

DePauw University Faculty Meeting Minutes

September 12, 2016

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

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by the Chair Howard Brooks. The chair asked that you please introduce yourself when you speak.

The meeting opened with memorial tributes to former faculty. Prof. Bob Newton remembered Roger Gustavsson with these words:

In these few words, I would like to remember an outstanding faculty member, Roger Gustavsson. He arrived on our campus in 1961, and he left upon retirement in 1994 with 33 years of service. With sadness and tribute I report his departure from worldly life as of August 31, 2016. He died, within hours, of a severe stroke while comforted by his wife, Louise Reinecke and daughter, Marka, and in the care of hospital personnel in Northhampton, Massachusetts. Immediately following is a summary of his final hours, which I won't read now.

Dear Friends,

Ann and I have just had a long conversations with Louise with information about Roger's death. Before summarizing those sad details, we report that at the moment there are no plans for a burial or a memorial. His remains have been given to the hospital in Massachusetts for research. Later there may be a memorial.

On Wednesday, August 31, Louise and Roger were eating lunch with a small group. He slumped at the table, lost consciousness, seemed to be fidgeting, but never spoke again. Immediately they called 911; the ambulance arrived swiftly. He was admitted immediately into the ER. Marka, their daughter was notified and arrived within two hours. Roger was in process of being moved to a room to be monitored, where Louise and Marka could sit in attendance. Upon reviewing the result of tests, the doctor discerned that death was imminent, at least by 5 pm. He obtained from Louise the end of life protocol previously declared as only sedation to reduce or prevent pain. Roger's face remained relaxed, but Louise could feel no response when she put her hand on his body.

The diagnoses. Although Roger had been faint on previous occasions and was on a protective diet, only on some recent occasions were there problem signs, as when he had difficulty sitting down at a picnic when joining Marka and John at a musical event. The ER doctor pointed to three large spots in the brain image that kept growing and flooding parts of the brain. The medical report describes the event as a cardiopulmonary arrest due to brain herniation with large left side ganglia accompanied by hemorrhage.

Marka, fortunately competent with phone and internet connections, was able to communicate with family and friends. She was able to stay with Louise until the weekend.

In the days, even some weeks, before he died, Roger was focusing on some articles he was reading and/or writing. In addition to his signature article on Hauerwas and Barth, he requested and received an article on whether faith entails belief, and he was revising an article that was intended for publication. He even had minimized his participation in the philosophers group that he regularly attended in order to concentrate on the documents that consumed his attention, including a critique of some of the theological positions of H. Richard Niebuhr.

Last year, he had made a trip to Sweden and on several recent occasions had been able to attend musical programs of his daughter and son-in-law. His delight in music enabled him to listen even by radio to performances of Mozart and Beethoven compositions.

To contact Louise, here is her address and phone number.

Louise Reinecke
12 Cranberry Lane
Easthampton, MA 01027
413-527-4291

Marka has several email addresses: here's one
gustavss@bard.edu

--Bob N

Roger came to the Philosophy and Religion Department as replacement for Leon Pacala, who was leaving to become chair of the Philosophy Department at Bucknell University. Leon, John Eigenbrodt, and I had recently inaugurated a course supported by a Lilly Foundation grant, called Basic Beliefs of Modern Man. It was a co-taught course with a single weekly lecture and two weekly meetings for the several small discussion groups. Roger joined us regularly in that course for several years and then irregularly as the department shifted course assignments around the existing faculty.

Roger was a philosophy major at, and a 1952 graduate of, Princeton. He completed his first graduate degree, M. Div. ('56) at Yale Divinity School, and subsequent Ph. D. ('63) from Yale University. During those graduate school years, Roger studied under some of the most outstanding and recognized philosophical theologians in academia, such as H. Richard Niebuhr (brother of Reinhold), Robert L. Calhoun, and Roland Bainton.

