

DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes
October 10, 2016

1. Call to Order – 4 p.m. Union Building Ballroom

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 by the Chair Howard Brooks.

The meeting opened with memorial tribute to former faculty member Dr. Donald White. Professor Craig Paré shared the following words:

A past colleague of ours, Donald H. White passed away on October 4 in Colorado Springs at the age of 95. Even though his tenure at DePauw was well before my time, I had the honor of becoming friends with him around the time his wife Rosalie passed away in July 2001.

Born February 28, 1921 in Narberth, Pennsylvania, Don studied music education at Temple University and composition at the Philadelphia Conservatory.

Don served in World War II as a navigator on B-17s and was awarded the Air Medal and two Oak Leaf Clusters for "exceptionally meritorious achievement while participating in 15 separate bomber combat missions over enemy occupied continental Europe." He was shot down on March 26, 1944 on his 19th mission over Germany/France (bombing V-2 rocket emplacements in Pas de Calais area in Northern France), was captured and held in a prison camp for 13 months. He was captured by German troops and imprisoned in Stalag Luft III for the final 13 months of the war, being liberated in April 1945 by Patton's Third Army. He was honorably discharged from active duty in December 1945.

In 1947, after earning his Master's degree and PhD in music composition from the Eastman School of Music, Don joined the DePauw faculty, and served as chairman of composition and theory studies from 1948-81, spending four years (1974-1978) leading the School of Music. He left DePauw to chair the music department at Central Washington University in Ellensburg, Washington, serving from 1981-90.

Don composed many works for orchestra, chamber, band and vocal performance. The works I remember that he was most proud of for winds and percussion included his *Lyric Suite* for Euphonium, which is still today a staple of that instrument's solo repertoire, *Tetra Ergon* for bass trombone, writing this piece for the eminent trombonist of the Philadelphia Orchestra and later conductor of the Minnesota Orchestra, Henry Charles Smith, his *Miniature Set for Band*, by which many of us have come to know Donald White's musical language, and *Patterns for Band*. I have to tell you that many of us learned, in middle school in the mid-60s, about the *Miniature Set for Band* that "those high schoolers got to play".

I once asked him what his personal favorite band composition was and he told me that *Patterns for Band* held a special place for him because, as he told me, every note, motive, melody, and musical gesture comes from the first four notes of the piece. On another visit, he told me that his collection of songs, *From the Navajo Children* for chorus and wind ensemble, was especially close to him because he'd composed it on a much-needed sabbatical to the Southwest United States, and that the premiere took place here at DePauw. And, it was also my privilege to play and record his *Concertino for Timpani, Winds, and Percussion*. Don was always appreciative of the interest we showed in his music, and was always gracious in hinting what the next piece should be that we should play or record☺

Don and Rosalie loved Greencastle, building a house one summer on Highridge Avenue, which is still there – down Arlington, right on Highridge as if you're headed to the McKim Observatory, and Don's home is the first on the left. And, with Don's daughter Barb and her family here in town, he loved coming back to see

them twice each year. As of fifteen years ago, it wasn't a late May or late December if I didn't get a call . . . "Hi, Craig - Don White here – have you got some time?" I didn't EVER not have the time—not if I could spend it with my friend Don.

Not only was it a privilege to get to know him personally, but I am proud that one of our 2008 DePauw graduates, Adam Hilkert, decided to devote his graduate research to Don and his music. Adam's Master's thesis from Indiana University of Pennsylvania with Dr. Jack Stamp was on Don's music for band, and Adam is currently preparing (while in the United States Army Band's conducting program) his doctoral dissertation at George Mason University on Don's *From the Navajo Children* – an unpublished piece. Adam wrote, "Don was a gifted composer and educator, who had a profound impact on my life. I am eternally grateful to have developed a friendship with him over the past several years, and I will miss him very much."

I'd like to finish with two short anecdotes that Don would tell me over lunch at the Double Decker or Mama Nunz. The great American composer Vincent Persichetti was traveling to DePauw for his residency in the contemporary composers series. He was lost, around Rts.36 and 231, so he stopped at a payphone (imagine that!) and called Don's house. "Don, are you there?" "Well, I'm talking to you, aren't I?" And, another great composer, Howard Hanson (mind you, Don, studied with both of these esteemed gentlemen), was enjoying a long, long night of drinks and stories following a final concert of his music here at DePauw. "Don – come over, I need you" was a call Don received around 3:30am that morning. Don went to the room Howard Hanson was staying in on campus to find him in his "skivvies" (at this point in the story, it was difficult to distinguish from the rest of the story because Don was laughing so hard I couldn't understand half of what he was saying!). I gathered that with an hour and a half to spare, Hanson had lost track of time and had to get to Indianapolis to catch a plane, trying to pack all of the materials and scores he'd brought with him. I'd be willing to bet that both composers are having a great laugh together over this story right now☺

It was my privilege to get to know Donald White, and I will remember, along with his wonderful music, the man, the teacher, and the mentor.

Thank you.

2. Verification of quorum

Howard Brooks confirmed that the quorum was met, approximately 100 faculty were present.

3. Consent Agenda

There was no request to move anything from the consent agenda to a regular item of business. The consent agenda was approved.

