham made the following announcements:

Student retention for last year's incoming class is 93.3

Discussed the issue of grade inflation (with hand out). The VPAA argued that the data showed students were off to better start but that academic standards remained unchanged.

Announced the institution of a new harassment policy. Orientation and training for faculty and staff would be forthcoming.

New funds under Mellon grant for collaborative teaching with other institutions. The VPAA has added funds to foster collaboration with Wabash.

The VPAA discussed faculty demographics and stated an e-mail would be forthcoming with further details. The following message was sent to the faculty on September 18, 2003:

Dear Colleagues,

I promised at the faculty meeting earlier this month that I would share with you some demographic information about the faculty as of the start of this semester. Of those holding full-time teaching positions with faculty rank we have the following information.

Tenured 78 Men 44 Women

note that of the 60 most senior (longest serving) professors, only 10 are women. Since the mid 1980's the gender balance of those on tenure-track positions has been very close to 50:50.

Tenure-Track (but currently not yet tenured)

34 Men 31 Women

Tenured + Tenure-Track

112 Men 75 Women

Term (those on term limited appointments, including those on visiting appointments and those in continuing faculty positions with substantial administrative duties which preclude eligibility for tenure)

22 Men 14 Women.

Those of under-represented minority groups make up 8% of the tenured faculty, 21% of the tenure-track faculty, and 9% of the term faculty. Of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members, 13% are members of under-represented minority groups and among them women out-number men 2:1.

Of our 21 academic departments, considering only tenured and tenure-track faculty members, eight are significantly under-represented for women, one is significantly under-represented for men, and 15 are significantly under-represented for members of under-represented minority groups, including 11 which have no members of these groups among their full-time faculty complements.

For these reasons, continued attention needs to be paid to the promoting of our open faculty positions to qualified members of under-represented groups, using various forms of personal outreach and contacts to supplement the advertising of these positions.

I would also note that our numbers of full-time faculty colleagues in term positions is declining steadily, as planned, as we move systematically to approve tenure-track positions in departments and programs where there is evident continuing

need or the prospect of significant enrichment of our curricular offerings. The tenure-track searches approved for this year will contribute to a substantial further decline in the number of term positions. As I mentioned at the Faculty Institute, this progression towards more tenure-track positions and fewer term positions will mean that departments with expanded faculty complements will be required to adjust their curricular offerings as colleagues go on leaves or participate in projects based on reassignment of time from teaching to those projects, since we will have fewer positions to allocate to provide replacements for those arrangements.

Regards,  
Neal

#### **6. Remarks from the President**

Robert Bottoms stated that the alcohol responsibility task force will be an important initiative this year. Minutes of the group's meetings will be posted on website.

He also announced that Fr. John Newhouse will be a Mendenhall lecturer 27-28 October. Those interested should contact Larry Burton (Chaplain of University)

#### **7. Old Business**

None

#### **8. New Business**

A. Selection of coordinators for 2004 and 2005 Crimmel Colloquia (N. Abraham)

Following an election facilitated by a deep hat, Deborah Geis will coordinate the Crimmel Colloquium in 2004 and Kerry Pannell in 2005.

B. The Chair, Martha Rainbolt, called for the endorsement of the following election results

1. Marthe Chandler, division 4 representative, Committee on Faculty, 3 year term
2. James Mills, at-large representative, Committee on Faculty, 1 year term
3. Michael Sinowitz, at-large representative, Management of Academic Operations, 3 year term
4. Caroline Jetton, division one representative, COF Review, term 2/01/03 - 1/31/04
5. Anne Harris, Management of Academic Operations, 1 year term

Motion to endorse made by Bob Kingsley; Art Evans seconded the motion.

Passed by voice vote.

#### **9. Announcements**

A. Bob Newton read the following remembrance of John Eigenbrodt.

A Tribute to H. John Eigenbrodt

In the spring of 1957 sitting in his room at the Yale Divinity School, John was reading a theological text in German. Two of us, I and Leon Pacala, were traveling for the Department of Philosophy and Religion, in consequence of a grant from the Lilly Foundation. We were also seeking candidates to fill a vacancy in the Department. Leon and I were dazzled by meeting this young Ph. D. candidate, who had been teaching Greek at the Berkeley Divinity School and at YDS, who also held a music degree from Yale, who was the organist at YDS, and who now was reading this German theological text. There was no question that he was the person for the position.

Though John's specialty was biblical literature, he joined in creating the core course entitled Basic Beliefs of Modern Man, which for twenty years was often mentioned by alums as the most significant course of their college careers. This was a three-faculty, team-taught course in the fullest sense of the term: lectures shared by all, lecture and discussion agenda planned by all, discussion sessions led by each, examinations planned by all, and a thesis paper required at every class meeting. The good old days! The first year of that course was hell! Meeting before class every night for hours, the agenda had to be hammered out to our mutual satisfactions. That was no easy task, since Leon took a distinctly Barthian approach and John took a distinctly Bultmannian approach to texts.

After several years a, John concentrated on his specialty biblical literature, so appropriate for many students preparing for church-related (now, "faith-based") careers. At the high point of a trend in the 60s and 70s, DePauw was second only to Yale College in graduates entering the Yale Divinity School, famously the premier graduate school in religion. I was told by a YDS representative that John's students were exempted from the standard year-long Old, and standard year-long New, Testament courses and placed in advanced courses. Due, of course, to John's teaching. John's courses were in the greatest demand of any in the Department, a fact true right through to the final year in which he retired.

Especially during this period, but also through his teaching career, John was not only a demanding scholar; but also a pastoral mentor. Students learned from him how to probe the biblical and intellectual dimensions of their often naive faith. And many followed him to the Wednesday noon services at St. Andrews and listening to his Sunday organ playing (when our colleague Art Carkeek had to be away). Many children of faculty members, mine included, learned from him and left from him with continuing respect for biblical study and for him as an important person in their lives.

John's interests always transcended his chosen field of specialty. Always interested in theological discussion, he regularly attended meetings of the American Academy of Religion. We would drive together, ride together, fly together, and room together in New York or Chicago or San Francisco. Because of his broad interests, in the middle of his career his reading of the theological literature led him to create one of the first courses in the U.S. on Liberation Theology, a course replicated in many, many colleges in ensuing years. John taught this course in alternate semesters, always to a full class, alternating it with upper level courses in a biblical text.

Yet John never abandoned his linguistic base. Over and above his regular teaching load, he would offer independent study courses and Winter Term projects in biblical Greek and biblical Hebrew, the Greek a good complement to the classical Greek so well taught by colleagues Ed Minar, Nick Steele, and Carl Huffman in the Classical Studies Department; the Hebrew, an uncommon opportunity in most liberal arts colleges.

As a colleague in the former Department of Philosophy and Religion, John was cogent, committed, and considerate. On matters of policy and procedure, he offered us the sound advice of one who knew how to take a strong position without demeaning those opposing him. During the time of my chairing the Department, I always found in him good counsel and loyal support in doing what was right for the Department and the University. In welcoming the new members of the Department (Here I think of Marcia McKelligan and Marthe Chandler.), he evidenced a graciousness that affirmed their personhood as well as their competencies. And as a colleague to those outside Department, John could be both a guide and friend. I remember when returning from a sabbatical leave, being invited to his home to meet a new faculty member from outside the Department with whom John had become good friend and mentor, and which relationship has continued to this day. That was my introduction to Rod Clifford.' Serving on the Committee on Faculty, that most formidable of committees, he argued decisions to recognize the valued achievement and protect the threatened rights of faculty members whose cases made for their academic life or death. And at personal risk along with others, he once, and more than once,

dared to oppose unfair pressures and charges in that Committee's work. Elected to the Faculty Committee on Financial Affairs, with Cynthia Cornell, he authored guidelines, still valid, for the position recommendations of the Resource Allocation Subcommittee.

When John received the Tucker Award for distinguished service in 1994, the University did it right and did a little bit of what we all should do in recognition and applause.

The members of the faculty then remembered John Eigenbrodt and his service to the university with a warm round of applause.

### **Continuation of Announcements**

B. Dennis Tinkle speaking on behalf of the Technology Initiative announced that the school would be moving to a new e-mail and communication system over the next 12 months. Includes to-do lists, instant communication and other systems.

Questions about the move included:

Do we have to change our mail accounts? VAX will go, Web mail will be revised and updated.

Is this the system known as Groupwise on other campuses? Yes, but modified for DePauw with name change to TigerMail.

C. Bob Hershberger. Report on Crimmel Colloquium on Service learning.

D. Martha Rainbolt asked that all committees send their membership lists to her and reminded committee chairs of coordinating committees that minutes of their meetings must be posted on faculty governance website, available through faculty e-services. Minutes should be sent to Terry Bruner, Academic Affairs.

## **10. Adjournment 5:15**

### **Appendix**

#### **\*Proposed Time Bank System**

#### **September 2003**

60 min x3

7:50-8:50 MWF

9:00-10:00 MWF

10:10-11:10 MWF

11:20-12:20 MWF

12:50-1:50 MWF

2:15-3:15 MWF

50 min x3

8-8:50 MWF

9-9:50 MWF

10:10-11:00 MWF

11:20-12:10 MWF

1:00-1:50 MWF

2:00-2:50 MWF

3:00-3:50 MWF

50 min x4

8-8:50 MTWF\*

9-9:50 MTWF\*

10:10-11:00 MTWF\*

11:20-12:10 MTWF

1-1:50 MWRF  
2-2:50 MWRF\*  
3-3:50 MWRF\*

110 min x2  
8-9:50 TR  
10-11:50 TR  
2-3:50 TR  
7-8:50 TR pm

170 min x1  
9-11:50 T  
9-11:50 R  
1-3:50 M  
1-3:50 W  
1-3:50 F  
7-9:50 T pm  
7-9:50 R pm

Labs only  
2-3:50 M  
2-3:50 W  
2-4:50 T+  
1-3:50 R

Studio Art Only  
8-10:50 MW  
9-11:50 TR  
1-3:50 MW  
2-4:50 T, 1-3:50 R  
7-9:50 MW pm  
7-9:50 TR pm

\* = these can be 5 hour banks for the school of music

+ = this bank may be used only when multiple sections of the lab taught in this bank are offered

#### Some Notable Features of the Proposed System

1. It is a tweaking - a gentle massaging if you will - of the current system, rather than an entire scrapping of the current system.
2. It has six 3X60 banks rather than the current five 3X65 banks.
3. It has seven 50X3 and 50X4 banks rather than six (as in the current system).
4. Almost all classes start and end at the same time each day they meet (unlike the current system).
5. Students can take a 50-minute afternoon course (1-1:50) and a two-hour course or lab that meets on the same day. This is impossible under the current system.
6. There is some guaranteed free time in the middle of the day on Tuesday (12:10-2:00) and Thursday (11:50-1:00) for convocations and other activities.

Meeting of October 13, 2003

1. Called to Order approximately 4:05 p.m.
2. Quorum of over 87 faculty was members verified
3. Previous minutes approved with corrections.
4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

#### Committee on Academic Policy and Planning

Howard Pollack-Milgate reported on the relationship between opportunity hires and the Resource Allocations Subcommittee process. There have been joint meetings of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP), the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS), and the Diversity and Equity Committee (DEC). There are currently two ways to create new tenure-track positions

(1) Through RAS

(2) Opportunity hires of nominated individuals, particularly to bring greater diversity to the faculty. These are done by individuals or departments without consultation with CAPP. CAPP would like faculty representation on these decisions made through opportunity hires and has formed a new (as yet unnamed) subcommittee made up of representatives of CAPP, RAS, and DEC to consult on opportunity hires.

In discussion, Bryan Hanson asked if this committee will report to the faculty. The committee has not met yet and will report to CAPP.

H. Pollack-Milgate also reported on the General Education reform taskforce, which will present four options for Gen Ed, currently titled: Hard Core, Soft Core, Baroque, and Triad.

#### Report of First-Year Seminar Committee (Subcommittee of CAPP)

Julia Bruggemann reported on the last week's FYS workshop and reminded the faculty that FYS proposals for Fall 2004 were due last Friday, but that the committee would be open to late submissions.

#### Committee on Faculty

Karin Ahlm reported the following items:

A. Motion (to be tabled): To approve the following changes in Section II. B. "Peer Observation" of the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook:

Peer observations of faculty members in tenurable positions

1. In the first year, peer observations are voluntary. If done, observations shall be initiated and arranged by the probationary faculty member. After visiting a class or classes, the observing faculty member should arrange a meeting with the first-year faculty member to provide feedback. Any written materials provided to the first-year faculty member based

on these class observations shall be under the sole control of the first-year faculty member.

2. Peer observations are required after the first year of the probationary period. Required course observations shall be conducted by tenured or tenurable faculty members who are appointed by the department chair in consultation with the DPC. Observers shall be from the probationary faculty member's department; in exceptional cases, as deemed appropriate by the chair, faculty members from outside the department may be chosen for this purpose. No single faculty member shall do a majority of the observations. At least half of the observations shall be done by tenured faculty. The timing of classroom observations shall be arranged by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member being observed. The courses observed should reflect the range and type of courses\* normally taught by the observed faculty member. Each observation should cover an entire session of the class. Following the observation of each course, the observing faculty member shall provide both written and oral feedback in a timely fashion to the observed faculty member. The observer will also provide a copy of the written feedback to the chair and the Vice President for Academic Affairs to be placed in the observed faculty member's personnel file and in the decision file for interim and tenure reviews.

(a) In the second year, two courses shall be observed in each semester.

(b) In the third, fourth, and fifth years of the probationary period, a total of four courses (at least one course each year) taught by the probationary faculty member shall be observed.

(c) Probationary faculty can always request additional observations. Departments wishing to conduct more classroom observations than the required number shall do so only with the written consent of the probationary faculty member.

3. If the probationary period is three years or fewer, peer observations will be required in the first year and will follow the process outlined in 2(a).

\* In the sciences, labs may count for one of the course observations

Motion was tabled.

B. Motion (to be tabled): To approve the following changes in the Section V of the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook:

#### V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions,

and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: good teaching during the probationary period, satisfactory professional growth, and service.

\* Tenure decision. Required: good teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the professional competence category; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued good teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either professional growth or service and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Good teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of good teaching. Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc.. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class.

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

B. Professional growth shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions.

Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development of professional competence in the field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, and attendance at conferences; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. The evidence can be used to demonstrate development as a researcher (performer) or teacher, or both.

Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another.

2. a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals, course development based on scholarly activity, teaching roundtables etc..

C. Service to the school, department, and the university shall be considered fully in personnel decisions. Evidence is not required in all categories, and unless there are special departmental requirements or responsibilities stated in the job description, a candidate is free to decide what area and categories of service should be documented to show effective service.

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

Motion was tabled.

C . Announcements coming via e-mail.

Committee on Management of Academic Operations

A. Erik Wielenberg moved that the following motion be removed from the table:

Motion to approve the following courses for inclusion in the category of those counting for group 2 credit:

ED170 Foundations of the Educational Process  
ED222 Educational Psychology  
ED230 Introduction to Exceptional Children  
Removed from table and passed.

B. E. Wielenberg announced the following experimental courses:

Experimental Courses:  
Univ Exp Environmental Science Seminar (.5 credit)  
Hist Exp Internship in Public History (.5 credit)

C. E. Wielenberg moved to make the following course deletions and additions:

(1) Deletions:  
CSC 255 Computers in Business/Science/Society (1 credit)  
CSC 492 Computer Science Topics (1 credit)  
MUS 380 Jazz Improvisation and Theory (.5 credit)

(2) New Courses:

CSC 296 Computer Science Topics (.5ñ1 credit)  
CSC 396 Computer Science Topics (.5ñ1 credit) (these replace CSC 492)

MUS 384 Jazz Theory (.5 credit)  
MUS 386 Jazz Improvisation (.5 credit) (these replace MUS 380)

PHIL 310 Philosophy of Religion (1 credit)  
Motion Carried

D. Erik Wielenberg announced the following course changes:

Title Changes:  
CSC 496 Seminar: Computer Science (.5-1 credit) to be changed to  
CSC 496 Computer Science Topics (.5-1 credit)

Number Changes:

MUS 382 Jazz Arranging to be changed to  
MUS 482 Jazz Arranging (.5 credit)

E. Erik Wielenberg announced the topics courses which have group credit for the spring semester:

ML 395 Russian and Eastern European Cinema, group 3  
SPAN 390a El drama desde 1950 (The Drama Since 1950), group 3  
SPAN 390b Latin American Women Writers, group 3  
FREN 401 The French Song, group 3  
MUS 290a Introduction to World Musics, group 3  
MUS 390a Opera and Gender, group 3

MUS 390b Beethoven, group 3  
POLS 390 Women and World Politics, group 2  
REL 370a Religion and Politics, group 4  
HIST 290a Modern History of the Southern Cone, group 4  
REL 370b Religious Bodies, group 4  
BIO 390a/390La Topics: Developmental Biology, group 1  
ARTH290HA Topics: Art & Lit Paris & Berlin, group 4  
ARTH390H Topics: Art of India, group 3

Addendum to list included in handout distributed at meeting:

COM 291 Voice and Movement, group 6  
ANTH 290B Men and Masculinity, group 2  
SOC 301A Principles of Population, group 2  
BIO 290, Organismal Biology, group 1 (with lab)  
HIST 290 Post-Revolutionary Mexican History, group 4  
HIST 300 The Cultural Turn in Latin America, group 2  
ASIA 290 Sex and Desire in India and China, group 3

F. E. Wielenberg moved that the statement concerning eligibility for the Dean's List be revised as follows:

Current Statement:

"Eligibility is based on the completion of at least three courses with a 3.5 semester GPA or better."

Proposed Revision:

"Eligibility is based on the completion of at least three courses with a 3.5 semester GPA or better and no grades of F. Students with incomplete or deferred grades will only be eligible when these grades are completed."

Clarification: Students on off campus study programs (except our Vienna program) do not have a DePauw GPA and therefore do not earn Dean's List status those semesters.

Fred Soster clarified that this applied only to individual semesters .

Pam Propsom asked why this change is needed. Ellie Ypma: because of quarter credit courses it is mathematically possible to get an F and make the Dean's list.

Motion passed

G. E. Wielenberg asked that the following motion be removed from the table

Motion: That the faculty approve a new timebank system

Proposed Time Bank System

September 2003

60 min x3

7:50-8:50 MWF  
9:00-10:00 MWF  
10:10-11:10 MWF  
11:20-12:20 MWF  
12:50-1:50 MWF  
2:15-3:15 MWF  
110 min x2 or (75 min x2)  
8-9:50 TR (8-9:15 TR)  
10-11:50 TR (10-11:15 TR)  
2-3:50 TR (2-3:15 TR)  
7-8:50 TR pm (7-8:15 TR)

50 min x3  
8-8:50 MWF  
9-9:50 MWF  
10:10-11:00 MWF  
11:20-12:10 MWF  
1:00-1:50 MWF  
2:00-2:50 MWF  
3:00-3:50 MWF  
170 min x1  
9-11:50 T  
9-11:50 R  
1-3:50 M  
1-3:50 W  
1-3:50 F  
7-9:50 T pm  
7-9:50 R pm

50 min x4  
8-8:50 MTWF\*  
9-9:50 MTWF\*  
10:10-11:00 MTWF\*  
11:20-12:10 MTWF  
1-1:50 MWRF  
2-2:50 MWRF\*  
3-3:50 MWRF\*  
Labs only  
2-3:50 M  
2-3:50 W  
2-4:50 T+  
1-3:50 R

?  
Studio & Performing Arts Only  
8-10:50 MW

9-11:50 TR  
1-3:50 MW  
2-4:50 T, 1-3:50 R  
7-9:50 MW pm  
7-9:50 TR pm

\* = these can be 5 hour banks for the school of music

+ = this bank may be used only when multiple sections of the lab taught in this bank are offered

Some Notable Features of the Proposed System

1. It is a tweaking - a gentle massaging if you will - of the current system, rather than an entire scrapping of the current system.
2. It has six 3X60 banks rather than the current five 3X65 banks.
3. It has seven 50X3 and 50X4 banks rather than six (as in the current system).
4. Almost all classes start and end at the same time each day they meet (unlike the current system).
5. Students can take a 50-minute afternoon course (1-1:50) and a two-hour course or lab that meets on the same day. This is impossible under the current system.
6. There is some guaranteed free time in the middle of the day on Tuesday (12:10-2:00) and Thursday (11:50-1:00) for convocations and other activities.

Motion on time bank revision was removed from table.

E. Wielenberg noted that since the last version of the proposed revision that a number of 110 min x 2 or (75 x 2) timebanks were created as additional options.

In a wide ranging discussion a number of issues were raised. [The following notes have been edited to reflect not only the chronology of the discussion but also to group together comments on the same basic topics. ]

Labs:

Wade Hazel reminded the faculty that the 170 x 1 timebanks were suitable for labs (although not stated on the handout).