Roger's career at DePauw turned toward philosophy, though he continued his involvement in philosophical theology. Even in his first year here, he had taught courses in Present Philosophical Tendencies (Experience and Time) and one of his lasting signature courses, Philosophy of Art. By immediately following years, he had taught seminars on Kant, Metaphysics, Plato, modern Continental Philosophy, Anglo-American Philosophy, and Philosophy of Mind. And he sustained the core departmental offerings of the History of Philosophy.

Roger's manner of class presentation was very deliberate, considered, and thoughtful. One of his devoted students – also an art major – Kristen Frederickson, upon hearing of his death wrote, "This is very distressing news to me. I will always remember his crooked smile and white hair and lovely, gentle demeanor. No. What a loss!"

Although Roger was not a politicized faculty person, he did serve (1985-1988) on one of the very important committees of the faculty, then named Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (CAPP). In the DePauw Archives there are several articles to Roger as representative of that committee from DePauw statistician, Jack Wright, comparing Depauw's Departmental Staffing Patterns with Selected Schools. Under then new President Robert Bottoms, DePauw was considering "possible additions of faculty positions."

When Roger spoke on the floor at faculty meetings, he exhibited his careful, deliberate, thoughtful way of thinking and communication. Former colleague, Noah Lemos, now Professor of Philosophy at College of William and Mary, wrote, "I especially recall him at faculty meetings giving well-reasoned and clear arguments for positions that would lose by huge margins. (I coined the term "rogustic" for an eloquent, thoughtful, sound argument that did not persuade the masses.) He was so often in the right, but rarely in the majority. Yet, he never lost the gleam in his eye and excitement for a good philosophical discussion." And Howard Brooks, *current chair of the Faculty*, wrote, "I also enjoyed listening to Roger's carefully spoken statements in faculty meetings."

Roger's wife, Louise Reinecke, with an B.A. Wellesley ('52) and Ph. D. from Yale ('64), also occasionally taught in the Department on an adjunct status. Initially they lived at 616 Anderson St. Eventually they moved to single level residence at 703 Highridge Ave. When they lived in the rising era of computers, Roger had one at home as well as at the office. But in retirement, they avoided the burden of

emails and internet messaging. However, Roger did not sever connections with us. Several times a year he would make a phone call to a former colleague here and collect the news and share some thoughts. Moving to Easthampton MA to be near their daughter (Marka Gustavsson, Visiting Professor of Music, Bard College), Roger joined a philosophy group from surrounding colleges for stimulating discussions. But in recent months he withdrew and began to concentrate on revision of some of his writings. In fact, one of these, published in the *Journal of Religious Ethics* 2007, entitled "Hauerwas's With the Grain of the Universe and the Barthian Outlook," had been supplied to Keith Nighthenelser and me. Because it was extremely dense and thoughtful, Keith had been rereading it recently, and even in the moments of Roger's stroke, I had somehow again picked up the article from my office desk and was engaged with Roger's mind.

Before his death, he had made a trip to Sweden, home of his immigrant parents. On several recent occasions he had been able to attend musical programs of his daughter and son-in-law. His delight in music enabled him to listen, even by radio, to performances of Mozart and Beethoven. Let us hope and, if he would accept, even pray, that as his body contributes to our medical knowledge, the vitality of his mind should never cease.

Prof. Fred Soster offered these words in memory of Jim Madison:

Dr. James A. Madison, Professor Emeritus of Geology, was 87 years old when he passed away on December 15, 2015 after a ten-year battle with cancer. Jim was born in 1928 in Woodstock, Illinois and grew up in Sylva, North Carolina. He attended Western Carolina University until he interrupted his education to serve in the Army in 1946 and 1947. After his service in the Army, he returned to school where he earned B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. He began his teaching career here at DePauw in 1953 and simultaneously earned his Ph.D. from Washington University, St. Louis. Jim retired from DePauw in 1991 after a 38-year teaching career.