A. Minutes from the September 12, 2016 Faculty Meeting

B. Courses satisfying Privilege, Power and Diversity (PPD) or International Experience (IE)

HIST 100B Sex and Society in Modern America (Rowley) PPD Offering

Honor Scholar 300Cb War and Society (Seaman) PPD Offering

HONR 102A: FYS Divided Cities (Finney) IE offering

FREN 202: Intermediate French II (CJ Gomolka), PPD Offering

ML 295 Holocaust and Exile in Film (Aures), PPD Offering

GER 314 Fussball is unser Leben (Aures) IE Offering

HONR 102 Managing the Chinese Empire (Mou) IE Offering

ENG 255B, African American Women Playwrights (Geis) PPD offering

MUS 390, Music and the Vietnam War (Harbert) PPD Offering

ML 324, Reading Russian (Hristova) IE Catalog

ENG 315 Language, Writing and Power (Stasik) PPD Catalog

C. Approval of a new course

FREN 302, Discussing Difference: Diversity in Postcolonial France (1 course, PPD)

Reports from Core Committees

4. Faculty Priorities and Governance (Glen Kuecker)

Since the last faculty meeting, Governance faculty have asked the committee to look into the process that led to the Class Dean decision. We looked into the issue and a short report on what we learned is in the written announcements for today's meeting agenda. The committee is exploring the faculty governance structure to add clarity to reporting and transparency within the committee structure.

In the written announcements, the committee reported that we are working on enhancing shared governance with our main focus being on faculty voice in recruitment, review and retention of senior administrators whose responsibilities intersect with the academic mission of the university. The committee met with President McCoy this past Friday, and we had a productive discussion about regularizing faculty voice in administrative reviews. We agreed to the basic contours for what guidelines might look like, and we hope to reach a formal agreement in the months ahead.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee gave advance notice to the faculty for changes in the Academic Handbook pertaining to the membership of the committee to be voted on at the November faculty meeting.

Changes to the Membership of the Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee in the Academic Handbook

~~Deleted language struck through~~, **additions in bold italics**

2. Membership.

Faculty membership: One (1) representative from the Core Faculty Committees: Curricular Policy and Planning, Faculty Personnel Policy and Review, Faculty Development, and Student Academic Life; ~~two(2)~~ **three(3)** directly elected faculty members **including one representative for the School of Music** and the Chair of the Faculty, for a total of **eight (8)** faculty members. ~~All representatives serve for two years to facilitate continuity on the committee.~~

Administrative members: Ex officio (without vote): ~~Chair of Chairs.~~ **None**

Student members: None.

Rationale:

Adding School of Music representative to the committee

The past academic year, Governance Committee, Review Committee, the School of Music, and the administration (VPAA and President Elect) engaged in a series of conversations about School of Music governance that pertained to potential changes to the Academic Handbook. A topic within the conversations frequently involved the general relationship between the School of Music and College of Liberal Arts, and particularly the dynamics of governance and shared governance between the two schools. One outcome the conversations was agreement that the School of Music needs to have representation and participation in university governance. Agreement centered on the idea of having a representative for, and preferably from the School of Music on the Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee.

Change to ex-officio member from Chair of Chairs

The existing policy states that the Chair of Chairs is an *ex-officio* committee member. That membership is intended to facilitate and enhance communication between department and program chairs and the committee. While the committee values this measure and does not seek to do away with it, the committee recognizes the redundancy in representation given that the Chair of the Faculty attends both Governance and Department and Program Chairs meetings. In the interest of efficiency and reduced work load, the committee recommends allowing the Chair of Faculty to represent Department and Program Chairs on the committee.

Written Announcements –

Responding to faculty requests for information about the process that led to the formation of the new class dean system, the committee looked into who the decision came about. Our findings indicate that the administration worked with both Student Academic Life Committee and the Advising Committee. A working group wrote a report that endorsed the idea, and following that input the administration acted to implement the program. These consultations and work appear to have happened during the second half of the spring semester. Governance finds that there was consultation between the administration and faculty on this decision, and the faculty did have a voice through two of its committees. However, Governance also finds that there was inadequate reporting out to the general faculty that these consultations were happening, and the general faculty did not have the opportunity to learn of the changes and share their concerns or support. To remedy this breakdown in governance, the committee reminds all committees of the importance of reporting out to the general faculty about their agendas, especially when work might involve substantive changes to items pertaining to the university’s academic mission. A key part of reporting out is knowing which committees to report to, especially ad hoc committees, and to actually report out the overseeing committee. Reporting out also may include: providing written notice to faculty meeting agendas, verbal reports at faculty meetings, the posting of meeting minutes on the university webpage, and communicating with the Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee. We remind each committee chair that standing committees need to file an annual report with the Chair of the Faculty in May. Governance notes that we all want to trust the good work of our committees and working groups, but remind all that transparency and communication is an important foundation for that trust.

This semester, Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee is working on several agenda items. We continue with last year’s conversations with the administration about shared governance. In particular, we are working on formalizing faculty voice in the recruitment, review, and retention of senior administrators whose work pertains to the academic mission of the university. We also anticipate conversations with the administration about better defining university confidentiality policies. The committee is continuing last year’s work on enhancing School of Music governance, and is working with the Chair of the Faculty, VPAA, and Dean of the School of Music on Handbook Changes, including today’s advance note about adding a School of Music representative to the committee. The committee also hopes to work on how issues like faculty salaries and benefits are discussed with the administration now that the COA no longer exists.

5. Curricular Policy and Planning (John Caraher)

Our work in developing a new process for requesting faculty positions continues and is approaching a milestone. As a reminder, the broad outline of the plan is that we begin with a general call for departments and programs interested in a position giving some basic information – title, what is prompting the request, very brief statements of the impact of the position in the classroom and on scholarly and creative engagement with a national or international community outside DePauw, and a list of other DPU departments and programs that might benefit from the position. This is all very preliminary – if you think you might have a position request for someone who might teach cross-listed courses with another department, for instance, we do not require that you’ve explored this in any depth with your colleagues. We will just want a sense of what you see as the possibilities. These things will be entered on what we call the “short form” online, roughly 3 pages of material.