Jim Benedix asked for clarification and reasoning for T afternoon lab only 2-4:50. E. Wielenberg replied for the need of a convo time on Tuesday 12:10--2:00. J. Benedix replied that this leaves fewer 3 hours labs.

Bryan Hanson concurred with Benedix.

Barbra Whitehead replied that there were 6 TR banks if you consider the Labs as well as the 170 x 1 groups.

Benedix replied that many of the 170 x 1 times were in the evening; outside labs can't be done in dark and staff support not available in evening. Benedix would rather have the timebank overlap the convo hour and allow for teacher discretion for students attending convo.

Ellie Ypma noted that new time bank actually adds 1 lab hour in addition to the convo hour.

Bryan Hanson responded that the number of time banks was less important than the time of the labs being on TR during the day.

#### Evening classes:

Dana Dudle raised concerns about the number of evening classes on MTWR at 7pm. Asked if there was consultation by MAO with Student Life because evening talks would always conflict with some class. E. Wielenberg replied that there are two students on MAO who provided feedback. The issue was not a concern to them. Evening time banks are not used often, so conflicts with speakers should be a rare problem.

Ellie Ypma added that the evening time banks were at the suggestion of the Art department for studio classes. This point was confirmed by Bob Kingsley

Ellen Maycock noted that many faculty give exams at night. What might be done to accommodate those faculty? With more evening classes this will not be possible. E.

Ypma replied that few courses would offered MW night, so this should not be a conflict.

#### Other Concerns:

Jim Rambo raised concerns of conflicts between language classes and labs under the present system.

Jackie Roberts reported that, as an advisor, she has not experienced these conflicts in the present system.

David Harvey asked what problems these revisions are trying to solve. E. Wielenberg replied that the problems included incompatibility of classes and trouble of students filling schedule, including conflicts of lab science and language.

Bridget Gourley asked how the proposed revisions will solve the problem. E. Wielenberg answered that the revisions created more banks and fewer inner-bank conflicts. The revision allows students to take afternoon lab and language.

Jamie Stockton voiced concerns about how education courses over 1 credit will fit. Ellie Ypma responded that those courses would be accommodated.

Hillary Eppley asked what the rationale was for the switch of Convo from Tuesday to Thursday.

Wade Hazel: Did MAO look at the timebanks of other schools? Are there faculty inequity workload issues?. E. Wielenberg: Yes, did look at other schools. DePauw's sports fields are not lighted, and, as Indiana does not observe daylight savings time, athletic teams need a 4:00 start for practice.

Neal Abraham: Regarding possible faculty inequity in time banks, class time less a central concern than office hours, grading, and other issues

Mary English: Previously the shorter banks were not enough, so we went to longer. Why do we need now more shorter banks?

Ellie Ypma: 65 mins x3 replaced 50 x4 and created inconsistent times. The proposed schedule creates consistent start times. MW 2-4 is possible in the revised bank system.

#### Suggested revisions and accommodations:

Marcia McKelligan: Allow faculty to teach other times as faculty desired.

Anne Harris: Bring back MW 2-4 and more longer banks.

Janette Jerz: Switch convo to R afternoon and the afternoon schedules of R and T.

Jamie Stockton stated that she would prefer not to vote on the motion today. She argued that proposed revisions which resulted in more timebanks with less time and fewer with extended time was not pedagogically sound.

Emmanuel Harris asked if we still had a quorum? Yes.

Amendments:

Marcia McKelligan moved to add two time banks 8-9:50 MW and 2-3:50. MW. Second Anne Harris.

Ellie Ypma: Classrooms would be tight at these times.

Motion carried.

Howard Brooks discussed concerns on Daylight saving time issues. He then moved to send the motion back to committee to consider amendments and discussion. Second by Bob Kingsley.

Further discussion followed

David Harvey was in favor of deliberation by MAO. Pedar Foss concurred.

Bernie Batto asked if there were a compelling reason for voting now. Erik Wielenberg said there was not.

Kelly Hall suggested the faculty should vote not to pass the motion instead of sending it back to committee.

Bob Hershberger called the question

Motion to send the time bank revision back to MAO for further consideration was passed.

Wade Hazel asked for clarification of the rule for departments to teach a certain number of classes in the 8:00 AM timebank. Ellie Ypma replied that it is now just a guideline.

Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee

Scott Thede made the following announcements :

Midterms grades due at 10:00 today.

Student Congress is putting together a number of forums for student feedback on issues.

## 5. Reports from Other Committees

Faculty Development Committee

Tom Hall reported:

First good news: more applications and many good applications. However, this leads to some bad news, some good applications are turned down. This happens for Faculty Fellowships, for Fisher Fellowships, for Fisher Timeouts, etc.

With new Mellon venture grants FDC is developing procedures, guidelines, and criteria, and hopes to have briefer and clearer instructions in the future.

The entire committee works very hard to be both consistent and fair in the decision process.

Not all Faculty Fellowships are awarded yet, but some letters are out. They cannot be completed because there are some simultaneous applications for Faculty Fellowships and Fisher Fellowships. Also those who applied but did not receive a Faculty Fellowship will have the option of applying for a Fisher Time out by 10/23. But FDC already has about 3 times as many applications as awards.

Upcoming Faculty Development Schedule

October 13 begin deciding Mellon Venture Fund Applications; Fisher Fellowship Applications

Due October 23 Fisher Time-out Applications from rejected Faculty Fellowships October 28 finalize Faculty Fellowships; Fisher Time-outs

Oct. 27 4:30 Sabbatical or leave applications due.

From Barbara Whitehead on Mellon grant:

Category 1 grants been awarded and abstracts of the successful projects will be placed on the Mellon webpage.

Very competitive process. Requests totaled over \$54,000 while the fund had \$10,000 to allot. Ended up spending \$18,000 with help of Neal's funds (Dean's fund)

Even though we've overspent our budget by 80%, it's possible that there is still money in the Dean's fund which could supplement category 1 requests, which is why we encouraged those applicants who were not funded in this round to resubmit their applications by November 1 for potential funding this spring. Anyone else who would like to make a new proposal for spring funding is encouraged to submit an application; projects that are not funded for the spring of 2004 can be resubmitted next spring for funding in the 2004-2005 academic year. The deadline for category one applications seeking funding in the 2004-05 academic year has not been set as yet, but it will be sometime next spring.

Since there is more time to pull together an application for the November 1 deadline, we are asking for more precision in these requests, especially on the costs. For example, if you are going to propose a book club, as many of you did, we would like to see an exact listing of participants, the specific books that will be read, and the cost of each book. We had to pare down food costs in order to fund as many projects as possible, so the new reimbursement schedule to be used is as follows: \$5 per person per breakfast or lunch, \$7 per person per dinner.

November 1 is an important date as all the other Mellon Grants for 2004-2005 are due on that day:

Venture Fund Grants

Cluster Grants: both the Local Initiatives as well as the Inter-Institutional Initiatives

Please look at the web page which you can get to through the faculty development webpage

#### Questions

Peder Foss: If Mellon-venture grant is not funded for 2003, will there be enough time to reapply for the following year?

Dana Dudle: What about problems of multiple submission?

T. Hall: Applicants need to prioritize submissions.

#### Committee on Administration

Marcia McKelligan reported that the most pressing concern of COA is health care . COA is working in conjunction with Paul Schmidt. Will solicit faculty input. Healthcare program will probably remain with Cigna.

#### Diversity and Equity Committee

Emmanuel Harris reported that DEC was continuing last year's work on handicapped accessibility on campus. Currently also working with CAPP on opportunity hires. Also on the agenda is the development of a committee webpage as well as hiring and retention policies. DEC continues to provide briefings for departments doing searches. It is also reconsidering the affirmative action policy in light of recent legal precedent and federal law.

#### 6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs

N Abraham began his comment by noting that the peer observation policy written in handbook (see COF discussion above) was also paralleled for term and part time positions. The latter will modified in light of any revisions to the former.

N. Abraham then discussed demographic data concerning why had DPU's numbers for minority faculty jumped from last year (10% full time 8% total) to this year (12% both full and part time).

He also announced that a workshop on students with learning differences with Mel Levine will be held from 10-12 this Thursday. Call Jerry Jolliff for further information.

#### 7. Remarks from the President

B. Bottoms reported that among the topics for Board of Trustees were the Coalition for Responsible Community (Alcohol) and Development of DePauw Nature park.

#### 8. Adjournment

Howard Brooks called for a quorum; there were not enough faculty members present to constitute a quorum and the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:25 p.m.



## **Meeting of November 3, 2003**

### **Union Building Ballroom**

Before a quorum was reached, Cleveland Johnson read the following remembrance of Arthur Carkeek.

#### **Arthur Carkeek: (1923-2003): Faculty Tribute**

Our colleague, Arthur Carkeek, Professor Emeritus of Organ and Music Theory, died on Sunday, October 19 at the age of 80. Arthur Carkeek and DePauw went back almost a half century together. He came to DePauw after World War II to complete his undergraduate degree in Organ under the tutelage of the legendary Van Denman Thompson. As a Junior, Art married another organ student, Maureen MacCormick, and they graduated together in 1948 and moved to New York City to do their Master of Sacred Music degrees at Union Seminary. Returning to DePauw in 1950, at the bidding of his former teacher, Art began what would become a 38-year career at this institution. (I should point out that Maureen, who still teaches, is in her 52nd year at DePauw!). Upon the retirement of Van Denman Thompson in 1956, Art also took on the position of University organist, a position that, in that era of well-attended weekly chapel services, held considerable responsibilities.

By the time I first met him, Arthur Carkeek was already an old fart – a self-proclaimed old fart, for he and his School of Music colleagues, Cassel Grubb, Dan Hanna, Bob Grocock, and Tom Fitzpatrick, were sometimes seen donning matching baseball caps bearing that proud designation. Because Art and I both circulated in the same professional circles and shared many common friends and colleagues, we both felt like we had long known each other, although it would take DePauw to bring us together in the same place at the same time. Of course, I was just at the beginning of my career; Art was at least a generation ahead of me and already a legend in the organ world.

Now many of you will have often experienced that awkward moment at a meeting or conference, when you realize that the person you're talking to has misread your name-tag and thinks you're from Chicago and teach in the largest Catholic university in the nation, DePaul. Well, thanks to Art, I seldom had this problem at organ conferences. One looks at my nametag and institutional affiliation, countless people over the years have responded, "Isn't that where Arthur Carkeek teaches? How is Art?" What a relief for me, and what a testimony to the prestige that Art brought to DePauw.

This renown and respect didn't seem to come from any single aspect of Art's multi-faceted career. Although Art was highly respected as a performer, with important recordings and concerts to his credit, he was probably best known in organ-building circles. Having been a serviceman in post-war Europe, where he first saw some of the organ treasures of that continent, and having worked in the shop of the legendary German organ builder, Rudolf von Beckerath, Art became a prophetic voice in America for his recognition that these ancient European organs held important secrets that could enliven the future of American organ building. Indeed, the past half-century has proved Art right: the most significant new developments in organ building have not been modern technological advances, but the rediscovery of earlier sounds and historic building principles. Art's reputation put Greencastle on the map with a constant flow of important visitors over the years from throughout the organ world. For example, even as recently as a week before Art's death, John Brombaugh, the dean of historically inspired organ-building, detoured through Greencastle to pay Art a visit.

Art's greatest legacy will certainly prove to be his teaching, for he passed on what he knew, and the enthusiasm about what he knew, to countless devoted students. During the heyday of his career, over a dozen organ majors were typically enrolled at DePauw to study with Art and/or Maureen. He realized, however, that DePauw had to keep up with the times – that DePauw

needed organ facilities to attract the best students. Just as universities across the country today are having to compete for students by building luxurious fitness centers, condo-like housing, and state-of-the-art laboratories and technology centers, Art recognized that DePauw's new Performing Arts Center needed great organ facilities. He turned to the very best at the time, Rudolf von Beckerath to build practice organs and a small recital hall organ, and Charles Fisk, an important American pioneer in mechanical-action organs, to build an instrument for his teaching studio. After the completion of the PAC, Art began thinking about a new concert organ in the building to keep DePauw's facilities competitive. I have to emphasize that these organs were not just expensive playthings in Art's eyes; his sole goal was to help maintain DePauw's historically strong enrollments of students in organ performance and church music. Enrollments at the time were already under threat, and Art's ideas for a new organ in Kresge, were the kind of exciting, cutting-edge thinking that would make everyone, from prospective students to international organ scholars, really sit up and take notice.

When I came to interview at DePauw in May of 1985, fresh from the European organ scene, I was amazed to learn of the project Art had envisioned and see a beautiful scale-model of it gracing the President Rosser's desk. I couldn't imagine, until I later came to know Art much better, how such a forward-looking organ project could have been conceived in this small Indiana college town. Tragically, sometime before my move to Greencastle that summer, Art's project was put on indefinite hold, and he would spend the remaining years of his career at DePauw, trying to revive it. As feared, organ enrollment did continue to plummet, and his talented successor, Carla Edwards, came to DePauw with a handicap that Art had done his very best to pre-empt.

As a colleague, Art was never content to hide away in his world of music; he was greatly respected throughout the entire University. I'll never forget my very first faculty meeting at DePauw – September 1985 when the relationship between President Rosser and the Faculty was coming apart at the seams. (I wondered what I had gotten myself into!) I was awed to see Art chosen by the faculty to serve on an ad hoc committee to help mediate the situation, and I later learned that, as an almost perennial member of COF, Art had never shied away from challenging and time-consuming University service. When our new president, Robert G. Bottoms, was chosen, Arthur Carkeek was chosen to deliver the faculty address at the inauguration.

In his retirement, Art finally had time to complete a long-ongoing project, a retrospective look at the life and work of Rudolf von Beckerath and to enjoy his new beautiful house organ. (Speaking of organ celebrities passing through Greencastle, the dedicatory recital on Art and Maureen's organ was played by none other than the famous German organist, Harald Vogel just as a personal favor.)

Soon, however, things started to go awry. Some of us first perceived it in church, noticing that Art's playing was becoming rhythmically unsteady. He certainly would have known long before we did that something wasn't quite right, and I can only imagine his own chagrin and frustration – great musician that he was. Eventually he was diagnosed with PSP (progressive supra-nuclear palsy), a still incurable disease which was just coming to be known through the efforts of the celebrity actor, musician – and victim -- Dudley Moore.

As Art's disease progressed and as he became increasingly homebound, I had the privilege to spend two or three afternoons with him every week for a number of years, while Maureen taught her afternoon students at DePauw. I don't know if he looked forward to our afternoons together, but I certainly did (esp. the first Monday afternoon every month when I had what I thought was a perfectly legitimate excuse not to attend the general faculty meeting!). Often I would have to bring along work to do -- papers to grade and such -- or I would practice (some of the best practice hours I have ever spent -- Art Carkeek sitting in the next room listening to you practice is great motivation), but typically we would do something together. He loved to keep abreast of the latest developments in the organ world -- and we would read journal articles together or listen to recordings. He also enjoyed getting the latest edition of *The DePauw* as a window onto campus

life, something he sorely missed. Gradually, communication became more and more difficult, but his mind was always clear. Spelling out his thoughts on a letter-board, he continued to share thoughts and ideas and ask questions about the world outside. You know, he was always so meticulous. I just couldn't get him to use abbreviations or shorten his sentences. Instead of spelling, "I'm thirsty," or even just "water," he would insist on spelling out, "Could you please bring me a glass of water to drink." I think he was trying to teach me patience.

Art's final year was full of ups and downs, but in many ways rounded out beautifully a deep and meaningful life. Last fall, St. Andrew's dedicated a new pipe organ, in honor of Art and funded by many of his friends, colleagues, and former students. The new organ in DePauw's Kresge Auditorium – a project resuscitated by Carla Edwards from Art's dreams of 20 years earlier – was dedicated just this spring and Art was able to be there for that long-awaited event. Just a week before his death, Art was able to make his last trip to campus, where his former student, Ted Gibboney, gave him a private preview of the recital scheduled for the following day. While listening intently, Art opened his eyes for the first time in ages and seemed to show his approval in the best way he could. The organ was indeed his life, and DePauw can be proud to count among its faculty such an important icon in that instrument's history. For those of you who knew Art, I'm sure you can join me in saying that his love for what he did, and particularly his esteem for this institution, will continue to inspire us for years to come.

- 1. Call to Order at 4:26 p.m.**, when quorum was attained
- 2. Verification of Quorum**

Chair of the Faculty Martha Rainbolt began with brief announcements about the guidelines for conducting the meeting.

1. Speakers must be loud enough to be heard throughout the room.
2. By Roberts Rules--each speaker can speak once to the question, until all who wish to address the Issue have had a chance to speak. This may mean that some people who wish to speak repeatedly on the question may not be called on immediately to allow someone who has not yet spoken to the question an opportunity to speak.
3. On secret ballots: Howard Brooks was called on as parliamentarian of the faculty to clarify if the chair can call for a secret ballot. Brooks: as any faculty member can call for a secret ballot and the chair of the faculty is a member of the faculty, in his opinion the chair can call for a secret ballot. Jim Benedix asked if allowing the chair this authority requires a vote of the faculty? Jim Benedix, who serves as the parliamentarian for another society, and Howard will meet to discuss this issue.

### **3. Approval of Previous Minutes**

Approved as circulated with minor corrections.

### **4. Reports from Coordinating Committees**

#### ***Committee on Academic Policy and Planning*** (H. Pollack-Milgate)

##### **A. Announcements**

CAPP has had only one meeting since last faculty meeting. CAPP will take up the question of minors in the various academic programs. Currently there is a great variety of minors in different areas of study of between 4 and 11 courses. CAPP will look into the diversity and see if it is possible to find common standards for the minors.

Work continues on the General Education Task Force: Four models handout was distributed at the meeting and will be distributed by e-mail. Forums to discuss the Gen Ed proposal will be announced .

B. Report of First-Year Seminar Committee (Subcommittee of CAPP)--(J. Bruggemann)  
Received proposals for next year's FYS courses have been evaluated and have been responded to. Staffing issues will be worked out by Departments with VPAA Abraham.

**Committee on Faculty** (K. Ahlm)

A. Motion (to be removed from the table): To approve the following changes in Section II. B. "Peer Observation" of the **Personnel Policies** section of the **Academic Handbook**:

Peer observations of faculty members in tenurable positions

1. In the first year, peer observations are voluntary. If done, observations shall be initiated and arranged by the probationary faculty member. After visiting a class or classes, the observing faculty member should arrange a meeting with the first-year faculty member to provide feedback. Any written materials provided to the first-year faculty member based on these class observations shall be under the sole control of the first-year faculty member.

2. Peer observations are required after the first year of the probationary period. Required course observations shall be conducted by tenured or tenurable faculty members who are appointed by the department chair in consultation with the DPC. Observers shall be from the probationary faculty member's department; in exceptional cases, as deemed appropriate by the chair, faculty members from outside the department may be chosen for this purpose. No single faculty member shall do a majority of the observations. At least half of the observations shall be done by tenured faculty. The timing of classroom observations shall be arranged by the department chair in consultation with the faculty member being observed. The courses observed should reflect the range and type of courses\* normally taught by the observed faculty member. Each observation should cover an entire session of the class. Following the observation of each course, the observing faculty member shall provide both written and oral feedback in a timely fashion to the observed faculty member. The observer will also provide a copy of the written feedback to the chair and the Vice President for Academic Affairs to be placed in the observed faculty member's personnel file and in the decision file for interim and tenure reviews.

(a) In the second year, two courses shall be observed in each semester.

(b) In the third, fourth, and fifth years of the probationary period, a total of four courses (at least one course each year) taught by the probationary faculty member shall be observed.

(c) Probationary faculty can always request additional observations. Departments wishing to conduct more classroom observations than the required number shall do so only with the written consent of the probationary faculty member.

3. If the probationary period is three years or fewer, peer observations will be required in the first year and will follow the process outlined in 2(a).

\* In the sciences, labs may count for one of the course observations

Removed from table.

Marcia McKelligan asked: Are course evaluations still required in first year. Yes, still required.

Motion Approved and will go into effect immediately.

B. Motion (to be removed from the table): To approve the following changes in the Section V of the **Personnel Policies** section of the **Academic Handbook**:

V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status  
(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: good teaching during the probationary period, satisfactory professional growth, and service.

\* Tenure decision. Required: good teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the professional competence category; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued good teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either professional growth or service and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Good teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of good teaching. Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class.

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

B. [DELETE: Professional growth shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions.]

**SUBSTITUTE: Continued development of professional competence is necessary for a positive personnel decision.**

Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development of professional competence in the field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, and attendance at conferences; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. The evidence can be used to demonstrate development as a researcher (performer) or teacher, or both.

Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another.

2. a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and

scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals, course development based on scholarly activity, teaching roundtables etc.

C. [DELETE: Service to the school, department, and the university shall be considered fully in personnel decisions.] SUBSTITUTE: **Effective service is necessary for positive personnel decisions.** Evidence is not required in all categories, and unless there are special departmental requirements or responsibilities stated in the job description, a candidate is free to decide what area and categories of service should be documented to show effective service.