Jim touched the lives of literally thousands of students, and I know that many geology alumni still have fond memories of him. Many years ago, one anonymous alumnus established the James A. Madison Fund for Research "...in gratitude for the fine education that I received at DePauw, and especially my discovery of geology as a life work." Current geoscience faculty members benefit tremendously from this research fund.

Jim hired me in 1983 right out of graduate school and we were colleagues for the first eight years of my teaching career. Although our time together as colleagues was short, he taught me many things and I will always be grateful for his thoughtful mentoring during the early years of my teaching career.

Jim is survived by his wife Dr. Sara Madison, 4 children, 8 grandchildren, and 1 great grandchild.

2. Announcement Quorum Number for Fall 2016 Semester (Anne Harris)

VPAA Anne Harris announced the official quorum for the semester.

279 voting faculty members

- 37 voting part-time faculty members
- 19 on leave academic year
- 5 on leave fall semester

218

x 0.4

87.2 rounded to 87 = quorum

Verification of quorum

There were 145 faculty in attendance at the meeting. The list of voting and non-voting faculty is appended to the end of the minutes:

3. Consent Agenda

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

A. Approve Minutes from the May 2, 2016 Faculty Meeting

B. Approval of the following new courses (recommended by Course and Calendar Oversight)

ASIA 251 Classical Chinese Literature in Translation (1 course, AH/IE)

FILM 250 Global Cinema (1 course, AH/IE)

FILM 260 African American Cinema (1 course, AH/PPD)

GLH 101 Introduction to Global Health (1 course, PPD)

HONR 122 Rethinking the Environment (1 course)

WLIT 205 Introduction to World Literature (1 course, AH/ IE)

WLIT 215 Topics in World Literature (1 course, AH/IE or PPD on offering basis)

WLIT 315 Advanced Topics in World Literature (1 course, AH, IE)

Course descriptions for item B can be found in Appendix C.

C. Announcement of change in title (approved by Course and Calendar Oversight)

KINS 354, Nutrition for Health and Performance. Title changed from Bioenergetics of Human Movement

D. Approval of International Experience designation (recommended by the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee)

ENG 396: Cinema of the New Silk Road

UNIV 290: Mathematics Across Cultures

E. Approval of Power, Privilege and Diversity designation (recommended by Course and Calendar Oversight)

ENG 255: Challenging Borders: Gendered Nationalism South Africa Lit/Film

SOC 329: Social Inequalities

COMM 291A: Histories of the American Press

POLS 390: Political Psychology

ML 395: Multiculturalism in Moorish Spain

F. Approval of Extended Studies designation (recommended by Course and Calendar Oversight)

MUS 183: DePauw Chamber Symphony Winter Term Tour to England .5 credit

Communications

4. Remarks from the President (Mark McCoy)

Dr. McCoy's Remarks:

- Opened by thanking everyone that has helped with the reprehensible action that happened to our students.
- Public Safety, Alan Hill and his group have been working around the clock to try and help.
- Dr. McCoy apologizes for how he responded, but was working with cabinet and other team members to figure out the best response.
- Dr. McCoy is frustrated and disappointed, but is dedicated to doing all that we can as a group.
- We are devoted to talking care of the students and reaching out in larger areas.

- DePauw is continuing to get lots of good information and is continuing the investigation.
- He opens the mic for discussion.

Discussion from Faculty Member: How can we increase the consequences for the perpetrator?

Response from Dr. McCoy: There is a process on how the consequences work. The aggressor has not been caught though. We are looking at possibly putting cameras in the residence halls, but they cannot be placed down the hallway. We are hoping someone seen something that will help them catch the person. We are putting our energies toward how to prevent this, but lots of hours are being put into the investigation.

Discussion from Faculty Member: Would like to hear from the president on what his perspective is and what's the approach?

Response from Dr. McCoy: That plan is to walk to talk. Action takes time. My efforts in this short span of time is to assemble the team, to challenge the member of each team, to find a way to quickly responds. The ability to support initiatives such as the day of dialogue are all in process. You will continue to see me listen to your concerns.