The most important thing for everyone to know, and which is the heart of the short form, is that you will also be required to submit between 5 and 7 “value statements” regarding the proposed position. You should think of these in terms of hiring criteria. These ideally would be elements that the potential members of a search committee could agree upon as characteristics of a successful candidate for the position. These ideally would also represent some kind of consensus within the department or program, and we expect the most time-consuming element of the process will be coming to an agreement on these statements. We also expect hiring committees to adhere to whatever guidelines emerge. If it is important to your department that the candidate be a PhD graduate of a top-10 graduate program in your field, that criterion should be in there. This is in the spirit of transparency and inclusion.

It should be noted that we expect these to be subject to negotiation and refinement over the course of developing a full-fledged proposal for a position, so it is not necessary for these to be in their final, perfected form when submitting an initial request for a position.

The next chairs meeting will be an occasion for sharing more details of how this process will work.

We would also like you to consider attending the Oct. 25 open meeting. The purpose of the open meeting is to aid our committee in developing our own “value statements” for evaluating requests for tenure lines. While we could certainly develop our own lists of what we think the university should value in considering requests for precious faculty positions, the committee felt strongly that buy-in from the faculty at large is important to the integrity of the process. Under the old system, there was an annual process by which CAPP would draft instructions to chairs and to RAS outlining what criteria would be applied in ranking requests. This was always challenging for chairs, CAPP and RAS – the criteria might shift depending on who was on which committee in a given year, and despite the best efforts of RAS it could be challenging for departments to understand why a proposal would fare well one year and poorly the next. Our hope is that CP&P can offer a more stable set of criteria, as well as to move away from an annual sweepstakes toward a more cooperative, developmental model that facilitates long-term planning, and we think an important part of creating such a model is identifying better what priorities in hiring our faculty most value. Ideally, this meeting will have a very concrete product – 5-7 “value statements” that we can apply to evaluate a request for a tenure line, functioning in a manner largely parallel to the way we expect departments and programs apply their value statements as hiring criteria.

Proposed changes to the World Literature Minor

CP&P gives advance notice of a motion to be voted on at the November faculty meeting:

That the faculty approve the following changes to the World Literature minor:

There is a change to the core courses (deletions in ~~striketrough~~, additions in **bold**):

CORE COURSES

~~ENG 151 and ENG 250. FREN 327, GER 307, or SPAN 335 may be substituted for ENG 151.~~

WLIT 205 (ENG 250)

Rationale for change: One primary aspect of this course is to survey world literature and introduce students to diverse conceptions and forms of literature from a range of cultures and traditions. We can offer the course twice a year and it can be taught by faculty from programs and departments affiliated with world literature. Therefore, substitutions are no longer necessary.

There are additions to Other Required Courses (additions **in bold**):

Three courses from:

Courses in literature taught in English: ASIA 281, ASIA 282, CLST 100, **ENG 151, ENG 161, ENG 171, ENG 181, ENG 191**, ENG 261, ENG 396, M L 194, M L 227, M L 260, M L 264, M L 326. The following seminars and topics courses may count when the topic is literature in translation: ASIA 197, ASIA 290, ASIA 390, ENG 197, ENG 255, ENG 390, ENG 391, ENG 392, M L 197, M L 295, M L 395, **WLIT 215, WLIT 315**, ENG 460.

Courses in literature taught in another language: LAT 224, LAT 341, SPAN 442, SPAN 444. The following topics courses taught in another language may count when the topic is literature: CHIN 269, FREN 401, GER 411, GER 412, GRK 205, GRK 452, ITAL 375, LAT 223, LAT 332, RUS 324, SPAN 390.

Rationale for change: ENG 151, ENG 161, ENG 171, ENG 181, ENG 191 are introductory courses imparting essential concepts of literary and cultural studies. ENG 151 was previously offered as a substitute for ENG 250/WLIT 205 (see above). WLIT 215 and WLIT 315 are core topics courses with the flexibility to address current critical interests. ENG 460, an independent studies course, will count towards the minor if the topic of the course is world literature.

Proposed changes to BME degree

CP&P gives advance notice of a motion to be voted on at the November faculty meeting of the following changes to the BME degree requirements:

1. Require that all BME students complete one Extended Studies internship in a secondary school

Rationale: In order to incorporate two 21CM courses and the NASM-prescribed percentage of CLA classes and expectation of elective options for students pursuing the BME, *MUS 375: Field Experience* was removed from the degree requirements in the 21CM music education curriculum. Given that our students are licensed to teach grades P-12, they must have sufficient pre-service field experiences at each developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle school, and high school). At present they have extended field experiences at the early childhood level (within *MUS 262: Music in Early Childhood*), elementary level (within *MUS 351: Elementary General Music*), and either the middle or high school level (within *MUS 352: Secondary Vocal Music* or *MUS 354: Elementary and Secondary Instrumental Materials*). Adding this Extended Studies internship in the secondary schools ensures that students have sufficient field experiences at all four developmental levels as is required by our state accrediting body, the Indiana Department of Education. Approving this proposal means that if a student completes an Extended Studies internship at the middle school level, he/she will complete field experience at the high school level in *MUS 352* or *MUS 354*.