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

Handout on Green paper was distributed which made explicit the above changes from the printed agenda.

Motion removed from table.

Wade Hazel: Question on professional growth section V.B.1 3rd sentence: Why is professional competence listed as both "researcher (performer) or teacher"? Doesn't this repeat teaching from the earlier category?

Carl Huffman concurred that the present language muddies the waters between the two categories.

David Newman: On the phrase in the same section (V.B.1), "more activity in one category may compensate for less in another": Does this mean zero in another?

Bob Newton: Question regarding V.A(teaching) candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following. But language is slightly different in Professional Growth (V.B)

Carl Huffman: moved to amend the statement by deleting, in V.B.1, the sentence " The evidence can be used to demonstrate development as a researcher (performer) or teacher, or both." and deleting, in V.B.2, the phrase "teaching roundtable."

Wade Hazel seconded the motion.

Marcia McKelligan: Traditionally these issues have been considered in professional growth.

Jim Benedix. Asked for clarification of two bold sentences which were friendly amendments.

Carl Huffman: Believes that Marcia McKelligan's concerns can still be met with the amendment.

Karin Ahlm: COF is not trying to change the expectations. Teaching development can include those things that are beyond classroom needs; such things have, therefore, been considered as part of professional growth.

Srimati Basu: Is intellectual liveliness on and off campus part of Professional Growth or Service?

Kelly Hall: Where does administrative development come? Can it be professional growth or just Service?

Fred Soster: Point of Order--we need to debate the motion.

Bruce Stinebrickner: Is the introduction of teaching new in Professional Growth?

Martha Rainbolt: COF is arguing that its practice has been to consider extraordinary teaching development as professional growth and that the proposed revision conforms to this practice.

Bruce Stinebrickner: Teaching roundtable seems redundant with workshops.

Marcia McKelligan: On V.B.1, if a faculty member develops a new area of teaching, is that professional growth or teaching?

Dana Dudle: Does scholarship of teaching still count as professional growth if the sentence is deleted?

Karin Ahlm: It always has in the past. Professional development related to teaching traditionally is seen by COF as part of Professional Development rather than just teaching.

Amendment not passed by paper ballot 52 No, 29 Yes, 3 abstentions.

Questions regarding Service at departmental, university, and national level.

Carl Huffman proposed the following amendment: Remove in V.C "Evidence is not required in all categories" and replace with "Adequate service is required in both departmental and university service."

Bob Kingsley moved to return the revision to committee. Motion seconded by Bruce Stinebrickner. Motion carried.

In concluding the discussion, Bryan Hanson asked: When a faculty member enters and the faculty handbook changes, what standard is the faculty member to be held to?

The motion to return the document to committee passed.

***Committee on Management of Academic Operations*** (E. Wielenberg)

A. Motions (to be tabled):

That MUS 384 Jazz Theory count for group 3 credit and MUS 386 Jazz Improvisation count for group 6 credit.

Motion tabled.

B. Motion (to be voted on):

To approve a new course Eng 343; Creative Writing II: Dramatic Writing Topics.

Motion passed.

C. Announcements:

1. Course changes and additions:

(a) Change in title:

ENG 342 "Creative Writing II: Playwriting Topics" to "Creative Writing II: Screenwriting Workshop"

GEOL 490 "Advanced Topics in Geology" to "Research Thesis"

(b) Change in title and credit:

ML 361 Advanced Chinese (.5) credit becomes Advanced Chinese I (1 credit).

(c) Change in number:

UNIV 155 Topics to UNIV 190 Topics (.5-1 credit)

GEOL 201 Geologic Field Experiences to GEOL 220

GEOL 111 Physical Geology to GEOL 110

GEOL 112 Historical Geology to GEOL 210

GEOL 301 Mineralogy to GEOL 280

GEOL 316 Sedimentology and Stratigraphy to GEOL 310

GEOL 302 Petrology to GEOL 320

GEOL 304 Structural Geology and Tectonics to GEOL 350

GEOL 430 Applied Hydrogeology to GEOL 370  
GEOL 420 Environmental Geophysics to GEOL 380  
GEOL 497 Senior Seminar to GEOL 450  
GEOG 151 Physical Geography to GEOG 115  
GEOG 251 The Global Environment to GEOG 125  
GEOG 262 Oceanography to GEOG 135

(d) Change in number & title:

GEOL 492 Readings and Research in Geology to GEOL 470 Readings in Geology  
GEOL 491 Readings and Problems in Geology to GEOL 480 Problems in Geology

2. MAO approved S&A's request to change the Anthropology major and the combined Sociology and Anthropology major. A new course, Anthropological Methods, will be required of all Anthropology majors; S&A combined majors will be required to take either this new course or SOC 401 Methods of Social Research.

3. Topics courses to count for group credit in the spring:

POLS 390 Politics of Labor – group 2

POLS 390 Citizens in the American Federal System: Past, Present, and Future – group 2

4. MAO continues to work on a timebank proposal.

Ellie Ypma reminded the faculty that a change of credit require faculty vote.

A motion to approve the course credit change of Advance Chinese (see C.1.b above) was proposed and carried.

#### ***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee*** (S. Thede)

Announcements

SLAAC will take up the issue of the University's Copyright clearance policy and invites suggestions from the faculty.

#### **5. Reports from Other Committees**

##### ***Faculty Development Committee*** (T. Hall)

Announcements:

FDC is about finished with first round of Mellon venture grants; letter should be out this week.

Deadline for second round is Nov. 12 at 4pm for grants for 2004-2005.

Applicants should briefly comment on how the grant will enhance their professional development. If applying for books or supplies, again, briefly explain why this purchase will enhance their professional development.

Week of 11/3 FDC will begin reviewing Fisher Timeouts;

Then FDC will turn to leave applications (sabbaticals) over the next two weeks, and on to the next round of venture grants

FDC is now receiving many more good applications than it can fund, and the committee members are working very hard to be fair and consistent in their choices.

#### **FISHER FELLOWSHIP AWARD 2004-2005**

*John Schlotterbeck* - (Fall) Completion of book manuscript, "Thomas Jefferson's 'Chosen People of God': Rural Society and Culture in the Virginia Piedmont, 1714 to 1900."

#### **FACULTY FELLOWSHIP AWARDS**

Three Year Award: 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007

Teaching Projects/Curricular Development:

*James Mills* - "Development of a Laboratory and Technological Enhancement of Lecture for Earthquakes and Volcanoes (GEOG 105)"  
*Ophelia Goma* - "Incorporating Active Learning in Economics With Technological Applications"

Combination of Teaching Projects/Curricular Development and Scholarly/Creative Projects:  
*Daniel Shannon* - "Translation and Commentary of Chapters 1-3, 7-8 of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit and Creation of the Course 'Idealism'"

Scholarly/Creative Projects:

*Srimati Basu* - "Re-Making Unions: Mediating Marriage in the Family Courts"  
*Barbara Bean* - "Misfits: A Collection of Stories"  
*Yung-chen Chiang* - "In the Interstices Among Race, Gender, and Class: Hu Shi and Edith Clifford Williams"  
*Eric Edberg* - "Improvisation for Classical Musicians: A Book-length Manuscript and Companion CD"  
*Carla Edwards* - "CD Recording Project: 19th and 20th Century Works for Voice and Organ"  
*Arthur Evans* - "Scholarly Editing: Science Fiction Studies and Wesleyan University Press"  
*Glen Kuecker* - "Globalization, Resistance, and Citizenship in Guerrero, Mexico and Intag, Ecuador"  
*Sunil Sahu* - "Democracy in the Third World: Why it Has Succeeded in India and Failed in Nigeria"  
*Caroline B. Smith* - "CD Recording Project: Its Completion and Promotion"

Mac Dixon-Fyle asked: What is rejection rate. Tom Hall: Fisher 4:1, other awards closer to 2:1.  
Dana Dudle noted that faculty development awards are for both teaching and scholarship.

#### **Committee on Administration** (M. McKelligan)

Announcements

COA distributed questionnaire on health care . Please respond by Dec. 1.

Bruce Stinebrickner about the question: where do you want to be on a scale of 1-5. Where is the current system? Is the current model 3 or 5.

Marcia McKelligan: we're probably around 3 or 4 (perhaps more 4).

#### **Diversity and Equity Committee** (E. Harris)

Announcements

Briefings for search committees continue.

Also drafting a letter to President regarding accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Members of DEC attended a conference on diversity and inclusion.

#### **6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs** (N. Abraham)

Neal Abraham mentioned that for clarification of the guidelines for faculty positions, see III.B of faculty handbook.

He then made the following statement:

I am pleased to share with you the selection of Jacqueline Roberts, Associate Professor of Chemistry, to receive the Exemplary Teaching Award for this year. The award is given each year by DePauw University and the General Board of Higher Education of the United Methodist Church. In past years the recipients have been David Field, Tom Chiarella, Andrea Sununu, Valarie Ziegler, Craig Paré, John Dittmer, Terri Bonebright and Carl Singer.

Jackie was selected from among 10 nominees who were proposed by various faculty colleagues. After reviewing the nominations and the supporting evidence provided in the nomination letters, I also reviewed evidence in the personnel files of each of the nominees before reaching my decision on the selection.

Her teaching of biochemistry has been deemed by colleagues and students to be inspiring. She has drawn students to study chemistry in more depth and breadth than the students themselves had first intended. Through her work with colleagues in the chemistry department she has contributed to a substantial redesign of the chemistry curriculum, placing biochemistry in more courses and in more places that make it more accessible to students in their early years of studying chemistry. In her teaching methodologies, she is innovative in finding ways to incorporate group work and student projects in subjects often treated solely by lecture and conventional laboratory exercises. As a consequence, it seems, her students gain a deeper appreciation for the subjects they are studying and a more complete engagement with their biochemistry course work during the semester.

She has provided leadership for the development of the biochemistry major at DePauw which has attracted new science majors whose numbers have grown rapidly since the major was approved by the Faculty 18 months ago. Jackie has also been a leader in national efforts, with substantial funding from the National Science Foundation, to develop new ways to teach biochemistry, particularly through the use of molecular models (both virtual and real). In her research work she has also steadily engaged students in collaborative research projects.

For her teaching which has inspired both students and colleagues, Jackie was selected as this year's "Exemplary Teacher."

Congratulations, Jackie!

#### **7. Remarks from the President (B. Bottoms)**

Asking Martha Rainbolt and Karin Ahlm to help form a committee to clarify handbook. Board of Trustees meeting dealt with Nature Park. Funding for park development coming from Board members. Initial development will begin with 9 miles of trails.

Board of Trustees also addressed issues of alcohol concerns and building a responsible community on campus.

President Bottoms also thanked all those who worked on the Julian Rededication.

#### **8. Old Business**

Endorsement of election results. (M. Rainbolt)

1. Brian Howard, at-large representative, Public Occasions Committee, 3 year term
2. Caroline Jetton, division one representative, Committee on Administration, spring 04 replacement for Sheryl Tremblay
3. Dave Berque, at-large representative, Management of Academic Operations, spring 04 replacement for Mike Sinowitz
4. Yvonne Williams, division four representative, Library Advisory Committee, spring 04 replacement for Dan Merrell

Marthe Chandler moved to accept the election results, Bob Stark seconded. Motion passed.

#### **9. New Business**

Clarification of Advising for Education Students (J. Stockton)

Presented by Linda Elman: Elementary and secondary advising worksheets have been revised in alignment of state requirements. Copies of these worksheets are available for all.

Bryan Hanson: Proposed the following motion: The chair of the faculty is hereby asked to make available to the faculty the transcript of the recent court case of Janice Price.

Pam Popsom: Seconded the motion.

Neal Abraham: Transcription and appeals may take months.

Call for quorum was not met, so motion could not be voted on

**10. Announcements**

Marcia McKelligan made an appeal for the United Way Campaign.  
Pam Propsom reminded the faculty to vote in the upcoming election.

**11. Adjournment**

Adjourned at c 5.25 pm.

## Meeting of December 1, 2003

1. **Call to Order** - 4:05 p.m., Union Building Ballroom

### 2. Verification of Quorum

**Change of Agenda** (to assure quorum for vote)

Item 9a on Agenda. Bob Stark moved to authorize the Board of Trustees to confer degrees on candidates eligible for graduation at the conclusion of the Fall 2003 semester. Marthe Chandler seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

### 3. Approval of Previous Minutes

Approved.

### 4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

**Committee on Academic Policy and Planning** (H. Pollack-Milgate)

A. Motion (to be tabled)

Howard Pollack-Milgate made a motion to be tabled to approve a new theatre major within the Department of Communications. Based upon conversations with Communications faculty. CAPP further recommends that staffing for any extra course offerings necessary to support the major be accomplished through redistribution of current resources.

#### **Required course of study for a major in Theatre**

**Total courses required: Nine courses**

Core courses: (4 course credits total, plus 4 semesters of University Theatre)

COMM 104 Introduction to Communication Arts and Sciences

(or COMM 100 Foundations of Communication)

COMM 111 \* Acting I (name changed from Beginning Acting)

COMM 117 Theater Production and Design 1 (name changed from Theatre Production)

COMM 314 History of Theatrical Theory and Criticism

COMM 001 Self Expression: DePauw Theatre (0 credit)

For each semester that the student is a major in Theatre, minimum of four semesters

Other required courses: (5 course credits total)

Two Communication Studies and Media Studies Courses

Students majoring in theatre must take courses in each of the other two areas of the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, one each from the following lists:

Communication Studies

COMM 223, COMM 224, or COMM 227 Media Studies

COMM 233 or COMM 237

One of the following two theatre courses:

COMM 213. History of Theatre 1: Pre-History to Early Eighteenth Century. (name changed from History of the Theatre I: Ancient Greece to 1642)

COMM 214. History of Theatre 2: Early Eighteenth Century to Present. (name changed from History of the Theatre II: 1642 to Present)

One additional 300-level course:

COMM 311 Acting 2

COMM 312 Performance Studies 2

COMM 316 Stage Directing

COMM 317 Theater Production and Design 2. (name changed from Advanced Theatre Production & Design)  
COMM 319 Writing for Stage, Screen, and TV

Senior Seminar requirement: Majors in Theatre must complete the senior seminar requirement by taking COMM 450, Senior Seminar. Seniors majoring in theatre will be required to complete a theatre related project as part of their senior seminar. With the approval of the seminar faculty instructor, this requirement can be fulfilled in any senior seminar in the department. Coursework completed in meeting the senior requirement can be applied toward meeting the 300-400 level course requirement.

Motion tabled

B. CAPP has endorsed two recommendations made by the "Department of Geology and Geography."

a. Motion (to be voted on)

Change the name of the above mentioned academic unit to the "Department of Geosciences"

Motion passed

b. Motion (to be tabled)

Eliminate the geography major from the Department.

Motion tabled

C. Brief remarks about Other Matters concerning General Education. Announcement of Lunch on Dec. 9 in Union Bldg.

D. Announcements by Julia Bruggemann on behalf of the FYS Subcommittee

FYS is still finalizing rosters for FYS Fall 04. Staffing issues with various departments are being worked out by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Neal Abraham.

FYS subcommittee is also working on dates and themes for Spring 04 FYS workshops to be announced later.

***Committee on Faculty*** (K. Ahlm)

Karin Ahlm announced that COF is continuing deliberation on tenure cases until the end of semester. Term and interim reviews will start over winter term.

COF is still working on rewording a motion sent back to the committee at the previous meeting and will be submit a new motion in February.

***Committee on Management of Academic Operations*** (E. Wielenberg)

Erik Wielenberg presented the following motions:

**A. Motion (to be voted on)**

**Approval of new courses:**

ANTH 256 Anthropology of Law

ANTH 356 Gender and Global Change

ANTH 277 Cultures of India

ANTH 280 Ethnographic Methods

PSY 358 Evolutionary Psychology

SOC 343 Frontiers and Borders

COMM 211 Voice and Movement

COMM 237 Film & Culture

ARTH 216 Art of India

ARTH 225 Modern Art and Modernity

ARTH 326 Abstract vs. Figurative Painting

ARTH 342 Art Theory and Criticism

UNIV 170 Environmental Science Seminar (.5 credit)  
ECON 440 Applied Game Theory  
Motion passed

**B. Motion (to be voted on):**

Change in credit:

That COMM 101 Introduction to Speech (.5 credit) become COMM 123 Public Speaking (1 credit)  
Kevin Kinney asked if this is a new course (new title, number, and credit) or a change of a course?

Erik Wielenberg: The content is essentially the same, only expanded.

Cynthia Cornell asked if the education department had any concerns because COMM 101 was required for English certification for education majors.

Jamie Stockton answered that it was not a concern, because other courses would meet the requirement.

Jim Benedix noted that the course would be taken by a lot of students as it is an introductory class, which will require a lot of resources. In the context of the proposed Theatre Major, he inquired if this would be a problem.

Sheryl Tremblay responded that the goal of all these changes was not to increase staffing and that the theatre major is a separate issue. There are staffing issues that will be worked out with VPAA Abraham, but the department's proposal is really one of pedagogy--enough time to combine theory and practice in the course.

Motion passed.

**C. Motion (to be removed from the table):**

That MUS 384 Jazz Theory count for group 3 credit and MUS 386 Jazz Improvisation count for group 6 credit.

Removed from table and passed.

**D. Motion (to be tabled):**

That the following courses count for group credit:

ANTH 256 Anthropology of Law, group 2

ANTH 356 Gender and Global Change, group 2

ANTH 277 Cultures of India, group 2

PSY 358 Evolutionary Psychology, group 1

SOC 343 Frontiers and Borders, group 2

COMM 211 Voice and Movement, group 6

ARTH 216 Art of India, group 6 (change to group 3)

ARTH 225 Modern Art and Modernity, group 3

ARTH 326 Abstract vs. Figurative Painting, group 3

ARTH 342 Art Theory and Criticism, group 3

ENG 301 Creative Writing II: Fiction Workshop, group 6

ENG 302 Creative Writing II: Fiction Topics, group 6

ENG 343 Creative Writing II: Dramatic Writing Topics, group 6

Motion tabled

**E. Motion (to be voted on):**

That a new timebank system be put in place. (See Appendix.)

Erik Wielenberg read the following statement regarding the Timebank proposal:

**HISTORY OF THE PROCESS**

MAO has been at this for about two years or so. We have invited feedback from all faculty; members of MAO have met individually with most department chairs. We have gone through a

number of possible timebank systems. This is a very difficult issue; obviously there are many competing interests. The committee has worked hard to balance these interests, but obviously we are unable to give everyone everything they want.

#### PROBLEMS WITH CURRENT SYSTEM

The current system has a number of drawbacks that we believe would be alleviated under the proposed system. Under the current system, some classes begin and end at different times on different days; this is not the case in the proposed system. Under the current system, sometimes there are only 5 minutes between classes; under the proposed system, there are at least 10 minutes between all classes. Students often have trouble getting access to classes because of time conflicts; we believe the proposed system will reduce such conflicts. The new system has a greater number of banks with less conflict between them. For instance, students can now take an afternoon 50 minute course AND an afternoon 2-hour course or lab; this is impossible under the current system.

#### ISSUES FROM LAST MEETING

One of the most difficult issues we face is the time of the 3-hour Thursday afternoon lab. After vigorous debate, MAO decided that the best solution is to have this lab run from 1-3:50. This sacrifices the so-called "convo hour" on Thursday. However, we note that under the proposed system most students and faculty would not have class from 1-2 pm on Thursday afternoon.

A second issue is the possibility of 2-hour MW banks. MAO feels that the introduction of a 2-3:50 MW bank would seriously clog up Monday and Wednesday afternoons, introducing precisely the sort of conflict that we are trying to avoid. As a compromise, we have added an 8-9:50 MW bank. Because this bank is at a less attractive time, it would probably be less popular, but it still provides an option for those who want to teach 2-hour MW courses.

#### GET IT TO A VOTE

MAO has worked on this issue long and hard, and we hope to bring the proposed system to a yes-or-no vote.

Bob Stark asked: What problems does this system NOT address? He noted concerns about students being able to enroll in lab courses. Labs MWF knock out 8 timebanks and students may not enroll in them. TR Labs runs into issue of Language classes. Erik Wielenberg replied that the revisions try to reduce these issues.

President Bottoms asked how does the committee see convocations?

Erik Wielenberg replied that there are no classes 11:50-1:00 R as well as 1-2 T. There is no long time in which there is no timebank.

Bottoms replied that there may be a conflict scheduling outside speakers and asked faculty members to be flexible when there are major convocations.

Jamie Stockton voiced concerns about the number of timebanks emphasizing shorter class times, rather than longer contact times.

Bryan Hanson: Given that there are few 8:00 classes currently, will we get anyone at 7:50?

Erik Wielenberg replied that faculty members are probably only slightly less motivated to teach at 7:50 than at 8:00.

Bryan Hanson asked the Registrar to clarify the rule that a certain percentage of classes must be offered at 8:00 AM.

Ellie Ypma: The rule was dropped at the last timebank change in favor of a rule that no more than 12% of classes may be offered in any one timebank. This is being enforced.