Discussion from Faculty member: WE did not get the details until a few days after it happened. We had to learn from faculty members on what may or may have not went on. How will these events be communicated in the future?

Response from Dr. McCoy: This is a mistake I will own. The cabinet met currently and after the incident. There was no protocol, it was my idea to put an email out to state a few things. The cabinet helped put this together. We did not want to give out to much information. We did not want to give any attention to the perpetrator. The first email went out and we really thought we were in front of this. We heard a lot of great comments, but with social media today it is hard to get in front of anything. These type of responses started to come in. From the time the meeting happened until the next email I think I had 4 hours of sleep. We were on it, but we are all human and we will all make mistakes. Do we think we made a mistake of course we don't. We are trying to figure out how to respond. Going from meeting to meeting on this incident. When I got home and set down to write the email and tried to get a head of my mistake I didn't want to name this person and the person get all the glory, but I set back and if I were a faculty member I would want more details. We are figuring out how to do this. What we are trying to figure out now is if there is something between a rave alert and an email that doesn't compromise an investigation. There is a lot of good people working on that.

Discussion from Faculty Member: Wanted to follow up on the previous faculty member's comments. The faculty wants assurances. Yes we accept the apology. I immediately wrote that I have class tomorrow and was not sure of what I would be facing. Reached out to members above me to see what I should do. I was also in a student life meeting, and we did introductions instead of discussing what was going on. We want assurances that after three years that this is going to happen. The parental concern, if this was my child I want to be assured that she's protected. I do not feel safe that there is as student that would actually do that. In the last email, there were no action words. We have to do better. It was also sent to undisclosed recipients, who got that? Very concerned that after three years we are not doing better.

Response from Dr. McCoy: Well stated concerns and I sense everyone's frustration. I sense the urgency. I assure you that we are taking that in ever aspect and that there is no lack of effort. The police have responded to 6 different issues and some are not sleeping at all. We have a complicated system. I will start saying in the email who it is addressed to.

Closing from Dr. McCoy: Thank you to everyone. These are all real pains that we are all addressing. We have to take this as leaders and try and understand how to make it and we all have to commit to it. I'm attempting to make this a wonderful place. You have all kinds of ways to reach me and I'm committed to make it work.

5. Remarks from the VPAA (Anne Harris)

Vice President for Academic Affairs shared these remarks with the faculty:

1) Thank you for the **support** that you provided our students and each other.

- *In ref to earlier discussion* – improved communications and partnerships
 - Committees (working with Alan and Dave; with Student Academic Life and with the Diversity and Equity committee)
 - Engagements (e.g. faculty in residence halls – working with Alan)
- **ACTIONS NOW**
 - Join a working described in the Campus Climate e-mail of today
 - Watch the Bias Incident video that JLL made (link available)
- **Priorities:** response time, transparency, and care on bias events
- **Resources:** each other; Diversity & Inclusion Lib Guide (Google it)

2) I also wanted to insert a phrase into the national conversation about “safe spaces.” I invite us to consider our pedagogy, our classroom practice, and part of the mission of our campus experience to be the creation of a **resilient space**. This phrase is connected to the existing idea of **brave space** that is shifting the conversation as it pertains to student experience from “protection” to “preparation.” I am hoping that we’ll find time as an institution to discuss these issues – the kind of time (and yes, safety) it takes to create a space in which students can think critically and in informed ways about subject matter so as to be resilient within complexity.

I single out two opportunities that I would ask you to take advantage of as you develop your own practice in response to these national conversations.