2. Require that instrumental/general BME students study both applied bassoon and oboe (1/2 semester of study on each instrument)

Rationale: This proposed change is the same requirement as was in the pre-21CM music education curriculum. The current language in the 21CM curriculum is "bassoon or

oboe.” While students enroll in *Woodwind Techniques*, the class content does not cover double reeds. Instrumental music teachers need experience with both bassoon and oboe.

Consistency in naming “PPD”

The official catalog language, reflecting the proposal approved by the faculty, refers to a “Privilege, Power and Diversity” requirement, often referred to by the acronym “PPD.” However, the term more commonly used to refer to this requirement puts “Power” first, which seems quite appropriate given the subject matter.

CP& P gives advance notice of a motion to be voted on at the November faculty meeting:

To change the catalog language to reflect what has proven the more common parlance.

Graduation Requirements, Fall 2016

*These requirements apply to students entering Fall 2016 and after. They include two new distribution requirements: International Experience and ~~Privilege, Power~~ **Power, Privilege and Diversity**.*

~~PRIVILEGE, POWER~~ POWER, PRIVILEGE AND DIVERSITY

Students earn one course credit in courses that have as a major component the analysis of the interplay of power and privilege in human interactions. Such courses will frequently focus on the experience of non-dominant members of political or social groups. They might also emphasize the dynamics of inequality from a more theoretical perspective.

There were no questions or discussion from the faculty.

6. Faculty Personnel Policy and Review (Meryl Altman)

The Review committee wishes to thank those who have been reviewing files and writing reports. An onerous and important task. We’re finishing up the chair recommendations and will be starting to review tenure files soon.

POLICY CHANGE – FDC reports in decision files.

This is some business from last year. It comes from the Review Committee and the Faculty Development Committee, who worked together on the idea and the wording for many, many meetings.

The motion is about the relationship between decision files (reviewed for promotion and tenure) and faculty development awards: pre-tenure leaves, sabbatical leaves, and competitive awards such as faculty fellowships. Currently proposals and reports on such awards simply go to and from the faculty member and the Faculty Development Committee; some people include them in decision files, as a record of what they did, but many people don’t. If the change is adopted, these proposals and reports would become part of the decision file for interim, tenure, and promotion reviews. (They will be automatically placed there, along with response from the Faculty Development committee.)

This would take effect with awards granted in 2017-2018 (next year).

The basic rationale for the change is that how we do it now is weird. Especially where it currently says, “In particular, major projects funded by the Faculty Development Committee ought to have criteria that allow, and encourage, the work be included for evaluation in the review file.”

What does this even mean?

The awards are important, and not including them creates gaps in the candidate's narrative of their development. Currently some people include that material and others don't, which also seems unsatisfactory.

When I brought this last month, we thought the single policy change required three amendments to the handbook, but the parliamentarian has ruled that only one modification is required to make the change – it's listed on your agenda under "third change." So I'm moving that, what it says under "third change."

Under Personnel Policies

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

B. Preparation of Decision File.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs may transfer to the decision file materials from the candidate's personnel file deemed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to be relevant to the review as stipulated in [Article III.E](#). The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file the following required materials for the review of faculty members not holding tenure as specified in [Article II](#): the faculty member's annual reports, the chair's or dean's responses to the annual reports, peer observations, ~~and~~ student opinion forms, **and all documents written for funded competitive, sabbatical, and pre-tenure leave awards. Award materials placed in the file will include the proposal, the report, and the response from the Faculty Development Committee.** The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file the following required materials for the review of faculty members for promotion not linked to a tenure review: the student opinion forms from the last eighteen full credit courses (or equivalent), or all courses taught during the review period, if fewer than eighteen, **and all documents written for funded competitive, sabbatical, and pre-tenure leave awards. Award materials placed in the file will include the proposal, the report, and the response from the Faculty Development Committee.** Notification of the placement of these funded awards in the candidate review files will be stated on the Faculty Development application form.

Question from faculty member: Does the entire committee write the letter of feedback to the applicant, since it will go into the file?

Response from Susan Anthony (chair of the Faculty Development Committee): Since it will be a part of the permanent file we do want to be consistent. usually individuals would respond due to the volume of reports. We are discussing how we might do this.

Question from faculty member: Clarification on all documents written. Does this include the finished product? We sometimes submit several documents with lots of artifacts.

Response from Meryl Altman: It seems likely that you can put all of it in there, but we don't need to see all your data.

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Prof. Altman, for the Review Committee also moved:

Under Bylaws, VIII, C. Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee, delete the last sentence:

The Faculty Personnel Policy and Review and the Faculty Development committees must work in concert. Personnel expectations, particularly shifts in expectations, must be supported through faculty development

programs. Additionally, since faculty development awards represent teaching, creative and scholarly endeavors of faculty members, the committees must regularly confer about the implications of new and existing faculty development programs in the review process. ~~In particular, major projects funded by the Faculty Development Committee ought to have criteria that allow, and encourage, the work be included for evaluation in the review file. (See Article VIII. D.1.)~~

The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Prof. Altman then shared details about student input into the decision file. Starting next year, we're going to make two small mechanical changes to the mechanisms that bring student input to decision files. Both of these changes are in response to some feedback from students, for which we are very grateful.

The first has to do with solicitation of student letters that become part of the decision file.

At present, students are encouraged to write letters that become part of the file in three ways. There's an ad in the DePauw; departments may obtain a list of students, and solicit letters from them with a form letter; or, the candidate can solicit letters directly from students.

Starting with next year's reviews, we're going to stop the practice of people soliciting their own letters; instead, ask them to submit names to a neutral party (probably Carol) who will send out a form letter to some percentage of the names, as well as to a fixed percentage of the candidate's students overall. This is to avoid the perception of putting the student, and also the candidate, in an awkward position, especially for the candidate's current students and current advisees.