Jim Benedix suggests that MAO consider how to get departments to use all the timebanks (some departments are not using unpopular timebanks).

Dave Berque asked if there was any discussion with information services about early classes. If the computer system goes down overnight, high tech classes that meet early in the morning would need to be assured that the computer systems are all working.

Erik Wielenberg: Adjustments will need to be made in consultation with appropriate people.

Jamie Stockton asked if it was possible to add a timebank of 10:10 to 12:00 MWF?

Erik Wielenberg replied that it may introduce conflicts with other popular timebanks.

Jamie Stockton: Too many smaller timebank are pedagogically inefficient. Moved to amend the timebank proposal by the addition of MWF 10:10-12:00

Bob Stark seconded the motion.

Martha Chandler responded that the proposal will cut out a large chunk of MWF classes and cause major chaos. The amendment affects 6 other timebanks.

Jeff Hollander spoke against the idea that we are moving away from longer timebanks. There is not a change in philosophy.

Ellie Ypma opposed the motion. 10:30 is the most popular timebank and this motion will cause conflicts with that time. The amendment is the worst two-hour period to propose a new timebank.

Amendment is defeated.

Bridget Gourley: New timebank does seem to favor smaller banks as there are more options for those times. Agrees with Jim Benedix that we might use current system better.

Marcia McKelligan: If the 12% rule is enforced, is there no more than 12% of classes being taught at any time?

Ellie Ypma: 12% rule is by department, so the overall percentage is higher for some times.

Bob Kingsley: Calls the question.

Dana Dudle asked for a clarification before the vote: Is it a problem that one of the 60 mins. timebanks overlaps two of the 50 min timebanks.

Erik Wielenberg: These overlaps occur in later afternoon classes which have smaller enrollment, so should not be a problem.

By paper ballot the motion passed 67 to 35 and will take affect Fall 04.

F. Announcements:

(1) Changes in title and/or number:

COMM 104 Intro to Comm Arts & Sciences becomes COMM 100 Foundations of Communication

COMM 111 Beginning Acting becomes COMM 111 Acting I

COMM 117 Theatre Production becomes COMM 117 Theatre Production & Design I

COMM 225 Interpersonal Communication becomes COMM 125 Interpersonal Communication

COMM 201 Oral Interpretation of Literature becomes COMM 212 Performance Studies I

COMM 213 History of Theatre I: Ancient Greece to 1642 becomes COMM 213 History of Theatre I: Pre-History To Early Eighteenth Century

COMM 214 History of Theatre II: 1642 To Present becomes COMM 214 History of Theatre II, Early Eighteenth Century To Present

COMM 124 Group Dynamics and Discussion becomes COMM 224 Small Group Communications

COMM 233 Mass Communication in Modern Society becomes COMM 233 Media, Culture, &

## Society

COMM 235 Broadcast Journalism becomes COM 235 Electronic Journalism  
COMM 312 Advanced Acting becomes COMM 311 Acting II  
COMM 317 Advanced Theatre Production becomes COMM 317 Theatre Production & Design II  
COMM 321 Studies in American Public Address becomes COMM 323 History of Public Discourse  
COMM 332 Telecommunications Management becomes COMM 332 Electronic Media Management  
COMM 335 Mass Communication Law becomes COMM 335 Media Law  
COMM 301 Advanced Oral Interpretation becomes COMM 310 Performance Studies II, group 6  
COMM 401 Communicating Race and Culture becomes COMM 327 Communication and Cultural Identity  
GEOG 460 Advanced Topics in Geography becomes GEOG 395 Topics in Geography  
ARTH 142 Visual Encounters: Critical Approaches to Representation becomes ARTH 142 Issues in Art

### (2) Discontinued courses:

MUS 920 Arranged Class Piano  
COMM 243 Voice Science and Phonetics  
COMM 344 Communicative Disorders  
ARTH 295 Art, Experience, & Criticism  
ARTH 321 Crusade & Cloister: Romanesque Art  
ASIA 106 Introduction to Chinese Culture

### (3) Topics courses approved for one-time group credit for the spring:

COMM 291B Digital Filmmaking, group 6  
COMM 291C Acting for Camera, group 6

### (4) Addition to the communications major:

"Majors must also complete a research requirement prior to enrolling in Senior Seminar. This requirement may be met by successful completion of one of the following courses:

COMM 314: Theatrical History & Criticism  
COMM 322: Rhetorical Theory & Criticism  
COMM 334: Media Criticism  
COMM 350: Research Methods"

(5) Change in Asian Studies minor. ANTH 277 Cultures of India is to be added to the list of "Other Courses" required for a minor in Asian Studies.

(6) At the request of the School of Music, extend the W deadline for music majors to the end of the junior year. This change is effective immediately.

## 5. Reports from Other Committees

### ***Faculty Development Committee***

Tom Hall reported that FDC had nothing to report

### ***Committee on Administration***

Marcia McKelligan thanked everyone who filled out questionnaire on health insurance. There were 186 responses to a questionnaire sent to the @Faculty distribution list. Among the trends: suspicion and confusion about what happens in negotiation. Paul Schmidt will meet with the faculty in the spring to help clarify situation in open meetings.

Also a clear trend to more comprehensive coverage paid for by combination of co-pay and premiums.

Health care will continue to be an issue for COA.

### ***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee***

Scott Thede announced that SLAAC was still working on discrepancies in academic integrity hearing policy and grade grievance. Also working on copyright issues.

Kevin Kinney asked if SLAAC was going to study student concerns regarding the printing quota. Scott Thede: Student Congress had open meetings but little attendance. Students appear to be grumpy but not up in arms about the issue.

### ***Diversity and Equity***

Holling Smith-Borne announced that DEC was continuing to hold briefings for search committees. Also continued to work on their Web page.

DEC will be meeting with Mayor of Greencastle on community issues.

DEC is creating a contact sheet for people interviewing at DePauw of people and resource related to diversity and equity issues which may be of concern for applicants to University positions.

DEC is also working on revisions to the affirmative action statement.

### **6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Neal Abraham began with comments to concerns raised earlier in the meeting.

On the printing quota: Library reports less waste at printers--good consequence of print metering policy

On the use of @ Faculty: That list goes to administrators and secretaries as well as faculty. If you only want to send to only faculty go to E-services faculty governance and use those distribution lists.

Analysis of faculty salaries will be distributed in the first meeting of the spring semester.

Compensation is substantially higher at DPU than peer institution (particularly health care) so room to maneuver is not great as health care costs increase.

### **7. Remarks from the President**

A committee has convened to clarify the faculty handbook in light of the recent law suit involving Janis Price.

Board of Trustees meets in January. Two main topics include budget issues and the development of the DePauw nature park. Wade Hazel will represent the faculty on the nature park.

Honorary Degree candidates will also be discussed at Trustees' meeting. Recommendations for candidates for honorary degrees should be sent to President in the next few days.

### **8. Old Business**

No old business was presented.

### **9. New Business**

A. Motion to confer December degrees was moved to earlier in the meeting to assure a quorum at the time of the vote.

B. Martha Rainbolt recommended that the faculty endorse the following election results:

Mac Dixon-Fyle, Division Four Representative, Academic Standing and Petitions, spring 04 replacement

Mary English, Division Four Representative, Committee on Academic Policy and Planning, spring 04 replacement

Bridget Gourley so moved, Art Evans seconded the motion. Passed.

C. Martha Rainbolt announced a need for new clerk of the faculty for next semester.

Bryan Hanson made the following motion: That the Chair of the Faculty is hereby directed to make available to the faculty, preferably in electronic format the transcript of the Price v. DePauw case.

Seconded by Bob Stark.

Marthe Chandler: Should Martha Rainbolt go down to the courthouse and type it in?

Bryan Hanson: The Chair should make a "reasonable" accommodation to make the material available.

Motion did not pass.

### **10. Announcements**

Linda Ellman invited faculty to a performance of a Lorca play done in Spanish 1:00 Sunday Dec. 7 in Moore theatre.

John Schlotterbeck invited faculty to a presentation on memorializing violence. 4:15 Thursday in the Watson forum.

### **11. Adjournment 5:15**

Appendix -- Current Timebank System and Proposed Timebank System

Current Timebank System

65 x 3 -195 min

50x3-150 min

50x4-200 min

90-110x2/ 180-220 mins

8-9:05 MWF

8-8:50 MWF

8-8:50 MTWF\*

8-9:50 TR

9:15-10:20MWF

9:15-10:05 MWF

9:15-10:05 MWF, 9T\*

10-11:40 R, 10-11:50 R

10:30-11:35 MWF

10:30-11:20 MWF

10:30-11:20 MTWF

12:45-2:35 WF

1:30-2:35 MWF

11:45-12:35 MWF

11:45-12:35 MTWF

2-3:50 TR

2:45-3:50 MWF

1:45-2:35 MWF

1:45-2:35 MTWF

2:45-3:35 MWF  
2:45-3:35 MWRF\*  
7-8:50 TR

\* = these can be 5 hour banks for the school of music

Class & Lab

170 mins x 1  
Labs Only

Studio Art &

Comm Only

9-11:50 T  
10-11:50 R  
9-11:50 TR

9-11:50 R

1-3:50 M  
1-3:50 T  
1-3:50 MW

1-3:50 W

1-3:50 TF

1-3:50 F

7-9:50 T

7-9:50 TR

7-9:50 R

### **Proposed Timebank System**

60x3-180 mins  
50x3-150 mins  
50x4-200 mins  
110x2-220 min

7:50-8:50 MWF  
8-8:50 MWF  
8-8:50 MWRF\*  
8-9:50 TR

9-10 MWF  
9-9:50 MWF

9-9:50 MWRF\*  
8-9:50 MW

10:10-11:10 MWF  
10:10-11:00 MWF  
10:10-11:00 MWRF\*  
10-11:50 TR

11:20 - 12:20 MWF  
11:20-12:10 MWF  
11:20-12:10 MTWF

1-1:50 MWF  
1-1:50 MTWF  
2-3:50 TR

12:50-1:50 MWF  
2-2:50 MWF  
2-2:50 MTWF\*

2:15-3:15 MWF  
3-3:50 MWF  
3-3:50 MTWF\*  
7-8:50 TR

\* = these can be 5 hour banks for the school of music.

75x2-150 mins

Class & Lab

170 mins x 1  
Labs only  
Studio Art & Comm Only

8-9:15 TR  
9-11:50 T

8-10:50 MW

8-9:15 MW  
9-11:50 R

9-11:50 TR

10-11:15 TR  
1-3:50 M

1-3:50 W  
1-3:50 T  
1-3:50 MW

2-3:15 TR  
1-3:50 F  
1-3:50 R  
1-3:50 TR

7-8:15 TR  
7-9:50 T  
2-3:50 M  
7-9:50 MW

7-9:50 R  
2-3:50 W  
7-9:50 TR

## Meeting of February 2, 2004

**1. Call to Order** - 4:05 p.m., Union Building Ballroom

**2. Verification of Quorum** -- number required for this semester 82, announced by the VPAA, Neal Abraham; 92 voting members present at 4:05 p.m.

**3. Approval of Previous Minutes**

Approved.

**4. Reports from Coordinating Committees**

***Committee on Academic Policy and Planning*** (H. Pollack-Milgate)

**A. Motion (to be removed from the table)**

To approve a new theatre major within the Department of Communications. Based upon conversations with Communications faculty; CAPP further recommends that staffing for any extra course offerings necessary to support the major be accomplished through redistribution of current resources.

Removed from table.

Wayne Glausser and Debby Geis asked about courses in other departments, such as English and Modern Languages, that would be appropriate for the theatre major.

Tim Good said that the Communications department will consider friendly amendments for substituting courses from other departments. The core of theatre courses will be in Communications but other courses can be incorporated at the 300 level.

Debby Geis proposed a friendly amendment that the wording be changed from "One additional 300-level course" to "One additional 300-level course in theatre or a related department with the permission of the major advisor."

The motion as amended passed. The theatre major as amended is approved.

### **Required course of study for a major in Theatre**

#### **Total courses required: Nine courses**

Core courses: (4 course credits total, plus 4 semesters of University Theatre)

COMM 104 Introduction to Communication Arts and Sciences

(or COMM 100 Foundations of Communication)

COMM 111 \* Acting I (name changed from Beginning Acting)

COMM 117 Theater Production and Design 1 (name changed from Theatre Production)

COMM 314 History of Theatrical Theory and Criticism

COMM 001 Self Expression: DePauw Theatre (0 credit)

For each semester that the student is a major in Theatre, minimum of four semesters

Other required courses: (5 course credits total)

Two Communication Studies and Media Studies Courses

Students majoring in theatre must take courses in each of the other two areas of the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, one each from the following lists:

Communication Studies

COMM 223, COMM 224, or COMM 227 Media Studies

COMM 233 or COMM 237

One of the following two theatre courses:

COMM 213. History of Theatre 1: Pre-History to Early Eighteenth Century. (name changed from

History of the Theatre I: Ancient Greece to 1642)  
COMM 214. History of Theatre 2: Early Eighteenth Century to Present. (name changed from History of the Theatre II: 1642 to Present)

One additional 300-level course:

COMM 311 Acting 2

COMM 312 Performance Studies 2

COMM 316 Stage Directing

COMM 317 Theater Production and Design 2. (name changed from Advanced Theatre Production & Design)

COMM 319 Writing for Stage, Screen, and TV

Senior Seminar requirement: Majors in Theatre must complete the senior seminar requirement by taking COMM 450, Senior Seminar. Seniors majoring in theatre will be required to complete a theatre related project as part of their senior seminar. With the approval of the seminar faculty instructor, this requirement can be fulfilled in any senior seminar in the department. Course work completed in meeting the senior requirement can be applied toward meeting the 300-400 level course requirement

### **B. Motion (to be removed from the table)**

To eliminate the geography major from the Department of Geology and Geography.

Removed from table. There was no discussion. The motion passed with dissenting votes.

### **C. General Education straw poll.**

Howard Pollack-Milgate passed out a straw poll. Which model should we follow? A general model or a specific model? He asked for votes now with the results to be announced at the end of today's meeting.

Dana Dudle asked which model do we currently have? Howard Pollack-Milgate replied that we currently have a specific model with specific content requirements, such that all courses should meet the requirements.

Marthe Chandler spoke in favor of the general model but asked about the implications for foreign language. Howard Pollack-Milgate replied that the foreign language requirement would be treated separately in the general model, as stated in the summary of the straw poll, "in such schemes, language and physical education requirements are often treated separately, outside the distribution system."

#### Gen Ed Straw Poll

In our discussions of general education, there seem to be two prominent schools of thought about distribution or breadth requirements. One school argues for requiring several courses in each of three or four very general distribution areas. The most common arrangement that we've found for this type of program defines three areas - sciences, social sciences, and humanities - and asks students to take two to three courses in each. In such schemes, language and physical education requirements are often treated separately, outside the distribution system.

The other school argues for more specific requirements, either within a distribution system or simply in a list of specific requirements. For instance, in a distribution system, the humanities area might specify that one course be a literature course, another must deal with a historical period before 1800, and so forth. In a specified requirement system, there would just be one requirement for a literature course; another for a course that deals with a historical period before 1800. Thus, this second school of thought encompasses many variations, ranging from the sort of program we

have now, with the six distribution groups and several criteria within each, to highly specific programs with a one-to-one match of criterion to requirement.

In this straw poll, we are asking which of these broad schools of thought you would put yourself in, if forced to choose. We recognize that some of you would prefer that there be no distribution or breadth requirements at all or that the goal of ensuring that students are broadly educated be met through a system of core courses that every student takes. But that's not the question we're asking here. For this straw poll, we want to know that if you had to choose between two types of distribution systems - one that only specifies general areas in which students must take courses, the other that has more specific requirements for what courses students should take - which do you prefer.

Results of the straw poll (announced by Howard Pollack-Milgate at the end of the meeting):

62 in favor of a "General Area System"  
33 in favor of a "Specified Requirement System"  
1 improperly marked ballot

#### **D. A few remarks about CAPP's spring agenda**

The spring agenda includes general education, minors, and departmental reports (to be considered by the Resource Allocation Subcommittee).

#### **E. Report from First Year Seminar Committee (Julia Bruggemann)**

Julia Bruggemann announced workshop dates that are coming up for first-year seminars:  
February 17 - workshop for new first year seminar faculty members  
March 17 - workshop on student research in first year seminars

Marnie McInnes will distribute a survey form for last fall's first year seminars soon.

#### ***Committee on Faculty* (K. Ahlm)**

##### **A. Report on COF Hearing Procedures**

Karin Ahlm announced that procedures for faculty sanctions are being added to the handbook. Send any questions or comments about the changes to Karin.

##### **COF Hearing Procedures for Faculty Sanctions (written by Committee on Faculty; reported to faculty and included in the by-laws for informational purposes)**

If personnel problems are brought for its review, the Committee on Faculty will follow these procedures. In order to make a recommendation to the President concerning a faculty member, COF shall conduct a hearing to ascertain the facts relevant to the case, consider the circumstances both mitigating and aggravating, hear from all witnesses who have direct testimony to offer, test the evidence, and make a finding of fact. Further, based on the evidence obtained, COF is to deliberate and recommend either dismissal or continuation of the appointment. The hearings will follow the rules of confidentiality that govern all COF personnel deliberations.

Prior to its evidentiary sessions COF is to receive a statement of the charges from the chief administrator working on the case as well as any other related documents. The chief administrator can be the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) or another appropriate Vice-President. COF is to receive a complete report of the investigations undertaken by the chief administrator and/or other officials of the University, such as the Campus Police, Chair of the Department, etc. COF is to receive lists of witnesses and relevant evidence from both the chief administrator and faculty member. The faculty member may provide a written response to the

materials provided by the chief administrator. COF will notify the chief administrator and the faculty member involved of the witnesses and evidence at least two days prior to the commencement of each evidentiary session. The witnesses are restricted only to those who may offer material evidence. Character witnesses are excluded from testifying.

The faculty member and chief administrator will be given at least four days notice before COF convenes its hearing. COF will consider legitimate reasons for delay, but only serious reasons, such as health difficulties should result in a delay.

The hearing is to be conducted by the Chair of COF. For its evidentiary sessions an official tape recording is to be made by the Secretary of COF. This tape will be retained until the case is resolved. It shall be made available to the Appeals Board if it is convened. Once the case is resolved the tape will be destroyed.

The following persons may attend the evidentiary sessions. The faculty members of COF; the faculty member who has been charged; an advisor to him or her, who may be anyone from the University community; the chief administrator; the Vice President of Academic Affairs (if not the chief administrator in the case); and the Secretary of COF. Witnesses are to wait in separate areas until they are called in for their testimony. Each witness may be accompanied by an advisor selected from the University community. Once a witness has given her/his testimony he/she will be excused from the proceedings.

Both the chief administrator and the faculty member may call witnesses, COF may question both parties on any points relevant to the case. COF will determine the order of witnesses called. Witnesses may be questioned by the individual calling them and by COF members. The VPAA, if s/he is not the chief administrator, will be given the opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses. In situations in which a witness is not comfortable providing evidence in front of the faculty member, the evidence will be given without the faculty member present. However, the advisor will be present to hear the witness and the faculty member will hear the tape or a transmission of that portion of the proceedings. Such safeguards are particularly important in cases in which a student is a key witness and/or sensitive issues (e.g. sexual harassment, racism) are involved. Witness concerns should be communicated to the Chair of COF.

If COF believes it is necessary to call additional witnesses, recall witnesses, or seek additional evidence as a result of its investigations, it may do so. COF may adjourn the evidentiary session at any time but shall reconvene at its earliest convenience.

Following COF's usual procedures, the deliberations will take place in two phases. The initial deliberative session of the hearing will include the members of COF and the VPAA. After discussion of the evidence a straw vote will indicate COF's initial position. The VPAA will express her/his agreement or disagreement with COF's recommendations and explain his or her rationale. This is to ensure that both COF and the chief academic officer are aware of the issues considered by both sides and that communication of all issues and concerns has been clear and complete. Final deliberations will involve only the COF faculty members. COF will deliberate on the evidence and decide (a) on a finding of fact that either supports or denies the culpability of the faculty member and (b) on a recommendation to the President. The recommendation may either call for dismissal, or an alternative sanction, or a continuation of the appointment without further prejudice. The recommendation shall include the finding of fact in the written report. Copies of the complete recommendation will be sent to the faculty member and the VPAA. The VPAA will inform COF of her/his final recommendation to the President.

The President may seek further clarification from COF on its recommendation. The Chair of COF will be responsible for communicating with the President. As with other personnel decisions, if the President decides against COF's recommendation, he or she shall communicate to COF explaining her or his rationale.

If the decision by the President is for dismissal or other major sanctions, the faculty member will have four days to call for a review of the COF decision. The review process will follow the procedures stated in the Academic Handbook but will include, when appropriate, further consideration of the case in light of the communications from the VPAA and the President.