3) We are very fortunate to have **Dr. Omid Fotuhi** on campus on Wednesday, September 21 for our Faculty Development lunch from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. that day. Dr. Fotuhi’s work with the College Transition Collaborative (which DePauw University joined in 2014) has greatly expanded our understanding of the opportunities and support that need to be in place to “promote persistence and achievement, especially among students from disadvantaged backgrounds.” Data demonstrates that these are first-generation college students, and, intersectionally, students of color in fields where they are consistently in the minority. Kelley Hall’s e-mail from April 7 provides links to the all-important article “Who Gets to Graduate” and an excellent introduction to the discussion Dr. Fotuhi will be bringing to us about “growth mindset.” This idea that intelligence is malleable, not fixed, is intimately connected to a student’s sense of belonging and, consequently, to his or her persistence and success in college. Dr. Fouthi’s visit will build on that of Dr. Strayhorn’s in August to provide you all with powerful frameworks through which to think about your pedagogical practice, advising, and mentoring.

4) Another key instrument in our work is what you may have heard referred to as the **SSC** – the Student Success Collaborative. There is now a web page and Julianne Miranda will send you the link in a follow-up e-mail tonight. The SSC is a software platform that will allow us to communicate much more effectively among each other about our students’ persistence through the four years of their academic experience. It also offers opportunities for earlier interventions in student development that can provide needed support for their efforts. Carol Smith and her incredible team led by Adam Hughes spent 2015-16 preparing the system for our use, and we are now ready to engage with the SSC. I’d like to take a moment to identify the team of people who have made this possible.

- Those who configured the system
 - Carol Smith and Adam Hughes

- Kelley Hall (Advising, Sophomore and Junior Class Dean) and Jacob Hale (Advising)
- Expanding with retention committee (AJ and co)
- Kate – leading all the staff training
- Ken – leading the faculty training

NOW IS THE TIME to invest in learning the system: 1 hour introductory sessions

- DePauw.edu/ssc – rationale + introductory sessions
- Call Registrar’s office for assistance afterwards
- Registrar’s office is the help desk
- Kate as the staff contact
- Customizing it to DePauw – and fixes or changes to Julianne Miranda
- We need the data – the more we know the more we can act

In terms of TIMELINE: we will be using the SSC for fall advising

- The work of advising stays the same (though you are newly advising for the completion of PPD and IE requirements) – you now have a new follow-through capability with the SSC, the chance to connect your advising conversation to others
- By spring of 2017, we are aiming to have the RAC available through SSC

5) **Focus groups** – bring your best ideas (and keep coming, Oct. 3rd Dartlet)

There were no questions or comments from the faculty at the conclusion of VPAA Harris’ remarks.

Reports from Core Committees

6. **Motion to change the Grievance Procedure in the Academic Handbook** (Howard Brooks)

With the transition to a new academic year, Prof. Glen Kuecker move to change the grievance procedure in the Academic Handbook. Prof. Pam Propsom seconded the motion.

Deleted language ~~struck through~~, new language *in bold italics*.

VIII. **Faculty Grievance Process**

A. **Overview of the Faculty Grievance Process.**

The Faculty Grievance Process provides eligible faculty members an opportunity for review of recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee regarding their employment with the University, or of other personnel decisions such as changes in job status or responsibilities that directly relate to their employment with the University. The Grievance Committee operates through three-member Mediation Panels and five-member Appeals Panels, on which its members serve. Mediation Panels attempt to facilitate mutually agreeable resolutions of matters brought before them. Appeals Panels review the ~~Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee recommendations and direct the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee to reconsider a recommendation if circumstances warrant.~~ **recommendations and offer their resolution to the President if the mediation is not successful.**

(note: no changes proposed to sections B-D)

E. **Petition to Grievance Committee**

1. **Deadline for Petition.** The Petitioner has three days after receiving notice of the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee 's response per section D.4 above to submit to the Chair of the Faculty ~~three copies of a request in writing for Grievance Committee review~~ **a**

written request to be shared with the Grievance Committee for review on an as needed basis only.