We're also going to standardize the process for generating names to ask, rather than leaving it up to each department what to do (and how many names to send to) ... I'll be exploring with the chairs what would and wouldn't work well.

The second change is to the student opinions survey. We're going to stop collecting the demographic data on the SOS forms. There was a student perception that this compromised confidentiality. This was an ethical issue and also a practical one: possibly concerns about confidentiality were one reason the quantity and quality of comments on these surveys has been less than we would like.

Written Announcements – None

7. Faculty Development (Susan Anthony)

- A. FDC is considering new PPD initiatives for this year, so we not be soliciting applications for the Triad or Innovation grants. Instead, FDC will announce new initiatives for PPD funding at the November faculty meeting.
- B. The award recipient of the Fisher Fellowship is David Gellman.

Written Announcements –

#1 Announcement from David Alvarez, GLCA Liaison

DePauw has so far benefited from \$53,858 in funding from the GLCA Global Crossroads grant program. Thanks to the initiative of our faculty and staff, global education at DePauw is moving forward through projects that support pedagogy, research, and faculty/student research. The range of funded projects include international collaborative efforts in support of Global Health, as well as a campus-wide initiative on "Global Citizenship and the Liberal Arts: Theory and Practice" that aims to clarify and strengthen how we

teach about global issues through an international conference, a scholarship-based task force on international education, and an IE pedagogy workshop in May.

This is, of course, only the beginning. DePauw is doubling down on the GLCA Global Crossroads grant. While we await new deadlines from the GLCA for this year's grant cycle, we're putting in place a new webpage with an easy-to-understand overview of the program, examples of successful applications, tools to find collaborators, and a one-click application process. Since we did not max out on the available funds from last year, there is even more money to support your projects this year. To open up a world of funding possibilities, point your web browser in this direction: <http://glca.org/program-menu/global-crossroads>

#2 Upcoming FDC deadlines:

Sabbatical/Pre-Tenure Leave applications due on October 26th

Fisher Course Reassignment applications due on November 2nd.

8. Student Academic Life (Tim Good)

Student Academic Life gave advanced notice to approve changes to the Classroom Atmosphere Policy at the November 2016 faculty meeting.

Proposed change to the Academic Handbook regarding the Classroom Atmosphere Policy

In the Academic Handbook this policy is found under Academic Policies, VIII. Classroom Atmosphere Deleted language struck through, new language *in bold italics*.

Classroom Atmosphere

Exchange of Ideas during Class

At DePauw University, academic discourse within the framework of our courses is of fundamental importance and faculty members should work to provide and maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students. We strive to encourage the free exchange of ideas always in an environment of respect and civil discourse. Inappropriate comments or behavior can sometimes seriously undermine that environment. For example, while students and faculty are encouraged to debate ideas and offer differing viewpoints, even when these exchanges are uncomfortable, they should recognize that personal attacks are unacceptable. ***The use or misuse of technology can also impact the ability to exchange ideas during class and faculty members generally have discretion to set guidelines for, and restrictions on, the use of technology during class. See Appendix A of this policy for additional information, including limitations on the faculty member's broad discretion.***

Use of Technology during Class

~~Faculty members generally have discretion to set guidelines for, and restrictions on, the use of technology during class, with the goals of supporting learning while also minimizing distractions for all students. Expectations will naturally vary from course to course, instructor to instructor, and even from class period to class period based on differences in teaching and learning objectives. In many cases, faculty members will choose to allow students to use technology, but will limit this use to activities that support the learning process. In other cases, for example to minimize distraction, instructors may implement additional restrictions on the use of technology. In each case, faculty members may find it helpful to explain their expectations as part of the course outline or in other ways. Students will benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations in this area, just as they benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations with respect to attendance, academic integrity, and other policies.~~

Notes: There are two exceptions to the broad discretion given to faculty members above.

- (a) ~~The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) gives students the right to use assistive technology or a suitable alternative if this has been determined to be an appropriate accommodation for their disability. ADA procedures require that such accommodations be reached by the campus ADA coordinator in consultation with the student and that they be communicated in writing to the instructor with the student's consent. Instructors may work with students and the ADA coordinator to determine the most effective way to implement the accommodation. Whenever possible, students should be allowed to use the assistive technology without disclosing their disability. For advice and guidance please consult with DePauw's ADA Coordinator.~~
- (b) ~~DePauw University uses an electronic notification system to distribute campus emergency alerts via text messages. When class policies require phones to be stored out of sight and/or reach during class, phones should still be set to vibrate. Emergency messages will cause multiple phones to vibrate at nearly the same time.~~

(Note: this section is moved down to Appendix A)

Resolving Conflicts

In addition to this Classroom Atmosphere Policy, DePauw University has other policies and protocols for reporting and resolving some types of incidents. In particular, individuals who have concerns that may involve harassment, should review the University Harassment Policy. Similarly, individuals who have concerns that may involve bias should review the University Bias Incident Reporting Protocol. Other classroom atmosphere concerns are best addressed through this Classroom Atmosphere Policy. In some cases, it may be difficult for a person with a concern to categorize the nature of the incident. In addition, some incidents may span categories. Such difficulties should not dissuade individuals from reporting a concern using any of these policies and protocols. Individuals who are uncertain of which policy to use should follow the steps below.

Frank yet respectful informal discussions between faculty members and students are the preferred response to problems that are covered by ~~this policy~~ ***the Classroom Atmosphere Policy***. However, each case is different and given these complexities faculty members or students who have concerns may wish to seek advice, as outlined below, to prepare for these discussions or to take other steps.