## **B. Announcements**

COF continued with reviews of files over winter term. Eleven cases were reviewed. Seven cases were completed. Four cases are still in review.

The following faculty members will be considered for review during the spring semester 2004:

Interim  
Thomas Dickinson

Term  
Dee Seketa

Tenure review  
Lenny Foy

If you have information you would like to share about your experience with any of these candidates, please write to the Committee on Faculty, c/o Brenda Reed, Academic Affairs, 305 Harrison Hall. Materials must be received no later than Wednesday, February 25, 2004, in order to receive the fullest consideration. Files will be closed by March 1. Because of the University's open file policy, all submissions will be made available to the candidate and, therefore, must acknowledge the policy.

### ***Committee on Management of Academic Operations*** (E. Wielenberg)

#### **A. Motion (to be removed from the table):**

That the following courses count for group credit:

ANTH 256 Anthropology of Law, group 2  
ANTH 356 Gender and Global Change, group 2  
ANTH 277 Cultures of India, group 2  
PSY 358 Evolutionary Psychology, group 1  
SOC 343 Frontiers and Borders, group 2  
COMM 211 Voice and Movement, group 6  
ARTH 216 Art of India, group 6 (change to group 3)  
ARTH 225 Modern Art and Modernity, group 3  
ARTH 326 Abstract vs. Figurative Painting, group 3  
ARTH 342 Art Theory and Criticism, group 3  
ENG 301 Creative Writing II: Fiction Workshop, group 6  
ENG 302 Creative Writing II: Fiction Topics, group 6  
ENG 343 Creative Writing II: Dramatic Writing Topics, group 6

Removed from table.

There was a question about ENG 302 Fiction Topics. Is this a topics course? Is this a one-time or permanent change for group credit? The answer is, no this isn't a "topics" course in the same way that other courses are "topics courses."

The motion passed.

#### **B. Motion (to be voted on):**

That item 3 of the "Academic Expectations for DePauw Students" section of the Student Handbook (p. 70 in the 2003-2004 edition) be revised.

Current version:

"3. Students should expect to spend at least two hours studying outside of class for every hour in class. This means they should plan to spend between 40 and 50 hours a week (or more) on their academic work, the equivalent of a full-time job."

Proposed revision:

"3. Students should expect a workload of approximately twelve hours per week (in and out of class) per full credit course. This means they should plan to spend between 40 and 50 hours a week (or more) on their academic work, the equivalent of a full-time job."

Neal Abraham said this statement is meant to clarify the difference between high school and college.

Jeane Jerz proposed an amendment, to change "approximately" to "at least."

Bridget Gourley seconded the amendment.

Jim Benedix asked if anyone had done a survey to find out if students put in these hours.

Eric Wielenberg spoke in favor of keeping the word "approximately."

Bridget Gourley stated that there is a bias associated with science courses. There are often comments on evaluations that lab courses are too much work. Twelve hours outside class is not enough time for lab courses.

Pedar Foss asked if the wording could be changed to 40-50 hours per week, not 12 hours per class.

Marcia McKelligan proposed an amendment to Jeane Jerz's amendment, that the wording be changed to "minimum workload of approximately 12 hours per week."

Jeane Jerz accepted Marcia McKelligan's proposal as a friendly amendment.

Eric Isenberg spoke against the amendment.

The amendment, to add the word "minimum" was voted on. The amendment was defeated.

Howard Pollack-Milgate spoke in favor of guidelines.

Pedar Foss proposed a substitute amendment: "Students should plan to spend between 40 and 50 hours a week (or more) on their academic work, the equivalent of a full-time job."

Pedar Foss's motion was seconded.

Dave Berque stated the range of students is vast. He proposed an amendment to add the word "most" so that the phrase would read "most students should plan to spend..."

Dave Berque's motion was seconded.

Eric Wielenberg spoke against the amendment.

Dave Berque's amendment was defeated.

The question was called.

The substitute amendment proposed by Pedar Foss was voted on. The amendment passed with 47 yes votes, 35 no votes, and 3 abstentions.

The wording in the handbook is now "Students should plan to spend between 40 and 50 hours a week (or more) on their academic work, the equivalent of a full-time job."

**C. Motion (to be voted on):**

That the following courses additions/deletions be implemented:

New course:

COMM 327 Communication & Cultural Identity

Melanie Finney stated that this is a change in title for the course, not a new course.

Discontinued courses:

MUS 920 Arranged Class Piano

COMM 243 Voice Science and Phonetics

COMM 344 Communicative Disorders

ARTH 295 Art, Experience, & Criticism

ARTH 321 Crusade & Cloister: Romanesque Art

ASIA 106 Introduction to Chinese Culture

Motion passed.

**D. Motion (to be tabled):**

That COMM 327 Communication & Cultural Identity count for group 2 credit.

Motion tabled

**E. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(1) Change in number: Geog 351 Map Interpretation is now Geog 315

(2) MAO has approved academic calendars for the following years: 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008

(3) A new Environmental Geoscience major has been approved.

At this point Erik Wielenberg announced that the new major was not simply an announcement, but required faculty vote. Registrar Ypma clarified that CAPP decided in 2001 that new majors, or significant changes in majors or minors, required faculty approval, not simply an announcement.

Scott Wilkerson said that this is not a new major. The Environmental Geoscience major was already approved by faculty and a few minor changes are being made. There is now a core set of courses and other courses are more specific. The calculus requirement was removed. MAO and CAPP are in favor of the changes. Dave Berque spoke in favor of the changes. Martha Rainbolt said the vote should be delayed until next month so that we can have something in writing to review before voting.

Scott Wilkerson returned later during the meeting with a handout detailing the specifics of the Environmental Geoscience major. *See Appendix*. There is a core set of courses and a set of electives that can be chosen via a menu system.

Kevin Kinney asked about why BIO 342 can substitute for BIO 120 and 140. Scott Wilkerson replied that BIO 342 is the best choice for Environmental Geoscience majors but not enough seats are available given that Biology majors usually fill this class, so students may take 120/140 instead.

Bob Stark asked if BIO 120 and 140 is a prerequisite for BIO 342. Scott Wilkerson replied no.

Dana Dudle asked about the number of credits required for the Environmental Geoscience major. Scott Wilkerson replied that the maximum is at or below 14, depending on whether students choose area 1, 2, or 3.

Motion passed.

(4) The following changes are being made to the Math major: (i) The number of courses required for a Math major has been raised from nine to ten, and (ii) Math 251, Multivariable Calculus, has been added to the list of core courses.

Ellen Maycock said that a change in the Math major is from a two-semester calculus sequence back to a one-semester calculus requirement.

Motion passed.

#### **F. Report from Advising Subcommittee on Academic Advising Survey (K. Hall)**

Kelley Hall announced that an advising survey would be conducted soon. The survey will be sent to the entire student population at DePauw University. The results of the survey will be used to assess the effectiveness of academic advising at DePauw and to make adjustments and improvements to advising-related programs. Results of the surveys will be available to advisors for their specific advisees. Any questions or comments should be sent to Kelley Hall.

#### ***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee* (A. Dziubinskyj)**

##### Announcements

The copyright policy is being reviewed in consultation with Dennis Trinkle and Rick Provine.

Marnie McInnes reported on Academic Integrity for fall 2003 and winter term 2004. There were 22 reported cases of academic dishonesty during fall semester 2003 and winter term 2004: 5 first-year, 7 sophomores, 5 juniors, and 5 seniors. Two of these were second offenses and therefore led to hearings before the University Review Committee. The most common form of dishonesty was plagiarism from websites for the whole or parts of an essay. Students also borrowed papers from friends, lightly rewrote them, and handed them in as their own work. Several students were charged with passing or receiving information during an exam. One student signed an advisor's and professor's signature to official forms.

The same number of cases (22) were reported in and settled during spring semester 2003; 12 were reported the previous fall (2002). Strong students as well as struggling students may resort to the web when they find themselves under one kind of pressure or another. Often they do so knowing that it's wrong and that other alternatives exist (such as handing in the paper late and accepting a lowered grade, or talking to the professor ahead of time, and so forth).

We've had some cases in which students have given a friend their work to look at, sometimes with good intentions; these students then may find themselves charged with facilitating plagiarism. These are awkward cases to adjudicate, and students ought to be reminded to be careful in giving their work out to friends, especially in the middle of the night on the day the paper is due.

If questions come up about student work in your classes, please give me a call. I remind you that the faculty policy calls for cases of dishonesty to be reported and settled through the process outlined in the handbook; and that you cannot penalize a student's grade for dishonesty unless you follow the settlement process. Consistency in reporting is very important, both to maintain

high standards to DePauw, but also for the sake of fairness. The penalty for two offenses is usually suspension or dismissal. We don't want to penalize some students for dishonesty while letting others simply get by, with no penalty at all.

## **5. Reports from Other Committees**

### ***Faculty Development Committee*** (T. Hall)

#### Announcements

Here are reminders for upcoming deadlines for Faculty Development Funds.

Feb 5: FITS grants for summer stipends (Julianne Miranda recently sent out a detailed message about this)

Feb 11: Faculty development summer stipends

March 10: Student/faculty summer research

If you have any questions about these awards, please check the website under Academic Affairs or feel free to contact Terri Bonebright or Tom Hall. Terri will also be sending out information soon about the Mellon fund deadlines and other FDC activities for spring semester.

### ***Committee on Administration*** (M. McKelligan)

#### Announcements

There was recently a retreat with the board of trustees. The two topics of discussion were the budget and the DePauw University Nature Park. The recommendation on the budget is to maintain salary raises and to minimize increases with health care costs. COA is currently considering other issues about health care cost increases. COA is open to suggestions on this issue.

## **6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

### a.) New faculty members for spring 2004

Please join me in welcoming the following new faculty colleagues for the spring semester. Their DePauw email addresses are listed at the end.

Girard Brenneman, Part-time Instructor of Philosophy, gbrenneman

Suzanna Crage, Part-time Instructor of Sociology, scrage

Caroline Good, Part-time Instructor of Communication Arts and Sciences, cgood

Lori Miles, Part-time Assistant Professor of Art, lmiles

Gil Raz, Part-time Instructor of Religious Studies, graz

Margy Stahr, Part-time Instructor of English, mstahr

Elizabeth Skomp, Part-time Instructor of Modern Languages \* Russian, eskomp

Julia Story, Part-time Instructor of English, jstory

Beverly Takahashi, Part-time Instructor of Political Science, btakahashi

### b.) If a student asks to be excused from academic obligations for rush:

The Interfraternity Council and the Pan Hellenic Council have made it clear that all students are to honor their academic obligations, particularly during rush, and that no student is to be obligated in any way with rush activities that require missing class. They have also said that no student, upper class or first-year, will be penalized for absence from rush to meet academic responsibilities. Hence, I think each faculty member support the student leadership by refusing to grant requests to be excused from class or other academic obligations because of rush.

### c.) Faculty compensation

Comparative data is now available for faculty salaries for 2003-2004. DePauw has held its relative position, indeed in some respects the compensation for DePauw faculty members has been strengthened. Discussions in the Trustee subcommittee on faculty compensation, which considered recommendations from the Committee on Administration, led to the recommendation

from that committee that DePauw work to retain our current relative ranking. Comparative data will be brought to the March faculty meeting.

d.) Grades for the fall semester

The Office of Institutional Research reports another strong semester for students in Fall 2003. There were no great increases such as we had seen in recent years for the grades of first-year students. However, those students who did well as first-year students last year, continued their strong performance and the overall GPA increased.

e.) Professorships awarded

The Richard W. Peck Chair in creative writing, for 2004-2006 has been awarded to Joe Heithaus, Associate Professor of English.

Distinguished Professor Awards for 2004-2006 for sustained excellence in teaching and service: awarded to Vergene Miller, Professor of Music; Judy Raybern, Professor of Education; and Page Cotton, Professor of Kinesiology and Director of Athletics and Recreational Sports. These awardees were chosen from eight nominees who prepared files for review.

University Professors for 2004-2008 for sustained excellence in teaching, service, and professional growth and development: awarded to Valarie Ziegler, Professor of Religious Studies; Tom Hall, Professor of Sociology; and Bruce Stinebrickner, Professor of Political Science. These awardees were chosen from sixteen nominees who prepared files for review.

The members of the review committee for the DP and UP awards were John Schlotterbeck, Gloria Townsend, and Neal Abraham. Recommendations were presented by the committee to Dr. Bottoms for approval.

f.) Faculty Career Enhancement Awards

A panel of deans and faculty members from the eight colleges in the cluster of schools funded by a \$2.5 million grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation for faculty career enhancement met in Memphis TN in December to consider proposals for "local" and "inter-institutional" initiatives.

Of twenty-seven proposals to support local initiatives such as sabbatical enhancements, one award of an enhanced (extended) sabbatical went to Noah Lemos for completion of An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge during Fall 2004.

Of seven proposals for inter-institutional projects, DePauw faculty members will be participants in all four that were awarded support. Bridget Gourley, Professor of Chemistry, will join a group of four other women chemists for "Advancing the Careers of Senior Women Chemistry Faculty through Horizontal Peer Network." Jeff Kenney, Associate Professor of Religious Studies (organizer) and Yung-chen Chiang, Professor of History and Kerry Pannell, Assistant Professor of Economics and Management, will join seven other colleagues from Denison and Vassar for "Central Asia and China: The Silk Road and Beyond" (a three-week trip in summer 2004). Mary English, Associate Professor of Economics and Management and Kerry Pannell, Assistant Professor of Economics and Management will join organizers from all seven of the other schools in the cluster for an intercollegiate economics conference to be held this summer. Peter Graham, Assistant Professor of English and Robert Hershberger, Assistant Professor of Modern Languages (Spanish) are among the organizers of a "Symposium on Film and Media Studies in the Liberal Arts" to be held next spring.

## **7. Remarks from the President**

Neal Abraham reported on behalf of President Bottoms who was absent for a meeting of NAICU and consultations with the Genesis group and the National Interfraternity Council on tackling the problems of alcohol abuse on college campuses. He will serve as the leader of the Liberal Arts College subgroup.

a.) Report on the Lilly Endowment challenge grant from Lisa Hollander

178 faculty members and staff members contributed over \$250,000 earning the matching funds in this category. All four challenges (for trustees, alumni, parents, and employees) were met successfully, bringing a total of \$4.5 million in matching funds from the Lilly Endowment.

b.) Endowment income and budget

Since DePauw uses an average of previous values of the endowment to determine its spending formula for funds to support the operating budget, the two recent bad years for the stock market will affect us for a while longer. At the same time, we are continuing with a steady decrease in our spending rate (from 6.3% two years ago to 5.5% two years from now) which reduces our endowment revenues still further. Overall this is reflected in a decrease by \$7 million in endowment revenues for next year compared to last year. The Board of Trustees has decided to cushion this decline by including sixteen quarterly values of the endowment in the average rather than twelve. This will cushion the decline in the endowment revenues by about \$1 million, but it will slow the recovery of revenues if the stock market continues to improve. The Board of Trustees also recommended that the administration continue its efforts to make prudent cuts in the budget, but not to cut so deeply as to harm core programs which have contributed to the current excellence of DePauw.

c.) DePauw University Nature Park

The Board approved a plan is to proceed with caution in developing the Nature Park. Funds for development should come from sources other than the operating budget. The trail system has been approved. The academic and recreational uses are to be emphasized in the early development stages. A steering committee for the Nature Park has been organized and is chaired by Professor of Biology Wade Hazel. Faculty members with suggestions for projects or uses of the Park should send them to Professor Hazel.

d.) The following are decisions on promotion and tenure cases considered in Fall 2003 for which Dr. Bottoms accepted the recommendations of the Committee on Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Teresita Hernández, Modern Languages: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Robert Hershberger, Modern Languages: Tenure and early Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

William Little, English: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Thomas Musser, Economics and Management: Tenure and Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Cynthia O'Dell, Art: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Kerry Pannell, Economics and Management: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Howard Pollack-Milgate, Modern Languages (German): Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Scott Ross, Psychology: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2005-2006

Linda Elman, Modern Languages: Tenure

e.) Budget

The Board of Trustees approved a 4 percent increase in tuition and fees. This is the lowest increase in recent years.

## 8. Old Business

None

## 9. New Business

### A. Motion: (to be tabled) (W. Hazel)

This motion is intended to clarify the criteria for review. The motion was seconded. The motion to table was approved. Martha Rainbolt encouraged the faculty to send any comments to Wade Hazel.

Substantive changes appear in bold type

### V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: **Strong** teaching during the probationary period, **promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service.**

\* Tenure decision. Required: Strong teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the **scholarly and artistic work** category; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued strong teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either **scholarly and artistic** work or service and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Teaching: **Strong** teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of strong teaching. Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

#### 1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops attended relative to the content of the courses taught.** The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc.. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops**

**attended related to teaching methods.**

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

**B. Scholarly and Artistic Work: Scholarly and artistic work** shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions. Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development **as a scholar or artist** in one's broadly defined field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, and attendance at conferences; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another, **but not to the exclusion of activity in either category.**

2. a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, **scholarship related to teaching** and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C.3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals.

c. Adequate service to both the department (or school) and the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions. In establishing a record that goes beyond adequate service the candidate is free to provide further evidence of service to the department (or school) or to the university or to provide evidence for service to the profession. The three areas of service are defined below.

**More activity in category 3 can compensate for less activity in categories 1 and 2, but not to the exclusion of departmental and university service.**

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum **and course** development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; **participation in community outreach programs affiliated with the university**; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

(This change would take effect in the fall of 2004 for those faculty hired to begin teaching in the 2004-05 academic year; for current faculty it would take effect after their next tenure or promotion review.)

## **B. Motion ( to be tabled)** (I.Csicsery-Ronay)

The motion was withdrawn by Istvan Csicsery-Ronay. He is interested in problems and concerns about the DPC process from the perspective of each category of faculty (tenured, tenure-track, term).

### By-Laws and Standing Rules of the Faculty

#### IV. C.1. Personnel Committee

(procedures described under "Procedures for Personnel Decisions" in the Personnel Policies section of the Academic Handbook)

##### a. Membership. Original Language:

A personnel committee shall consist of all continuing tenure and term faculty members of the department except the person being reviewed, those on non-academic leave, and those in their first year of service. Faculty members on academic leave and nontenured members of the department may withdraw from any case. If there are fewer than three eligible department members or if the tenured members do not constitute a majority, the committee shall select additional tenured members from related departments, according to a procedure established by the Committee on Faculty and the administration. It is expected that all members of a personnel committee shall fully participate in the activities of the committee.

##### **New Language:**

A personnel committee shall consist of all continuing tenured members of the department except the person being reviewed and those on non-academic leave. Faculty members on academic leave may withdraw from any case. If there are fewer than three eligible department members, the committee shall select additional tenured members from related departments, according to a procedure established by the Committee on Faculty and the administration. It is expected that all members of a personnel committee shall fully participate in the activities of the committee.

The remainder of the section on personnel and search committees remains the same, with the exception of the first sentence of the description of Search Committee Membership. That statement would read "**A search committee may be constituted by the department with three or more members drawn from its continuing tenured faculty members....**" The word "term" is omitted from this sentence.

## **10. Announcements**

### A. Phi Beta Kappa Selection (K Kinney)

Kevin Kinney will distribute a form with students' names listed. He is asked for brief comments from faculty, not letters of recommendation. The comments are not associated with students' GPAs. The GPA is not the primary criterion. Please look at the package and keep extremely confidential.

### B. Update on email system upgrade (D. Trinkle)

Dennis Trinkle reported that the conversion from webmail to tigermail is 4/5 complete. The anti-spam program is working well. Contact Dennis with any questions. He thanks the faculty for their patience.

## **11. Executive Session to elect candidates for honorary degrees** (N. Abraham)

## **12. Adjournment**

## APPENDIX

### [Requirements for major in geosciences](#)

## **Meeting of March 1, 2004**

### **1. Call to Order - 4:00 p.m., Union Building Ballroom**

### **2. Verification of Quorum -- number required for this semester 82**

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. with 85 members present.

### **3. Approval of Previous Minutes**

Approved.

### **4. Reports from Coordinating Committees**

*Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (H. Pollack-Milgate)*

#### **A. Motion (to be tabled):**

To change the catalog definition of a departmental major as indicated (straight brackets indicate the sentence to be deleted; curly brackets indicate the word to be added)

Departmental Major: The departmental major consists of eight to 10 courses in a single academic department, including at least three courses at the 300-400 level. [A department may designate as many as two courses from other departments as requirements of its majors.] A department may also require as many as six courses from related departments. {However,} the total number of courses required for a major may not exceed 14 courses. In departments designated as single-subject departments, i.e., history or political science, at least 19 of the 31 courses required for graduation must be outside the major subject.

Motion tabled.

#### **B. Announcement: Update about General Education**

The next model to be voted on will come up during the May faculty meeting. Watch for announcements about meetings via e-mail.

#### **C. Announcements from the First-Year Seminar committee (Julia Bruggemann)**

On March 17 at 4:00 p.m. there will be a workshop on student research and performance in first-year seminars. The workshop is cosponsored by the S committee.

The mentor selection process is proceeding. Chris Niles provided facts about the mentor selection process. Thirty-eight mentors from last year want to return for next year. Less than 40 additional mentors will be hired from a pool of 131 applicants. This means that less than 1 of 3 applicants will be hired.

*Committee on Faculty (K. Ahlm)*

#### **A. Motion (to be voted on)**

COF is proposing the following changes in the criteria for faculty status. COF reviewed the criteria carefully. Most elaboration has been removed. The changes should be useful.

Wade Hazel made a motion to substitute his motion for COF's motion. Martha Rainbolt summarized the differences between COF's proposed revisions and Wade's proposed revisions. The primary difference between the proposals is whether course development should go under teaching or under professional growth. In COF's proposal, course development remains under professional growth. In Wade's proposal, course development goes under teaching.

Wade Hazel announced that there are many cosponsors of his proposal. The proposal was also approved by Division III in a vote (13-1). There are three pillars of being a faculty member at DePauw: teaching, professional development (scholarship), and service. All three are essential.

The issue of debate on the floor was Wade Hazel's proposal. Faculty members spoke in favor of the motion and against the motion and asked questions for clarification. Comments included:

The definition is currently flexible. Previous COF members never voted against any candidate based on these criteria. Teaching is our top priority at DePauw. We don't have any "publish or perish" directive. But we must keep alive our ability to communicate with our peers and our criteria are flexible. (C. Huffman)

Scholarship is important, but the changes could be harmful. Any abuses could be an exception, not the rule. We all are involved in scholarship activity, so why change the criteria? Younger faculty may be discouraged from developing new courses given these new criteria. (B. Whitehead)

First-year seminars and 200- and 300-level courses are hard to develop. If faculty don't get professional development credit for this, then they may not develop these new courses. (M. English)

COF is a difficult job. Will the new criteria make it more difficult for COF? Should we have external review of files? (K. Pannell)

It is important to speak to peers outside of campus. We can still do course development and external activities. (P. Foss)

The proposal doesn't differ that much from COF's. COF requires intellectual liveliness outside or within the university, so why change? If there's a problem, then it's COF or DPC, not the criteria. What happens when we attend conferences and accumulate content for courses? Is this course development or professional development? (D. Harvey)

Should course development count as teaching or professional development? Should it count twice? Our resources have changed at DePauw. We now have a pre-tenure leave that wasn't available when the handbook was written. This helps faculty keep up with professional development with relief from teaching. So it's reasonable to expect professional development. (W. Glusser)

It's important to recognize presentation of ideas to peers outside of the university as a standard of professional growth. We are productive despite the criteria. (D. Newman)

The criteria differ between the handbook and job announcements. In our job announcements, we require that candidates develop research programs that involve undergraduates. The current handbook is inconsistent with this specification. Serving on COF should be easier, not harder, given the changes in criteria. (J. Benedix)

We are teachers and get paid to develop new courses. When we were awarded our PhDs, this came with the expectation to "produce knowledge". Developing new courses does this, but it's important to recognize differences between scholarship (outside the university) and teaching (our profession). Peer review is critical. (G. Kuecker)

Can we see data on what percent of faculty present papers and write externally-reviewed manuscripts? If more of us are producing scholarship, then what is the harm in keeping the criteria as-is? This allows for more flexibility for development of new courses. (B. Whitehead)

Call to question (M. Chandler)

Vote to stop debate: 43 to 33; needs two-thirds majority; motion defeated.

We don't have to produce scholarship every year given these new criteria. We can still devote whole years to course development. We must resist the temptation to devote all our time to teaching. (M. Chandler)

Different incentives are in place. Faculty development stipends are big. External grants have matching funds. (B. Hanson)

Professional math meetings are more focused on teaching now. This is an exciting change in our profession as we make huge commitments to teaching. (E. Maycock)

Flexibility in COF's criteria is good. 75-80% of our time is spent on teaching so development of teaching should continue to be professional development. Faculty have close working relationships with students. Will we leave this behind if we change the criteria? Will this change our approach from an open-door policy to a closed-door policy? (K. Ahlm)

What is the administration's comment on the proposal? How will the administration respond? (H. Pollack-Milgate)

The administration's response may involve minor changes to the criteria. It depends on what the faculty votes in. (N. Abraham)

Flexibility will still be there with Wade's proposal. Teaching won't be secondary to professional growth. Teaching is still our primary mission. We're just strengthening the importance of professional growth.

Call to question (F. Soster)

Vote to stop debate: passes with two-thirds majority.

Call for secret ballot.

Results of vote on Wade Hazel's motion: the motion passed. Vote count: 55 yes, 33 no, 1 abstention

After the vote was announced, Karin Ahlm announced that there will be two sections in the handbook, depending on the hire date of the faculty member. She proposed that COF's changes should be incorporated on an interim basis, effective immediately. Bryan Hanson recommended that the changes be identified as a clarification, not a substitution. Carl Huffman proposed to table the motion because the meeting was running late. The motion to table was passed.

Revised COF Motion

Bold type indicates changes in wording; brackets show material from present wording which will be deleted.

V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and

accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: **good** teaching during the probationary period, satisfactory **professional growth, and service**.

\* Tenure decision. Required: **good** teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the professional development category; and **adequate contributions in service**.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued **good** teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either professional **growth** or service since the initial appointment to the preceding rank and at least adequate performance in the other category.

#### A. Teaching

**Good teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision.** Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of good teaching. [This material would be removed from the text per se but included as a footnote: *Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student evaluations for 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) must 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.*] Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

##### 1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: [made a separate category] evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class.

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

#### B. Professional Growth

**Continued professional growth is necessary for a positive personnel decision.**

Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development of professional competence in the field(s) or discipline(s). **The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, course development based on scholarly activity, and attendance at conferences; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. The evidence can be used to demonstrate development as a researcher (performer) or teacher, or both.**

Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another.

2. Intellectual liveliness

a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. **Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, and other activities of a similar nature.**

ii. Professional contributions. **Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)**

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community: **Evidence might include workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals, teaching roundtables etc.**

C. Service

**Effective service to the department (school) or the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions.** Evidence is not required in all categories, and unless there are special departmental requirements or responsibilities stated in the job description, **a candidate is free to decide what area and categories of service should be documented to show effective service.**

**[New Wording]**

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

**[Old Wording]**

1. effective participation in school, department or university governance, including committee assignments;

2. effective participation in program development and resource acquisition within the school, department, or the University.

3. effective participation in curricular development for school, department, competence, special, or general education programs;

4. effective counseling and advising of individual students and student organizations related to academic life.

**B. Description of proposed new student evaluation form -- see appendix to the agenda**

A new student evaluation is being considered. This form is used at Bowdoin College. Send questions or comments to Karin Ahlm or Brenda Reed. The new form is one page. Students would write comments directly on one side of the page without having to turn it over. There are fewer questions about demographics. The new form also takes out the comparison of multiple faculty members, and instead asks students to rate on scales such as poor to excellent or not helpful to very helpful. The form also asks about "level of effort" instead of "workload", which should be a better sign of rigor.

Dana Dudle asked if evaluations can be made anonymous, especially in small classes. Karin Ahlm replied that students can avoid filling out demographic information in small classes and this would help maintain anonymity.

Jim Benedix asked if student evaluations can be done electronically, with grades contingent on completing the evaluations. Karin replied that this may be possible in the future.

Bruce Stinebrickner asked if there was a timeline for the changes. Karin replied that this depends on concerns from the faculty, but the changes could occur as soon as this semester. Bruce asked why these changes are occurring. Karin replied that part of COF's responsibility is to look at the course evaluation procedures. This new form looks good so we should consider trying it.

***Committee on Management of Academic Operations (E. Wielenberg)***

**A. Motion (to be removed from the table)**

That COMM 327 Communication & Cultural Identity count for group 2 credit.  
Motion passed.

**B. Announcements:**

(1) The title of KINS 110 has been changed from "Sports Medicine and First Aid" to "Introduction to Sports Medicine" (.5 credits)

(2) We approved the following revision of the two distinct final exam policy statements in the student handbook and the course catalog. The single statement below will appear in both the handbook and the catalog:

**"EXAMINATIONS IN COURSES**

Instructors schedule all but the final examination in their courses. No hour examinations may be given the last five class days of the semester except for laboratory portions of final exams. Only assignments that substitute for a final exam should be given a due date during finals week. In addition, assignments for papers and projects due in the last five days of class should be provided well in advance.

Final Examinations. An examination period is provided at the end of each semester for instructors to give such examinations as they deem proper to cover the course work. Normally, a final examination should not exceed three hours. Final examinations are not to be given at any time other than that announced in the official schedule, although the laboratory portion of final examinations in science courses may be given in a regularly scheduled lab period in the last week of classes. The Vice President for Academic Affairs must approve any request to move an exam time for a whole class. Instructors may allow individual students with unusual circumstances (such as a death or serious illness in the family, postseason athletic events, or having three exams in one day) to take an examination at another time: problems involving transportation, family occasions, and/or jobs, for example, are not sufficient grounds for changing an examination. No student may be excused from taking the final examination in any course in

which an examination is a requirement for credit in the course.

Multiple Exams Policy. No student may be required to take more than two in-class final exams on the same day. 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 ([www.depauw.edu/admin/registrar/forms.asp](http://www.depauw.edu/admin/registrar/forms.asp))."

(3) MAO has developed a policy concerning the awarding of group credit for high school AP exams. The policy will be to allow individual departments to decide whether to award such credit. The default policy will be that no such credit will be awarded; if a given department wants to award group credit for performance on AP exams, the chair of that department should provide the registrar with a brief description of how the department would like to award group credit and why. The registrar will then bring all such requests to MAO, who will consider and either approve or reject the department's request. MAO will then announce all such approvals to the faculty.

### ***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (A. Dziubinskyj)***

#### Announcements

A new program will require all students to have their own laptop computer. This program is in its earliest days of planning and implementation. SLAAC will advise and address concerns regarding this new program. Send comments or questions to Aaron Dziubinskyj or Dennis Trinkle.

## **5. Reports from Other Committees**

### ***Faculty Development Committee (T. Hall)***

#### Announcements

Student Faculty research proposals are due March 10

Mellon proposals, both support intellectual communities and venture, are due April 14. There is a new application form for the Mellon proposals.

FDC is processing summer applications. Only 20 can be awarded. 42 applications were submitted (2 withdrawn, 9 exploratory, 11 scholarly, 18 course development, 2 FITS). It is clear from the applications that there is considerable synergy between teaching and research. Virtually all research applications carry significant teaching consequences, and most of the course development applications either feed from research and/or contribute to future research.

Comments thereon: obviously more applications than FDC can award. FDC is working at equity issues. In cases of TIES, nod to those who have NOT had recent award. Many are very good, thus some good applications will NOT be funded. We are working on providing feedback to those that go beyond, "others" were better.

Changes: applications for all sorts of awards exceed our capacity to fund them. This means we are shifting, maybe slouching, toward a state of competitiveness that has not been present in the past. Indeed, we have repeatedly found that applications that might have been a "cinch" 5 or 10 years ago, are now not competitive.

FDC will discuss and report back to faculty, probably in May or Fall for comment and/or discussion and/or vote ways to address this.

- a. might be a changes in eligibility rules, e.g. longer waits between reapplication
- b. making available more successful applications [with permission of original submitters]

- c. clarifying and streamlining application forms with strict page limits
- d. for course development, what kinds of courses? and what categories? should FITS and FYS be rolled into general course development or should they be their own category?
- e. should course development emphasize new and innovative and not refreshing or “off the shelf” or “in the catalog” courses?

Today’s point is not to answer or even discuss these issues, but to put them on everyone’s radar to mull over, so that we can eventually be clear about what should be covered and how to write it up.

Reminder in applications: Remember all FDC applications, including the Mellon grants that go through FDC go to colleagues who are smart and hard working, but seldom in your discipline. One problem we have encountered more than once to the detriment of some applicants had been “hidden” assumptions about either the field or the applicant’s background. There are a couple of strategies for addressing this:

- a. talk to Terri Bonebright or members of FDC NOT in your discipline
- b. talk or have someone NOT in your discipline look over your application
- c. make sure that you explain how the current application relates to:

- 1. your previous work
- 2. other projects funded through FDC

The point here is to make it readily apparent to the committee how this is so. This often takes only a sentence or two. \*IF\* you are the sort who works on many phases of a project in separate applications, then it may take a paragraph to situation the current application in a stream of applications.

- d. this does NOT require much, often only a sentence or even a parenthetical remark like, “as is standard practice in xxxx,” or “I have addressed this [complex] issue in detail in the following paper” [with a copy appended should anyone want to see more].
- e. be sure to indicate what the result of your project will be. Again sometimes only a sentence is necessary: “I plan to draft the first few chapters of this book project.”

### ***Committee on Administration (C. Huffman)***

#### Announcements

COA is working on a plan for health insurance. The plan should be done by April 1.

### **6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Neal Abraham provided data on faculty compensation by rank in comparison with compensation at other liberal arts colleges. DePauw continues to remain competitive in its compensation for faculty members in comparison with other GLCA private liberal arts colleges. Even with quite modest raises last year, some significant relative progress was made in compensation of those at the rank of Professor. It is notable that DePauw’s Professors average fewer years in rank than do professors at other colleges; this is a partial explanation for the lower average salary. Averages change less than the raises for continuing faculty members from one year to the next because of the promotion or hiring of new faculty members at that rank and by retirements. The continued progress in faculty compensation is a tribute to the resolve of the Board of Trustees to invest in the faculty. There were no questions.

### **7. Remarks from the President**

Neal Abraham reported on behalf of President Bottoms who was absent for a meeting of the Bonner Foundation Board. There were no announcements and no questions.

### **8. Old Business**

None

## 9. New Business

### A. Motion: (to be removed from the table) (W. Hazel)

Substantive changes appear in bold type

#### V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: **Strong** teaching during the probationary period, **promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service.**

\* Tenure decision. Required: Strong teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the **scholarly and artistic work** category; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued **strong** teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either **scholarly and artistic** work or service, since the initial appointment to the preceding rank, and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Teaching: **Strong** teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of **strong** teaching. [This material would be removed from the text per se but included as a footnote: *Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student evaluations for 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) must 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; indepth interviews of students; and detailed evaluation of syllabi.] Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:*

#### 1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops attended relative to the content of the courses taught.** The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc.. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that

teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops attended related to teaching methods.**

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

**B. Scholarly and Artistic Work:** Scholarly and artistic work shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions. Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development as a **scholar or artist** in one's broadly defined field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, and attendance at conferences, as well as supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another, **but not to the exclusion of activity in either category.**

2. a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, **scholarship related to teaching** and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include workshops; participation at university, school, or departmental forums; panel discussions and presentations; and on-campus recitals.

c. Adequate service to both the department (or school) and the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions. In establishing a record that goes beyond adequate service the candidate is free to provide further evidence of service to the department (or school) or to the university or to provide evidence for service to the profession. The three areas of service are defined below.

**More activity in category 3 can compensate for less activity in categories 1 and 2, but not to the exclusion of departmental and university service.**

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum and course development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; **participation in community outreach programs affiliated with the university**; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

{This change would take effect in the fall of 2004 for those faculty hired to begin teaching in the 2004-05 academic year; for current faculty it would take effect after their next tenure or promotion review.}

## 10. Announcements

**A. Election to fill positions on faculty committees: vacancies and timetable (M. Rainbolt)**

Division officers will hold division meetings and then report all nominations to the Chair of Faculty by March 17. All voting members of the faculty will vote electronically within their division for the division representatives in early April. The announcement of the results of the elections will be posted by April 9. Divisions may meet again if they wish to nominate additional candidates for the at-large positions. These nominations will be reported to the Chair of the Faculty by April 21. The voting members will vote electronically for at-large members of faculty committees during the last week of April. The results of the election will be reported at the May faculty meeting.

**B. Boswell symposium (Y. Williams)**

The Hampton and Esther Boswell Symposium is scheduled for March 14-15. The symposium will examine "Global Human Rights and the Media."

**11. Adjournment**

## **Meeting of April 5, 2004**

### **1. Call to Order - 4:00 p.m., Union Building Ballroom**

### **2. Verification of Quorum -- number required for this semester 82**

Quorum is reached with 86 voting members. Meeting is called to order.

### **3. Approval of Previous Minutes**

Approved.

### **4. Remarks from the President**

With permission of assembled body, the report of the president was moved to this place on the agenda.

The University will establish a women's center to open in August. The formation of the women's center was a result of a recommendation from the task force on the status of women. The center will be located at 306 Hanna Street.

The Office of Religious Life is being renamed the Office of Spiritual Life and will be moved to Gobin United Methodist Church.

### **5. Reports from Coordinating Committees**

#### ***Committee on Academic Policy and Planning*** (H. Pollack-Milgate)

#### **A. Motion (to be removed from the table):**

To change the catalog definition of a departmental major as indicated (straight brackets indicate the sentence to be deleted; curly brackets indicate the word to be added)

Departmental Major: The departmental major consists of eight to ten courses in a single academic department, including at least three courses at the 300-400 level. [A department may designate as many as two courses from other departments as requirements of its majors.] A department may also require as many as six courses from related departments. {However,} the total number of courses required for a major may not exceed 14 courses. In departments designated as single-subject departments, i.e., history or political science, at least 19 of the 31 courses required for graduation must be outside the major subject.

Removed from table with two dissenting votes.

#### Discussion:

H. Pollack-Milgate explained the reason for the motion. The current catalog allows for a minimum of six courses in one department to count for a department major. CAPP suggests that eight courses should be the minimum for a department major.

M. Chandler spoke against the motion. The motion would eliminate the "bridge" majors in philosophy. Students declare a bridge major in philosophy, such as philosophy of science, math, history, art, literature, etc. Students designate one course as a bridge course and develop a proposal to show how courses fit to create the "philosophy of \_\_\_" major (fill in the blank). Proposals are reviewed to make sure the gains outweigh the losses. Many students learn that the bridge major is more rigorous and switch back to the philosophy major. Other students find that the bridge major allows for more flexibility.

M. McKelligan spoke against the motion. It is important to have standards but the bridge majors should be preserved.

D. Shannon asked why CAPP is interested in this change. Students enter the program as juniors, given dissatisfaction with other programs. Students must develop their own proposals, which must be approved by the advisor and the department. Sometimes proposals are turned down. The result of successful proposals is a better thesis and a better quality education for the students.

Ellie Ypma stated that transcripts don't differentiate bridge majors and philosophy majors. The transcripts should be more descriptive.

H. Pollack-Milgate explained the rationale for the motion. CAPP's job is to define the department major. Responses from departments are insufficient to show why students shouldn't pursue a minimum of eight courses in philosophy, even with the bridge major. The rationale that students enter the program as juniors isn't a good enough reason.

W. Hazel asked about individually-designed majors. Why not allow bridge majors given that students design their own interdisciplinary majors?

H. Pollack-Milgate responded that the interdisciplinary major involves multiple departments whereas the bridge major is approved by only one department.

J. Kenney stated that interdisciplinary studies should be encouraged, not discouraged.

M. Altman stated that department boundaries shouldn't be reinforced. The bridge major seems better than the individually-designed major because one department takes responsibility for approving the major. It's hard for students to design a major from scratch.

Other comments were made by S. Basu, P. Foss, B. Gourley, J. Benedix, and J. Roberts.

B. Hanson moved to table the motion. The motion was seconded. The motion to table was defeated.

Voting on the motion occurred by secret ballot. Results of the vote: 16 yes, 58 no, 1 abstention. The motion was turned down.

### **B. Motion (to be voted on)**

To change the name of the "Department of Communication Arts and Sciences" to "Department of Communication and Theatre."

CAPP agrees with the proposed name change. The change needs no second. The motion was approved.

### **C. Announcements**

The Education Department has persistent concerns about staffing. An outside consultant was brought in to meet with the department. The department is considering a five-year Master's program in Education Studies as a result of meeting with the consultant. CAPP will review the proposal.

### **D. Motion (to be tabled):**

To replace the current system of General Education requirements ("the groups") with the following:

## **GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS:**

The general education distribution requirements ensure that all DePauw students are exposed to the challenge and excitement of a variety of academic disciplines, develop a range of intellectual skills that will contribute to success at DePauw and beyond, and are instilled with a persistent curiosity and desire for increased understanding of the world around them. The DePauw system should and will force all students to explore unfamiliar academic territory. These requirements also help prepare them to make an informed choice about the fields in which they will major. General notes: All requirements are to be met in full. No more than one course meeting the distribution requirements may be taken in any one program or department (inclusive of dual-subject departments).