I. Options for Students

1. ~~Students may consult with~~ ***Get advice from*** resources including faculty advisors, department chairs, or staff members in a variety of offices including Student Life, Academic Life, Multicultural Student Services, International Student Services and the Women's Center ~~to seek advice informally~~. Based on their judgment, these staff members may consult with, or encourage students to consult with, the Dean of the Faculty or the Dean of Academic Life. Students may also consult informally with either of these Deans as a first step.
2. ~~Students are encouraged to provide~~ ***Provide*** their input using the student opinion form that is administered at the end of the semester in almost all DePauw courses. When students feel comfortable doing so, they are also encouraged to talk with faculty members in person, either during the semester or after the course ends.
3. ~~DePauw has~~ ***File*** a formal grade grievance policy that may be applicable ***if applicable***, depending on the nature of the student's concern. See www.depauw.edu/handbooks/academic/policies/grievance/
4. ~~Students may file~~ ***File*** a formal complaint by submitting a signed letter to the Dean of the Faculty during the semester, or at any time after the course concludes.

When concerns are raised, Academic Affairs Administration will be responsible for follow-up, if warranted, which could include informal mentoring; formal improvement plans; faculty development opportunities; documentation placed in personnel files with a copy to the faculty member; and/or consideration during the annual re-appointment, renewal and compensation processes, which could have employment ramifications. Any necessary follow-up will be undertaken in accordance with DePauw' personnel procedures (see: www.depauw.edu/handbooks/academic/personnel/). Actions taken through these procedures are typically confidential.

II. Steps for Faculty Members

Faculty members may wish to consult with the student's academic advisor, the Department Chair, and/or a designated member of ~~Academic Affairs~~ **Student Academic Life** (currently the Dean of Academic Life), even at the stage of informal interventions. If informal measures are unsuccessful, faculty members should follow these procedures:

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

6. A pattern of disruptive behavior in several courses may be addressed by representatives of the offices of Academic Affairs and Student **Academic** Life.

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

Appendix A: Use of Technology during Class

Faculty members generally have discretion to set guidelines for, and restrictions on, the use of technology during class, with the goals of supporting learning while also minimizing distractions for all students. Expectations will naturally vary from course to course, instructor to instructor, and even from class period to class period based on differences in teaching and learning objectives. In many cases, faculty members will choose to allow students to use technology, but will limit this use to activities that support the learning process. In other cases, for example to minimize distraction, instructors may implement additional restrictions on the use of technology. In each case, faculty members may find it helpful to explain their expectations as part of the course outline or in other ways. Students will benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations in this area, just as they benefit from a clear statement of faculty expectations with respect to attendance, academic integrity, and other policies.

Notes: There are two exceptions to the broad discretion given to faculty members above.

- (a) The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) gives students the right to use assistive technology or a suitable alternative if this has been determined to be an appropriate accommodation for their disability. ADA procedures require that such accommodations be reached by the campus ADA coordinator in consultation with the student and that they be communicated in writing to the instructor with the student's consent. Instructors may work with students and the ADA coordinator to determine the most effective way to implement the accommodation. Whenever possible, students should be allowed to use the assistive technology without disclosing their disability. For advice and guidance please consult with DePauw's ADA Coordinator.**
- (b) DePauw University uses an electronic notification system to distribute campus emergency alerts via text messages. When class policies require phones to be stored out of sight and/or reach during class, phones should still be set to vibrate. Emergency messages will cause multiple phones to vibrate at nearly the same time.**

Revised and adopted by the Faculty, September 8, 2014 **November 7, 2016.**

Student Academic Life gave advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote on changes to the appeals section of the policy on "Student-Initiated Grievance on Grading and Other Forms of Evaluation by Faculty" at the November 2016 faculty meeting.

Proposed change to the Grade Grievance Policy – Appeals Section

Deletions are ~~struck through~~, Additions are in **bold italics**

A student or faculty member who wishes to appeal the URC decision on procedural grounds must do so in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within three business days of receiving the decision from the committee. **The Vice President for Academic Affairs will consult with the Vice President for Student Academic Life while considering the appeal. The decision of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is final and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convenor of the URC and to the chair of the URC.**

(Adopted by the Faculty November 4, 2002; revised April 3, 2006; **revised November 7, 2016. Hearing Procedures are updated and revised periodically by the Student Academic Life administration in consultation with the Student Academic Life Committee.**)

Student Academic Life gave advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote on changes to the appeals section of the Academic Integrity Policy at the November 2016 faculty meeting.

Proposed change to the Academic Integrity Policy – Appeals Section

Deletions are ~~struck through~~, Additions are in **bold italics**

Either the instructor or the student may appeal the decision of the URC to the Vice President for Academic Affairs **who will consult with the Vice President for Student Academic Life while considering an appeal.**

Appeals must be made in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs within three business days of receiving the written notification of the decision. Appeals will be considered only if they are based on one or more of the following criteria: 1. new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing and which is provided as part of the written appeal; or 2. procedural error that can be shown to have affected the outcome of the hearing; or 3. appropriateness of sanction only in cases of suspension or dismissal. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will decide whether or not there is a basis for appeal, and, if so, upon consideration of the appeal, may revise the URC decision or the penalty. The decision of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is final and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convenor of the URC and to the chair of the URC.

(Approved by the Faculty, November 4, 2002; updated April 14, 2014; **updated November 7, 2016.**

University Review Committee (URC) Hearing Procedures are available in the office of **Student Academic Life**. Hearing Procedures are updated and revised periodically by the ~~Academic Affairs~~ **Student Academic Life** administration in consultation with the Student Academic Life Committee.)