### **CATEGORY I: Courses in the Arts and Humanities**

(3 credits required; at most 1 credit may be taken in self-expression courses)

. [Note: non-classroom work (e.g. newspaper, radio) does not count toward the fulfillment of this requirement]

### **CATEGORY II: Courses in Cultural Studies and the Social Sciences**

(3 credits required)

### **CATEGORY III: Courses in Science, Mathematics, and Technology**

(2 credits required; at least one must be taken in a laboratory science course)

## **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**1. Language Proficiency Requirement:** This requirement may either be satisfied by a sufficiently high score on a language placement examination (placement beyond third-semester proficiency level) or by coursework. In the latter case, students must either satisfactorily complete a language course at the third-semester proficiency level, or complete a one-semester program in a non-English speaking country and enroll in a minimum of two courses of different disciplines related to the location of the program.

Students whose first language is not English may be certified as meeting this requirement through the Office of the Registrar.

**2. Physical Activities:** Complete one half-credit Life Fitness course. [Note: These are courses covering a physical activity with class discussions of the health benefits of exercise.]

H. Pollack-Milgate answered questions about the proposal. P. Foss asked if all courses from one department fall into one category. The answer is no. E. Maycock asked what is a lab course. The answer is Division III and the faculty, as in the current system will decide, not CAPP.

The motion to table was approved.

## **D. Announcements from the First-Year Seminar committee (Julia Bruggemann)**

There is a lunch scheduled for April 23 for first-year seminar instructors to meet with mentors. Chris Niles has requested that mentors and students meet at one designated time, possibly 6 p.m. on Sundays, every other week during fall semester. Faculty should avoid scheduling meetings with FYS students at this time to prevent conflicts.

### **Committee on Faculty (K. Ahlm)**

A. Motion (to be removed from the table)

Revised COF Motion

Bold type indicates changes in wording; brackets show material from present wording which will be deleted.

#### V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: **good** teaching during the probationary period, satisfactory **professional growth, and service**.

\* Tenure decision. Required: **good** teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the professional development category; and **adequate contributions in service**.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued **good** teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either professional **growth** or service since the initial appointment to the preceding rank and at least adequate performance in the other category.

#### A. Teaching

**Good teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision.** Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of good teaching. [This material would be removed from the text per se but included as a footnote: Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student evaluations for 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) must 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; indepth interviews of students; and detailed evaluation of syllabi.] Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

##### 1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: [made a separate category] evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class.

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations , peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

#### B. Professional Growth

**Continued professional growth is necessary for a positive personnel decision.**

Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development of professional competence in the field(s) or discipline(s). **The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, course development based on scholarly activity, and attendance at conferences; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities. The evidence can be used to demonstrate development as a researcher (performer) or teacher, or both.**

Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another.

#### 2. Intellectual liveliness

a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. **Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, and other activities of a similar nature.**

ii. Professional contributions. **Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)**

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community: **Evidence might include workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals, teaching roundtables etc.**

#### C. Service

**Effective service to the department (school) or the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions.** Evidence is not required in all categories, and unless there are special departmental requirements or responsibilities stated in the job description, **a candidate is free to decide what area and categories of service should be documented to show effective service.**

#### [New Wording]

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals,

institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

**[Old Wording]**

1. effective participation in school, department or university governance, including committee assignments;
2. effective participation in program development and resource acquisition within the school, department, or the University.
3. effective participation in curricular development for school, department, competence, special, or general education programs;
4. effective counseling and advising of individual students and student organizations related to academic life.

The motion was removed from the table with several dissenting votes.

Discussion:

P. Foss asked if it was okay to change the criteria. Are there contractual issues even though these aren't substantial changes?

K. Ahlm replied that these aren't changes but are clarifications that repeat content from handouts provided to faculty members.

Other comments were made by C. Huffman, E. Edberg, W. Hazel, and M. McKelligan.

M. Rainbolt called for a secret ballot. Results: 41 yes, 26 no, 7 abstentions. The motion was approved.

**B. Announcements**

Interim and promotion reviews are almost done.

***Committee on Management of Academic Operations*** (E. Wielenberg)

**A. Motion (to be voted on)**

That the following course additions be implemented:

ARTS 270, Sculpture II

ARTS 370, Sculpture III

BLST 290, Topics in Black Studies

BLST 390, Advanced Topics in Black Studies

BLST 480, Senior Project

BLST 490, Independent Study

CHIN 269, Topics in Chinese Language

MATH 123, Computational Discrete Mathematics

Motion approved.

**B. Motion (to be voted on)**

That the following change be made to the computer science major:

The requirement that all computer science majors take MATH 151 and MATH 253 is replaced with the requirement that all computer science majors take MATH 123, Computational Discrete Mathematics, and MATH 223 Theory in Discrete Mathematics

Motion approved.

**C. Motion (to be tabled)**

That MATH 123 Computational Discrete Mathematics and MATH 223 Theory in Discrete Mathematics count for group 1 credit

Motion approved.

**D. Announcements**

(i) Changes in title:

ANTH 153 Introduction to Anthropology: Human Origins becomes ANTH 153, Human Origins

ANTH 151 Introduction to Anthropology: Human Cultures becomes ANTH 151, Human Cultures

HONR 151 Management Fellows Seminar becomes HONR 151 Management Fellows

Colloquium.

HONR 171 Media Fellows First Year Seminar I becomes HONR 171 Media Fellows Colloquium I

HONOR 172 Media Fellows First Year Seminar II becomes HONR 172 Media Fellows

Colloquium II

HONR 191 Science Research Fellows Seminar I becomes HONR 191 Science Research Fellows Research Experience I

HONR 192 Science Research Fellows Seminar II becomes HONR 192 Science Research Fellows Research Experience II

(ii) Change in title and number:

MATH 253, Discrete Mathematics becomes MATH 223 Theory in Discrete Mathematics

(iii) We approved the following topics courses for one-time group credit for fall 2004:

CLST 300, The Archaeology of Carthage and North Africa, group 2

HIST 300, People and Politics, group 2

FREN 401, Les classiques du cinema, group 3 (non-lit)

RUS 324, Advanced Composition & Stylistics, group 5

SPAN 390a, The Novel of Pop Culture, group 3 (lit)

SPAN 390b, Cinema of Spain, group 3 (non-lit)

(iv) We approved changes to the deadlines for the independently-designed internships. The new deadlines are as follows:

Preliminary Proposal with Academic Affairs administrator's signature and academic advisor's signature Feb. 15 (1 year prior to internship) for fall internships; April 15 (1 year prior to internship) for spring internships

Affairs administrator and academic to internship)

Letters of recommendation (2): fall deadline - Feb. 15; spring - April 15

Current transcript: fall deadline - Feb. 15; spring - April 15

Faculty sponsor approval of preliminary proposal: fall deadline - March 15; spring - Sept. 15

Letter of inquiry to host: fall deadline - May 1; spring - Dec. 1

Resume: fall deadline - May 1; spring - Dec 1

Host confirmation letter: fall deadline - May 1; spring - Dec. 1

Liability release: fall deadline - May 1; spring - Dec. 1

Project description/learning contract signed by faculty sponsor and academic advisor: fall deadline - May 1; spring - Dec. 1

***Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee*** (A. Dziubinskyj)

**Announcements**

The petitions committee reminds the faculty that there are appropriate circumstances for incompletes.

There will be two forums to discuss the laptop initiative: April 8 and April 9, both 4 p.m., in the Watson Forum. N. Abraham will lead the forums.

Five vendors have been chosen to submit proposals for the laptop initiative. The deadline is April 5. Vendors will exhibit their products on April 26. A decision on the vendor will be made by May 17.

## **6. Reports from Other Committees**

### ***Faculty Development Committee*** (T. Hall)

#### Announcements

Reviews for summer stipends are now complete and grants have been awarded. Applications for Category I Mellon Grants are due April 14.

Faculty Fellowship reports are due on April 28.

FDC will be meeting in late April to discuss issues set aside for the end of the year. If faculty members have any policy issues to be considered by FDC, send comments to T. Hall. Among the issues are further streamlining, clarifying, and simplifying the application process.

In May, FDC will bring some issues to the faculty for input. FDC first needs to determine which issues are mainly FDC administrative and which have wider policy implications that need faculty input.

### ***Committee on Administration*** (M. McKelligan)

#### Announcements

There is a \$0.5 million increase in health care premiums. How to pay this increase is undecided. P. Schmidt has contributed a lot to the discussions, but no specifics are available yet. There will be meetings to discuss this issue soon.

## **7. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

On Monday, May 3rd, at 7:30 p.m., in Meharry Hall in East College, we will have the Annual Academic Awards Convocation at which we will recognize students designated to receive prizes and honors for their academic accomplishments. Many students will be joined by their parents, and a number of the donors whose gifts funded the awards and prizes will also be present. Please plan to join us for this convocation and to join in celebrating our students' academic accomplishments. The speaker for the evening will be Associate Professor of Chemistry, Jackie Roberts, recipient of the Exemplary Teacher Award for 2003-2004. The evening's events will conclude with the President's award of the Walker Cup to the senior who has contributed most to DePauw. Refreshments will follow the roughly hour-long program.

Regarding the proposal for the new general education distribution requirements, courses for each category will be reviewed by MAO and voted on by faculty.

COA is reconsidering a health care plan for retirees. The plan would be to pre-fund the program, not pay each year. This would build up a fund for a medical spending account by setting money aside, investing it, and letting it build up, thus creating an extra benefit. A huge proportion of retirement income from TIAA-CREF must go to health care, so this plan would provide an alternative. It would also create buying power and bargaining power to obtain health care coverage. The program is called Emerti and is being developed through Mellon.

The proposed criteria below were developed in consultation with attorneys and the committee to revised the academic handbook.

**A. Revised Motion proposed by Administration** (hereafter in italics)

(Motion passed at the March faculty meeting appears right after this text; current handbook statement is attached as an appendix at the end of the agenda.)

V. Criteria for Recommendations on Faculty Status based on Interim Reviews or reviews for Tenure and Promotion. (Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Recommendations should express judgments about the merits of a candidate as documented in the decision file, considering the quality and quantity of the individual faculty member's documented accomplishments in relation to the criteria for recommendations on faculty status detailed in this section and on any other criteria specified in the job description at the time of hire (or mutually agreed upon later by the candidate and the administration). A large amount of activity does not necessarily represent superior accomplishment.

Bases for dismissal (Section VI. B. below) may also be considered in recommendations on faculty status.

\* Interim review. (based on performance during the previous two years.) Required: Effective teaching, including effective teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted; demonstrable achievement or promise of accomplishment in scholarly or creative work; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Tenure. (based on performance during the previous five years.) Required: Effective teaching, including effective teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted; demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the scholarly or creative work; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate professor or professor. Required: continued effective teaching since the previous positive personnel decision including effective teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted. Significant achievement or contribution in either the scholarly or creative work category or the service category and at least adequate performance in the other category, based on performance throughout the period of service at the previous rank.

A. Teaching: Effective teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of effective teaching (FOOTNOTE). Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. Professional Competence. Completion of a terminal degree in the field. Continued professional mastery of content, critical scholarship, and methodologies of teaching in areas of responsibility. Evidence may include professional activities to stay current in the field; evidence of use of current materials in courses; attendance at meetings or workshops on content or teaching methodologies combined with evidence of use of that material and experience.

FOOTNOTE: For interim and tenure reviews, all student course evaluations over the period under review will be provided to the decision file by the VPAA. Evidence should also include a representative sample of course syllabi, assignments, samples of graded student work, the required peer observation reports, the candidate's annual reports, and responses by the department chair to annual reports.

For tenure reviews copies of the interim reviews from the personnel committee and COF should be included.

For promotion reviews not linked to tenure, faculty members must include at least the lesser of either all complete sets of all student evaluations submitted in the years since the closure of the file for the last positive performance review or complete sets of all student evaluations in each of six semesters from the period under review for teaching effectiveness. "Complete sets" means all

forms that have been filled out by students and the data from the Office of Institutional Research which includes the number of students enrolled in the course, the number of students present and completing the forms, and the statistical reports from OIR. Candidates must include a representative sample of syllabi, assignments, and graded student work. Candidates may also include peer observation reports and correspondence received from students.

In any of these reviews other first-hand information received from members of the University community or solicited by the DPC or COF according to procedures specified in sections III and IV may be included in the file.

Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. Content and rigor

a. Content: Evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards of the discipline appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: Evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as reported by the Registrar's Office. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course according to the standards of the discipline and the University.

2. Teaching methods: Evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, description of instructional strategies, examinations and assignments, peer observations, other course materials, reflective annual reports, etc. The evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class. Such evidence can also include use of insights and materials gained from meetings or workshops attended related to teaching methods.

3. Student Learning. Evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, student work, annual reports. The evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

B. Scholarly and/or Creative Work. Continued scholarly or creative work is required for a satisfactory personnel decision. Candidates are required to show evidence of the following:

1. Continued development as a scholar, professional, or creative or performing artist, as appropriate in gaining the terminal degree in one's broadly defined field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in meetings or conferences of learned societies or professional organizations; also from supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities.

2. Intellectual Liveliness. (Between the following areas, 2.a. and 2.b., more evidence of activity in one area may compensate for less in another, but not to the exclusion of evidence of activity in either area.)

a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing of grant proposals for external funding which receive positive critical reviews, scholarly publications or presentations at professional meetings on teaching, scholarly publication including edited work, presentations at professional meetings of instructional materials, and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include scholarly or creative contributions in the following: organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, editing professional journals or publication, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C.3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include presentations on

campus, organizing workshops, presentations, and panel discussions, contributions to workshops, participation at university, school, or departmental forums, panel discussions and presentations, on-campus recitals or exhibitions.

c. Service. Continued adequate service to both the department (or school) and the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions. In establishing a record that goes beyond adequate service the candidate may include service to the profession. The three areas of service are defined below. More activity in category 3 can compensate for less activity in categories 1 and 2, but not to the exclusion of adequate contributions in categories 1 and 2.

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include documentation of effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments and leadership; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum and course development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include documentation of effective participation in university governance, including committee service or leadership in the division; effective advising of first-year and non-major students, advising student organizations, organizing or participating in co-curricular or extra-curricular programs for students; effective work in developing or contributing to interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; participation in community outreach programs affiliated with the university; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Service to the candidate's professional field. Evidence might include documentation of serving as an officer of a professional society or foundation; organizing institutes, meetings, or conference sessions; serving as a juror at academic or creative competitions; visiting other schools to contribute to a program or accreditation review; serving on panels for governmental agencies or foundations; serving on review panels for fellowships or awards.

(This change will take effect in the fall of 2004 for those faculty members hired to begin teaching in the 2004-05 academic year; for current faculty members it will take effect after their next satisfactory promotion review.)

### **Text of Motion as passed at March Faculty Meeting**

Substantive changes appear in bold type

#### V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status

(Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about a candidate's merit using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI. A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

\* Interim review. Required: **Strong** teaching during the probationary period, **promise of accomplishment in the scholarly and artistic work category, and service.**

\* Tenure decision. Required: Strong teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the **scholarly and artistic work** category; and adequate contributions in service.

\* Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued strong teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either **scholarly and artistic work** or service, since the initial appointment to the preceding rank, and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Teaching: **Strong** teaching is essential for a positive personnel decision. Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of **strong** teaching. [This material would be removed from the text per se but included as a footnote: Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student evaluations for 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) must 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; indepth interviews of students; and detailed evaluation of syllabi.] Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. Content and rigor

a. Content: evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, course materials, such as handouts, primary and secondary textual sources, textbooks and other course materials. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops attended relative to the content of the courses taught.** The evidence should demonstrate that courses meet standards appropriate to the level of the course.

b. Rigor: evidence to be drawn from quizzes, tests, examinations, paper assignments, marked and graded material, distribution of grades as submitted to department chairs by the Office of Institutional Research, etc.. The evidence should demonstrate that the course requirements are sufficiently challenging for the level of the course.

2. Teaching methods: evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of the discipline, topic, and specific characteristics of a given class. **Such evidence can also include meetings/workshops attended related to teaching methods.**

3. Effectiveness: evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, annual reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process.

**B. Scholarly and Artistic Work: Scholarly and artistic work** shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions. Candidates are required to show:

1. Continued development as a **scholar or artist** in one's broadly defined field(s) or discipline(s). The evidence might include participation in learned societies, professional organizations, and attendance at conferences, as well as supporting documents in area 2 and similar activities.

Between the following areas (2.a. and 2.b.), more activity in one category may compensate for less in another, **but not to the exclusion of activity in either category.**

2. a. Intellectual liveliness outside the university:

i. Scholarly outreach. Evidence might include publications, presentations at conferences, public performances and exhibits outside of DePauw, writing grant proposals for external funding, **scholarship related to teaching** and other activities of a similar nature.

ii. Professional contributions. Evidence might include organizing conferences or competitions, reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, giving master classes outside of DePauw, and scholarly work for publication houses, institutes, and governmental agencies, etc. Evidence related to professional service should not be included in this area (See C. 3. below.)

b. Intellectual liveliness within the university community. Evidence might include workshops; participation at university, school, or departmental forums; panel discussions and presentations; and on-campus recitals.

C. Adequate service to both the department (or school) and the university is necessary for positive personnel decisions. In establishing a record that goes beyond adequate service the candidate is free to provide further evidence of service to the department (or school) or to the university or to provide evidence for service to the profession. The three areas of service are defined below. **More activity in category 3 can compensate for less activity in categories 1 and 2, but not to the exclusion of departmental and university service.**

1. Departmental Service. Evidence might include effective participation in departmental governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of majors and minors; participation in curriculum **and course** development; resource acquisition, laboratory supervision, maintenance of office and lab equipment or musical instruments; and similar activities.

2. University Service. Evidence might include effective participation in university governance, including committee assignments; effective advising of first year students and/or student organizations related to the academic life; effective work in developing interdisciplinary or general education programs; administrative assignments and appointments; **participation in community outreach programs affiliated with the university**; and similar activities that show a commitment to the good of the university.

3. Professional Service. Beyond scholarly activities directly related to participation in learned societies, a candidate could supply evidence of service to professional societies, journals, institutes, governmental agencies, and the like. Evidence might include chairing conference sessions, being a juror at competitions, visiting schools for accreditation reviews, holding office in professional societies or foundations, and similar service activities which are related to the individual's fields as either a scholar or teacher.

{This change would take effect in the fall of 2004 for those faculty hired to begin teaching in the 2004-05 academic year; for current faculty it would take effect after their next tenure or promotion review.}

## **B. Revision of Section I of Personnel Policies of Academic Handbook**

(This change will take effect in the fall of 2004 for those faculty members hired to begin teaching in the 2004-05 academic year; for current faculty members it will take effect after their next satisfactory promotion review.)

### **I. Appointment**

(article written by the administration) The University appoints each faculty member to one of the following types of faculty positions each year. Each faculty member will be afforded the rights and privileges consistent with the position designated in that faculty member's letter of appointment and with other provisions of these Personnel Policies. Faculty members who work more than half time in a given fiscal year (which runs from July 1 to June 30) taking into account both faculty responsibilities and other responsibilities are eligible for certain benefits as set forth in the University's Employee Handbook.

### **A. Types of Faculty Positions**

1. Full-time Faculty Positions with Academic Rank Those appointed to such positions are granted such titles as "Instructor," "Assistant Professor," "Associate Professor," or "Professor."

Appointments made by the University to positions of this type are to departments in the College of Liberal Arts or to the School of Music, although some duties or obligations may be specified in the

letter of appointment as being within interdisciplinary programs or administrative areas. Ordinarily, the duties of someone appointed to this type position include a full range of faculty responsibilities (teaching, service and scholarly and creative work), though some duties may be replaced by administrative responsibilities at the discretion of the President. Normally, this status is granted only to those employed for at least one academic year. There are two subcategories of full-time faculty positions with academic rank: Tenure-track positions and term positions, as described below.

a. Tenure-track Positions

(1) Tenured positions. These positions are held without limit of time unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment. The time limit is subject to the provisions of Section VI in the Personnel Policies. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IG, IIA, IID, III, IV, V, VI and VII and IX; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

(2) Probationary tenure-track positions (also called probationary positions or tenurable positions). Such positions are identified at the time of appointment by the University as those that may lead to tenure as specified in Section II.C.4 and 5 and Section IV of the Personnel Policies in the Academic Handbook. Probationary tenure-track appointments are for the period of time specified in the faculty member's letter of appointment, and there is no guarantee of continued employment beyond the period specified. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IG, IIA-IIC, III, IV, V, VI and VII and IX; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

b. Term Positions. Persons holding term appointments are not eligible for tenure. Recognizing the policies and principles of the AAUP regarding tenure, the University will not appoint a person to more than a total of six years in a term position, except that this limit shall not count years in which significant administrative duties make a person holding such a term position ineligible for tenure as specified in the letter of appointment. Term positions are for the period of time specified in the letter of appointment, and there is no guarantee of continued employment beyond that period. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IG, IIA, IIE, III, IV, V, VI and VII and IX; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

2. Full-time Term Positions with Nominal Rank These positions carry titles of "with rank of Instructor," "with rank of Assistant Professor," "with rank of Associate Professor," or "with rank of Professor". These positions carry significant administrative duties and typically carry less than half of the normal instructional duties of full-time faculty members with academic rank. Persons holding term appointments are not eligible for tenure. The University makes such appointments for specified periods of time and there is no guarantee of continued employment beyond the periods specified. These appointments are made to a department, the School of Music, or the library. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IG, IIA, IIE (except that Librarians shall be subject instead to Section IIF), III, IV, V, VI and VII and IX; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

3. Part-time Faculty Positions with Academic Rank These positions carry titles of "Part-time Instructor," "Part-time Assistant Professor," "Part-time Associate Professor," or "Part-time Professor." "Part-time" in the title may be replaced by "Adjunct" at the discretion of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This category includes those appointed by the University who perform only part-time teaching duties as well as those employed full- or part-time for other duties at the University who are also assigned part-time teaching duties. Normally, these positions carry instructional duties (teaching, service and professional growth) corresponding to less than half the instructional workload of a full-time faculty member. The University will make such appointments in a department or several departments, in the School of Music, or in a program. Appointments

are made for a specified period, typically either for a semester or an academic year, and there is no guarantee of continued employment beyond the period specified. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IE, IIA, VI, VII, VIII and IX (note: as the Personnel Policies are a document relating only to faculty, the Sections cited apply only to the faculty portion of an appointment). In addition, Section IX of the Personnel Policies applies to persons appointed to such positions only with regard to grievances concerning dismissal or release from faculty duties; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

4. Part-time Faculty Positions with Nominal Rank These positions carry titles of "with rank of Part-time Instructor," "with rank of Part-time Assistant Professor," "with rank of Part-time Associate Professor," or "with rank of Part-time Professor". "Part-time" in the title may be replaced by "Adjunct" at the discretion of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This category includes those appointed by the University who perform only part-time teaching duties as well as those employed full- or part-time for other duties at the University who are also assigned part-time teaching duties. Normally, these positions carry instructional duties (teaching, service and professional growth) corresponding to less than half the instructional workload of a full-time faculty member. The University will make such appointments in a department or several departments, in the School of Music, or in a program. Appointments are made for a specified period, typically either for a semester or an academic year, and there is no guarantee of continued employment beyond the period specified. These positions are subject to the provisions of the Personnel Policies Sections IB-IE, IIA, VI, VII, and VIII (note: as the Personnel Policies are a document relating only to faculty, the Sections cited apply only to the faculty portion of an appointment). In addition, Section IX of the Personnel Policies applies to persons appointed to such positions only with regard to grievances concerning dismissal or release from faculty duties; Personnel Policies sections not specifically referenced above do not apply to persons holding these types of positions.

## **CURRENT HANDBOOK LANGUAGE**

### I. Appointment (article written by the administration)

#### A. Types

1. Tenure positions carry academic rank and may be or are held without limit of time, subject to specified conditions. They may support either a full or partial load of teaching.

2. Term positions carry academic or nominal rank and are held for a specified period of time (e.g., two years). Ordinarily, they support a full load of teaching, advising, and committee responsibilities. They may be renewable.

Some term appointments (directors of competence centers and librarians) support instructional and administrative responsibilities. These positions are made for fixed periods of time, renewable at the end of each period.

3. Part-time positions carry academic rank and are held for a particular semester. Ordinarily, they support one or two courses during that semester.

4. Administrative staff positions carry nominal rank and are held for a specified period of time. Ordinarily, they support administrative responsibilities but not a teaching load.

## **8. Old Business**

None

## **9. New Business**

A. Concerns about policy to require all students to buy laptop computers and phase out computer labs (S. Spiegelberg)

## **10. Announcements**

A. Report on progress of elections. (M. Rainbolt)

A motion to endorse the elections results as circulated was made by K. Kinney. The motion was seconded by B. Gourley. The motion was approved.

## **11. Adjournment**

### **Appendix:**

### **Current Handbook Language of Section V: Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status**

V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status (Article mutually agreed to by administration and faculty)

Decisions should express judgments about candidates' merit and service using the principle of equity, which considers each individual faculty member in terms of his or her unique talents, abilities, and accomplishments in relation to the criteria for personnel decisions, and quality. A large amount of activity per se does not necessarily contribute to a superior academic environment.

Criteria for possible dismissal (VI.A. below) are also applicable to decisions on faculty status.

Interim review. Required: effective teaching during the probationary period, satisfactory growth in the professional competence category, and contribution to school, department, or university programs.

Tenure decision. Required: effective teaching, including teaching in the school or department in which tenure will be granted, demonstrable achievement or unquestioned promise of accomplishment in the professional competence category; and contribution to school, department, or university programs.

Promotion to associate or full professor. Required: continued effectiveness of teaching; significant achievement or contribution in either professional competence or service to the school, department, or the University since the initial appointment to the preceding rank; and at least adequate performance in the other category.

A. Teaching effectiveness shall be considered paramount in all personnel decisions.

Candidates are required to provide broad-based and representative evidence of teaching effectiveness. Tenured faculty under consideration for promotion can satisfy this requirement most easily by providing complete sets of student evaluation for 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 enrolled in the course and 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) must 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. Candidates are required to show evidence in all of the following:

1. content and rigor (evidence to be drawn from course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, texts, other course materials, distribution of grades, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that courses meet scholarly standards and are offered at an appropriate level of difficulty);

2. teaching methods (evidence to be drawn from teaching philosophy, course goals, syllabi, examinations and assignments, other course materials, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that teaching methods are appropriate, given the contexts of discipline and topic and the specific characteristics of a given class);

3. effectiveness (evidence to be drawn from student evaluations, peer observations, self reports, etc.; evidence should demonstrate that the candidate has been successful in implementing her or his teaching methods, has treated students with professional fairness and integrity, and has established relations with students that are conducive to the learning process).

B. Professional growth shall be given full consideration in personnel decisions. Candidates are required to show evidence in the following; however, for (2) and (3), more in one category may compensate for less in the other.

1. Continued development of professional competence in the field(s) or discipline(s);

2. Professional contributions or scholarly outreach beyond the university community;

3. Intellectual liveliness within the university community.

C. Service to the school, department, and the University shall be considered in personnel decisions. Candidates are not required to show evidence in all or any one category unless there are special departmental requirements or responsibilities stated in the job description.

1. effective participation in school, department or university governance, including committee assignments;

2. effective participation in program development and resource acquisition within the school, department, or the University;

3. effective participation in curricular development for school, department, competence, special, or general education programs;

4. effective counseling and advising of individual students and student organizations related to academic life.

## Meeting of May 3, 2004

1. Call to Order - 4:00 p.m., Moore Theatre in the Performing Arts Center

2. Verification of Quorum -- number required for this semester 82

3. Approval of Previous Minutes

Approved.

4. Reports from Coordinating Committees

*Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (H. Pollack-Milgate)*

**A. Motion (to be voted on):**

To change the name of the Education Department to the "Department of Education Studies."

Motion approved.

**B. Motion (to be removed from the table):** To replace the current system of General Education distribution requirements ("the groups") with the following:

### GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS:

The general education distribution requirements ensure that all DePauw students are exposed to the challenge and excitement of a variety of academic disciplines, develop a range of intellectual skills that will contribute to success at DePauw and beyond, and are instilled with a persistent curiosity and desire for increased understanding of the world around them. In requiring breadth, the DePauw system encourages all students to explore unfamiliar academic territory. These requirements also help prepare them to make an informed choice about the fields in which they will major.

General notes: All requirements are to be met in full. No more than one course meeting the distribution requirements may be taken in any one program or department (inclusive of dual-subject departments).

CATEGORY I: Courses in the Arts and Humanities.

(3 credits required; at most 1 credit may be taken in artistic expression courses).

[Note: non-classroom work (e.g. newspaper, radio) does not count toward the fulfillment of this requirement]

CATEGORY II: Courses in Cultural Studies and the Social Sciences.

(3 credits required)

CATEGORY III: Courses in Science and Mathematics.

(2 credits required; at least one must be taken in a laboratory science course)

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Language Proficiency Requirement: This requirement may either be satisfied by a sufficiently high score on a language placement examination (placement beyond third-semester proficiency level) or by coursework. In the latter case, students must either satisfactorily complete a language

course at the third-semester proficiency level, or complete a one-semester program in a non-English speaking country and enroll in a minimum of two courses of different disciplines related to the location of the program.

Students whose first language is not English may be certified as meeting this requirement through the Office of the Registrar.

2. Physical Activities: Complete one half-credit Life Fitness course. [Note: These are courses covering a physical activity with class discussions of the health benefits of exercise.]

### **Discussion**

Motion to remove from the table approved with two dissenting votes.

Introductory remarks from Howard Pollack-Milgate: CAPP has worked on this proposal for two years. Ideas from everyone are incorporated, including minority viewpoints. The proposal is a product of the committee.

### **Comments and questions on the Language Proficiency requirement:**

Why wasn't a diversity requirement incorporated? (K. Ahlm)

Can a student meet requirements during a semester abroad program? If a student takes an ecology course in Denmark, does this meet the requirement? (D. Dudle) Yes, this has always been true but this option is rarely used. (J. Rambo)

How would this affect allocation of faculty resources? If two FTEs are required for the proposal, would this affect other departments? (M. McKelligan)

N. Abraham said 12 additional courses would be needed over one year to satisfy student needs. Resources will be allocated to meet needs. Of 30 term positions currently in place, two positions would meet this need. Part of the reallocation would shift positions from term to tenure-track. This would reduce flexibility in sabbatical leaves. Also, if students take more modern language courses, then enrollment would be lower elsewhere given conservation of students, so there will be lower demand elsewhere. The budget doesn't permit expansion of faculty.

Costs and benefits of issues such as staffing should be considered by faculty when voting. (H. Pollack-Milgate)

How many students have a third semester proficiency? (J. Bruggemann) H. Pollack-Milgate said 20% of students test into the third semester and 30% of students test into the second semester. These estimates are accounted for in estimates of staffing needs.

### **Comments and questions about the Life Fitness requirement:**

How are students with disabilities affected by this requirement? (D. Newman) This issue is addressed in the Americans with Disabilities Act. (K. Kirkpatrick)

Why is this a requirement, especially if there are non-academics teaching these courses? (D. Shannon)

Will ¼ credit courses be eliminated? Why don't we keep the whole menu of ¼ credit courses rather than have one specific course as a requirement? (W. Glauesser) T. Ball replied that the menu of courses would still exist but the courses would be supplemented by classroom

discussions about the holistic nature of well-being. Data show that students in this type of program continue with exercise throughout life.

D. Gellman said this involves a reduction in the total number of credits required for graduation, from 31 to 30.5.

How many new faculty would be needed? (T. Chiarella) No new faculty would be needed; courses would be taught by the existing coaching staff. (T. Ball)

J. George spoke in favor of T. Ball's statements.

### **Comments and questions about Categories I, II, and III:**

Several faculty members spoke in favor of the existing groups 3 and 4. The proposed changes do not have appropriate substitutions for these. The proposal involves a reduction in humanities with less literature, philosophy, and history. (C. Huffman, D. Shannon, T. Chiarella)

Members of CAPP (B. Stark and H. Pollack-Milgate) said that the justification for the proposal was that the faculty votes for a system with more general requirements, not specific requirements, so the categories are more general and open. The vote by the faculty was 2 to 1 in favor of the general plan so CAPP acted on this vote.

Double majors may be hurt by the "1 course per department". (P. Foss) H. Pollack-Milgate said perhaps fewer students will double major as a result of the proposal. However, high-GPA students that double major actually may take a diverse array of courses to meet requirements anyway.

Several faculty members spoke in favor of the lab science requirement. Others expressed concern about the lab science requirement (R. Henry, J. Stockton). The definition of lab science should be more specific and should include inquiry-based labs (J. Stockton). Several faculty members replied that the proposed changes will create an opportunity to design and teach more courses that are appropriate for non-science majors (J. Benedix, D. Dudle, E. Maycock).

### **Comments and questions about the "big picture"**

The curriculum is increasingly becoming rationalized. The consensus attitude supports sciences but humanities and arts are only supported in the university system. This is not a good time to cut history, philosophy and critical thinking. (I. Csicsery-Ronay)

We need science and literature in the curriculum. Students should read more, but we can't cannibalize other departments. (T. Chiarella)

Critical thinking should be in every course. This isn't being eliminated. (B. Stark)

Proposed categories I and II are setting up studio art vs. philosophy vs. literature. Can we discuss this further? (T. Good)

The science and language requirements are good, but there's not enough history, philosophy, and literature. (C. Huffman)

It's important to emphasize these ways of thinking here because there won't be any exposure elsewhere. (B. Calvert)

All classes start with historical and philosophical perspectives. Surveys of students show that they are in favor of the proposal; they like having more choices. Students currently don't have to take history and philosophy now. Critical thinking is part of every course. The proposal has flaws but no better solution is being proposed. (M. Kemp, student representative for CAPP)

Harvard is currently doing a General Education review, calling for more international studies and more science. CAPP's proposal is consistent with this. From the humanities, no strong and unified voices have contributed to the discussion. From the sciences and languages, strong and unified voices have contributed to the discussion. (H. Pollack-Milgate)

Vote by secret ballot. The motion is defeated. 53 yes, 70 no.

**Committee on Faculty** (K. Ahlm)

**A. Motion (to be tabled):** Revision of Section VI of Academic Handbook: Standards and Procedures for Termination: Release, Dismissal and Non-Reappointment

The link to the full text of the revision is as follows:

<http://www.depauw.edu/admin/acadaffairs/RevisedHandbookSectionVI4-29-04.pdf>

[Hard copies of this material were available at the faculty meeting.]

The motion to table was approved.

**B. Announcements**

The proposed teaching evaluations have been revised in response to comments. The evaluations now have a seven point scale, an option for "not applicable", and multiple questions are now covered as individual questions.

The fall reviews are complete. The spring reviews are still underway.

**Committee on Management of Academic Operations** (E. Wielenberg)

**A. Motion (to be removed from the table):**

That MATH 123 Computational Discrete Mathematics and MATH 223 Theory in Discrete Mathematics count for group 1 credit.

Motion approved.

**B. Motion (to be voted on):**

That Educ 292, Children's Literature, be deleted.

Motion approved.

**C. Announcements:**

1. Topics course approved for one-time group credit for fall 2004:  
Phil 206C, Individual and Society, group 4 credit

2. MAO has approved a request that two courses taught in the Vienna program be given .75 credit. This is a one-time approval only.

### **Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee (A. Dziubinskyj)**

#### Announcements

There were four vendors for laptops on campus. There is a website for comments and surveys ([www.depauw.edu/laptop](http://www.depauw.edu/laptop)). A decision on the vendors will be made on May 17. There will be an option for Macintosh computers.

The office of religious life is being reorganized. Concerns have been discussed with Vice President Lincoln. An associate chaplain will be hired. The job announcement has been posted. All efforts are being made to incorporate diverse religious needs in the reorganization. All groups will be accommodated in the new space.

## **5. Reports from Other Committees**

### **Faculty Development Committee (T. Hall)**

#### Announcements

No new Professional Development Fund applications will be accepted for 2003-04 but new proposals will be accepted beginning July 1, 2004. All awarded funds will be honored.

The committee, in conjunction with Academic Vice President Neal Abraham will be re-examining professional development fund limits and professional conference funds, with an eye to decreasing professional conference funds.

Spacing of awards: Summer stipends in all categories: 1 award in every two years in each category; only one application per faculty member per year. Summer research: 1 award per year; applications need to specify how faculty member and student will benefit from the project.

The committee is revising the forms. The form will be shortened to one page of check-off boxes. There will be specific short page limits for all applications. The goals are (1) to level the playing field; (2) to facilitate comparisons on FDC; and (3) to provide practice for writing outside grants that have exceedingly strict page limits.

### **Committee on Administration (M. McKelligan)**

#### Announcements

There will be no premium increase for health care. There will be an increase in co-payments but this increase will not be burdensome.

Recommendations on raises will be considered soon.

## **6. Remarks from the Vice President for Academic Affairs**

There were no comments sent regarding the revision of Section I: Appointments in the Personnel Policies, so this revision will be added to the Academic Handbook; it does not require faculty vote.

### **A. Revised Motion proposed by Administration (to be removed from the table)**

The text of this motion appears at this web address:

<https://www.depauw.edu/admin/acadaffairs/RevisedHazelMotion4-5-04.pdf>

[Hard copies of this material were available at the faculty meeting.]

Motion to remove from table approved with dissenting votes.

## Discussion on amendment #1

Page 11 of the handout: footnote 2 is a definition of terminal degrees. This would replace the professional competence definition. This is intended to be a clarification, not a change. Occasionally someone may be hired with exceptional experience despite the lack of a terminal degree. (N. Abraham)

Approval of amendment #1: motion made by V. Ziegler, seconded by A. Evans

Friendly amendment proposed by T. Good: add Master of Fine Arts in theater practice, playwriting or acting as appropriate terminal degrees.

Amendment #1 approved by vote.

## Discussion on amendment #2

Amendment #2 on page 12 of the handout: sufficient evidence should be provided in reviews. How should "sufficient" be defined? Why not identify more specific types of evidence? The proposed change is to incorporate course evaluations from 12 complete courses. This change would allow the evidence to be more broad-based.

If we re-teach the same course twelve times, can we put in only evaluations from this one course? Why don't we put in complete sets from specific semesters instead? (M. McKelligan)

Won't the size of the review file increase? Won't this make the files more unwieldy? (T. Chiarella)

We don't need "more" but we need "consistency" in the reviews. (A. Evans)

It's important to differentiate tenure candidates (probationary) and promotion candidates. Promotion candidates are already tenured and don't need specific guidelines. It's good to let have faculty members have more choices (K. Ahlm)

Motion to table amendment #2. Move to table, seconded, approved by vote.

## Discussion of main motion with amendment #1

Why is the wording on page 1 changes from "decision" to "recommendation"? Does this take power away from COF? Why does the wording on page 1 include both "quantity" and "quality"? Why is "quantity" a criterion? (K. Menzel)

The President makes the "decision" based on the "recommendation" from COF. Quantity and quality are both important. For example, if someone has one advisee and does a fantastic job, this is good, but it's important to have more than one advisee. (N. Abraham)

Motion to table discussion until fall. (E. Edberg)

The implication is that another year would go by before these changes would affect incoming faculty. We would go by the criteria in the far left column.

Motion to table approved by vote.

## B. Other Announcements from the VPAA.

Data were presented on deciles of faculty salaries. Summer stipends were not included in these numbers.

## **7. Remarks from the President**

The following are decisions on promotion and tenure cases considered in Spring 2004 for which Dr. Bottoms accepted the recommendations of the Committee on Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Masha Belyavski-Frank, Modern Languages (Russian): Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Eric Edberg, Music: Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Susan Hahn, English: Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Jeff Hansen, Chemistry: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Sunil Sahu, Political Science: Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Dan Shannon, Philosophy: Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Steve Timm, Communication: Promotion to Professor effective 2004-2005

Dennis Trinkle, History: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor effective 2004-2005

Report on the Board of Trustees meeting

There has been a market decline in the endowment. Solutions to balance the budget in previous years have been to cut the budget or to raise tuition. The board will not consider spending the endowment. The board does recognize the importance of salary increases for the faculty. The goal is to do more fundraising. President Bottoms is not announcing a campaign but will spend more time to address fundraising issues. Changes are being made in the administration to allow President Bottoms to have more time for fundraising. Neal Abraham's title has been changed from Academic Vice President to Executive Vice President; he will take on more responsibilities with this change in title. Paul Hartman's title has changed from Vice President for Development to Secretary of the University; his primary responsibility will be fundraising. Lisa Hollander is the new Vice President for Development. Dennis Trinkle is the new Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Coordinator of Information Services.

The admissions process is complete. The incoming Class of 2008 has a median 3.69 grade point average, a 1230 SAT and 27 ACT and their median rank is the top 10% of their high school class. The new students will be coming from 36 states and 6 countries. Forty-seven percent are from Indiana. As of May 2, 684 deposits have been received. The deposit amount is \$400. Admissions is considering raising the deposit because students sometimes place deposits at multiple universities.

## **8. Old Business**

None

## **9. New Business**

None

**A. Motion to confer degrees:**

That the faculty authorize the Board of Trustees to confer degrees on candidates eligible for graduation at the conclusion of the May 2004 semester.

Moved and seconded. Motion approved by vote.

**B. Motion: that the faculty show strong support for the provision of 2 platforms - PC and Macintosh - in the new laptop initiative (S. Spiegelberg)**

Motion withdrawn based on comments from D. Trinkle, indicate that support for both platforms - PC and MacIntosh - will be included in the new laptop initiative.

**C. Endorsement of results of divisional and general elections (M. Rainbolt)**

Moved and seconded. Motion approved by vote. Send names of committee chairs to M. Rainbolt.

**10. Announcements**

A. Support for TIAA-CREF resolution calling on Freeport management to end its financial payments to the Indonesian military until the armed forces cooperate with an ongoing U.S. FBI investigation related to the August 2002 ambush on Freeport's mining road. (E. Silverman)

Announcement withdrawn due to complications.

**11. Adjournment**