Student Academic Life moved to adopt changes in the Academic Handbook related to liaisons and student members of the Student Academic Life Committee at the October 2016 faculty meeting.

Proposed changes to description of the Student Academic Life Committee (Article VIII. Section E.)

E. Student Academic Life Committee

1. *Function.* This committee shall be responsible for the policies and actions of the faculty relating to student life and general academic atmosphere of the University.

This committee, with faculty approval, shall deal with policies, guidelines, and information on all factors affecting student life and campus-wide academic atmosphere; these factors include policies stated in the Student Handbook (e.g., academic dishonesty, the student judicial process, or sexual harassment), policies on campus-wide academic atmosphere (e.g., collecting data on University-wide GPAs or studying the effects of social activities on classroom work), policies related to international student life, and policies which encourage faculty-student interactions which foster the intellectual life of the University.

This committee shall coordinate the faculty representation on those committees, councils, and boards which supervise student life and campus-wide academic atmosphere issues participated in jointly by faculty members and students including the University Review Committee, which deals with grade grievances and cases of academic integrity (See the Article I. in the Academic Policies section of the Academic Handbook), Community Conduct Council (See Article VI of the Student Judicial Code in the Student Life section of the Student Handbook), and Athletic Board.

The following Standing Appointed Committees report to the Student Academic Life Committee: Academic Standing and Petitions Committee, Student Publications Committee, and Athletic Board.

The following Ad Hoc Committees report to the Student Academic Life Committee: None. A member of the Student Academic Life Committee should be assigned as a liaison to each Standing and Ad Hoc Committee. **The Chair of the Student Academic Life Committee will request annual reports from each Standing and Ad Hoc Committee.** Additionally the Student Academic Life Committee should appoint a liaison to the Diversity and Equity Committee. **Additionally, the Chair of the Student Academic Life Committee will maintain regular communication with the Diversity and Equity Committee.**

2. *Membership:*

Faculty membership: Five (5) elected representatives.

Administrative members: Ex officio (without vote): Dean of Academic Life, Vice President for Student **Academic** Life or representative.

Student members: ~~Two (2) (Student Body President and one other appointed by Student Congress).~~

Two (2) - Student Body President or his/her representative, and Vice President for Student Life from Student Congress or his/her representative. Two additional Ex officio members (without vote) appointed by Student Congress.

Rationale:

The committee thinks that the liaisons add unnecessary bureaucracy, and the connection to the named committees can be handled more efficiently.

We are asking for the change in Student members, so that the wording and practice in the constitution of DePauw Student Government, and in the Academic Handbook, line up. It seemed prudent to have wider student voices on this particular committee, and the two additional ad hoc student members are named in the DSG constitution.

The motion was approved by the show of hands.

Written Announcements – None

Reports from other Committees

9. University Strategic Planning Committee (Jackie Roberts)

There were no questions for the committee.

Written Announcement– None

Communications

10. Remarks from the President (Mark McCoy)

President McCoy was out of town on university business and had no remarks.

11. Remarks from the VPAA (Anne Harris)

Dear colleagues,

Many thanks for the midterm grades that were turned in this morning and thank you, as ever, for your stamina at the end of our time together. I will use our time to follow up on conversations I've had with many of you, with student groups, and with staff on questions put to me about race, dialogue, and how to keep the work going. And I know that you've given a lot to this work over the past month – so this is me looking for ideas to have in our core, to lift us up. I have 2 statements for us to think through.

Dolores Huerta: "Education is the new civil rights movement"

The first is a statement made by labor leader and civil rights activist Dolores Huerta, spoken before an audience of 3000 people at the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education this summer. Education is engaged in the struggle for equity and inclusion; it is simultaneously a *site* of that struggle as well as having the *force* to move the struggle forward. It's a statement that I've carried with me since

hearing it this summer and I've contextualized and re-contextualized here at DePauw ever since: our shifting student demographics (from 29 domestic students of color attending DePauw in 1986 to over 400 in 2016), our initiatives and needs for inclusive pedagogies (from the Inclusive Excellence grant of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute we are candidates for to the English department's Empowerment and Inclusion Committee, known by its acronym: EPIC), our advising, our mentoring, our teaching. The statement calls up that of a dear colleague who asked me last year, "Is talking about race part of the job description now?" Our faculty vote in May citing cultural competence work as part of tenure and promotion requirements answers yes. More closely, the student protest at DePauw Dialogue and the continuing crisis of belonging it calls out answers yes. As I will discuss with the chairs on Thursday, our four-year graduation and student retention data, answer yes.

Talking about race was not part of the job description when the large majority of us were in graduate school. Being vulnerable and acknowledging lack of expertise is not how most of us were encouraged to complete our terminal degrees. We were never trained to say "I don't know" – "I need help" – "I'm confused" – No, the aching majority of us are not experts in talking about race, or addressing race in our curriculum. Not knowing is not comfortable for the majority of us. And yet, we talk a great deal about the liberal arts teaching adaptability and responsiveness because of the inter-connected critical thinking framework that it champions. We are now being called upon as a faculty to adapt and to be responsive to race at DePauw. We are being called upon by student anguish here and now, and also by the earliest statements of DePauw University whose founding charter established it as an institution **"for the benefit of the youth of every class of citizens, and of every denomination, who shall be freely admitted to equal advantages and privileges of education."** This is in us, inclusion and difference is deep in us as an institution, and I see us at a time in our history when we can claim it. We will need to find the strength and resolve to see it through throughout the institution, and I am deeply grateful to faculty members and faculty committee partners: the Governance committee, the Curriculum committee, the Diversity and Equity Committee, the Faculty Development committee, the Student Academic Life committee, and others for the work we will do this year. We have each other in this work.

And so, how to keep talking about DePauw Dialogue, how to keep talking about race? How to continue the shift of the past 18 months that I am hearing, from "Why are we talking about this?" to "How can I talk about this?" How to engage with the messages the students held? Many of you took signs and have put them up in your offices, where I imagine they are framing many important conversations. Others recorded them and passed them on to me, for our collective engagement. "Why is it my responsibility to stop the hate against me?" "If you are neutral in situations of *Injustice* you choose the side of the OPPRESSOR!!!" "DePauw, take the responsibility off students of color! We are TIRED" "I don't get it." Many of you have asked about the signs as well as about Vernon Wall's remaining points – I will work to gather those together for you so that you can discuss them with each other. This is where my second statement for today comes in: Home.Work.

Home.Work.

We, as an academic program, as a faculty, have home work to do. Along with Student Academic Life staff, we are the stewards of the living and learning spaces that our students call home for four years. And so when there is racist graffiti in the living space, and it affects learning, there needs to be responsiveness in the learning space. When a biased comment is made in the classroom, and it affects learning, there needs to be responsiveness in the learning space. When a national event causes anxiety and fear, and they affect learning, there needs to be responsiveness in the learning space. And if this call to responsiveness makes you uncomfortable, then come talk to me – tell me what you're afraid of, and I'll tell you what I'm afraid of, and we'll work together to find language and skills and training. Also know that we are not new to a faculty-wide call to responsiveness. We've started this home work with sexual assault – as "responsible employees"

of the university, a Title IX designation we hold, we are required to inform the Title IX Coordinator when we are aware of sexual harassment or assault. We started our work understanding our role with a video, then Green Dot Training, then the Elephant in the Room Campaign, and we are building a shared vocabulary of bystander intervention that can extend from sexual assault to racist bias. We need to create and foster learning spaces where the power dynamics of race are acknowledged. And yes, that will be hard work.

Let's be clear: responsiveness is not the same thing as fixing things. Nor is it the same thing as being nice, or kind, or presenting an abstract principle of treating everyone equally that cannot speak to individual student experience. That is not enough. If it were, we wouldn't be in our current situation. Because we *are* nice, and kind, and seeking to treat everyone well. Instead, responsiveness starts with educating ourselves, with this idea of home work. And there's faculty development for that, and workshops for that, and they will be available to you, and we all need to do this work. Multiple points of entry are available to you to learn, and act, and create real change in our learning spaces. And I thank you for what you're already doing, and what you will commit to doing.

- Read about "Anti-Racist Pedagogy Across the Curriculum" (a workshop attended by and written about by Leigh-Anne Goins, Lynn Ishikawa, and Tamara Stasik) in the [Reports from the Field](#) blog
- Read "5 Things that Make it Hard to be a Black Student at a Mostly White College," with links to research and publications ([here](#))
- Gather in departments or programs around [Between the World and Me](#) by Ta-Nehisi Coates – using Vernon Wall's language, it connects the head to the heart
- Join me Tuesday evening at 7:30 p.m. for a Prindle reading group devoted to Dr. Terrell Strayhorn's book, [College Students' Sense of Belonging: a Key to Educational Success for All](#) - or read the book/chapters as a department or program
- Reshape DePauw Dialogue for its next iteration in September 2017 – more action, more workshops - get your students involved in shaping the Dialogue as well
- Talk about the student messages and Vernon Wall's comments (both should be available soon) as a department or program
- Participate - and encourage your students to participate - in the [events of Arts Fest](#) addressing "Art and Utopia"

It's about listening for conversations, tuning in to them. You've heard this before about social change: it's not about doing everything. It's about doing *something*. It's about starting to act. It's about talking to each other. And after my many years here, after being inspired and pushed and moved by so many of you, I know that we can trust each other to try, have faith in our courage, and be proud in our resolve to do this work. Thank you and yes, and always, I will take questions.

There were no questions.

Additional Business

12. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

13. New Business

There was no new business.

14. Announcements

Prof. Harry Brown – Arts Fest 2016 - I follow my email announcements of **ArtsFest 2016: Art and Utopia** with reminder that the millennium will be upon us in less than a month. We open on October 26 with a Kelly Writers Series reading by our own Lili Wright. Lots of miracles and upheavals will follow, including a debate about the utopian and dystopian dimensions of DePauw, a Duzer Du production of *The War of the Worlds*, a performance of Mahler's Symphony No. 1 by the DePauw University Orchestra, Company Unspoken's choreographic interpretation of Huxley's *Brave New World*, *A Day in the Life* featuring the Living Theatre and the Greencastle community, and a screening of the futurist film *Metropolis* accompanied by live pipe organ. We have a full schedule of talks, panels, and musical performances. For all the details, see the [ArtsFest 2016 website](#). As always, I encourage you to take full advantage of these events by incorporating them into your classes where you can.

Written Announcements

Corinne Wagner - Dr. Zollinger at the Indiana University School of Medicine reached out to me to see if any of our faculty are interested in collaborating with him and his colleague on identifying risk factors for suicide, effective intervention or prevention methods, treatment and/or post-vention. If anyone is interested in this collaboration/research area please email Corinne Wagner (Dir. of Sponsored Research and Institutional Grants) cwagner@depauw.edu for more information/an email introduction with Dr. Zollinger.

18. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.