F. Mediation Panel Process, 2.Meeting of Panel with Petitioner

- a. **Submission of Documents by Petitioner.** At this initial meeting of the Mediation Panel with the Petitioner, the Petitioner will provide the panel chair **either three paper copies (or an electronic copy to be shared with members of the Mediation Panel)** ~~three copies~~ of all documents the Petitioner wishes to submit in support of his or her written statement describing the subject matter of the grievance.

G. The Appeals Panel Process 2.Submission of Documentation to Appeals Panel

1. **Submission of Documentation to Appeals Panel.** Within an additional three days, the Petitioner must submit to the chair of the Appeals Panel ~~copies of all documents the Petitioner wishes to submit in support of that statement~~ **either five paper copies or an electronic copy to be shared with members of the Appeals Panel all documents the Petitioner wishes to submit in support of his or her written statement describing the subject matter of the grievance.**

There was no discussion on the motion. The motion was approved by a show of hands.

Written Announcements –

Elections and Upcoming Handbook Changes

1. There are several vacancies on the Grievance Committee for 2/1/17 – 1/31/18.
2. David Harvey was elected Parliamentarian and Dave Guinee was elected as a GLCA Academic Council Representative.
3. Additional changes to the Academic Handbook are in the process of coming before the faculty for votes in the coming months. These changes generally arise from the reorganization of the administration.

There were no questions or discussion from the faculty.

7. Faculty Priorities and Governance –

Prof. Glen Kuecker, committee chair for 2016-17, offered these remarks:

The committee had its first meeting of the academic year last week. We worked transition from last year's agenda items, addressed items that came from faculty over the summer and the start of the semester, and began work on defining our agenda for this academic year.

Continuing and new committee members thank Pamela Propsom for her work as chair last academic year.

Current committee membership

Bob Hershberger—Faculty Policy and Review Committee

Tim Good— Student Academic Life

Howard Brooks—Chair of the Faculty and Department Chairs

Bryan Hanson—Faculty Development Committee

Francesca Seamen—Curricular Policy and Planning

Glen Kuecker— Directly elected (Chair) + (2018)

Pamela Propsom—Directly elected (2017)

A special thank you to the committee members for their service, especially those representing committees as Governance constitutes additional time and labor.

Looking ahead the committee will need one elected replacement for a two-year term starting next fall.

Along with its charge to serve as a steering committee for governance, we most likely will be working on:

- faculty voice in recruitment, review, and retention of senior administrators
- enhancements to shared governance
- Handbook changes defining Dean of School of Music position
- clarity to confidentiality policies
- continued work on diversity and inclusion

There were no questions or discussion from the faculty.

8. Curricular Policy and Planning

Prof. John Caraher, professor of Physics and Astronomy and chair of the Curricular Policy and Planning Committee, opened his remarks by reminding the faculty of the other faculty members of the committee this semester are Scott Spiegelberg, Francesca Seaman, David Gellman and Jamie Stockton.

Our chief goal in the near-term is to develop a system for tenure-line requests before Fall break (in order to give departments time enough to develop proposals). Over the summer and into early fall, an ad hoc committee consisting of myself, VPAA Anne Harris, previous Governance chair Pam Propsom, Chair of Faculty Howard Brooks and last chair of the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS) Rich Cameron met to craft a charge to CP&P for this new process. While CP&P has not yet met to discuss this, some emerging features of the new process include elimination of RAS, elimination of the 3-day period of proposal vetting that RAS used to perform, and replacing this with an exchange between CP&P and departments and programs seeking tenure lines to occur throughout Spring semester.

To facilitate this, we anticipate several procedural changes. We expect initial proposals to be much briefer documents than those produced in the past, and these will be due much earlier in the year to facilitate the spring semester process. We will likely ask for a declaration of intent to make a proposal late in Fall semester (possibly just before Thanksgiving break); this will allow time for the Office of Institutional Research to gather data pertinent to the requested new tenure line. In general, expect a process that vastly reduces the initial effort in writing a proposal, adds a significant amount of interactive engagement with CP&P during Spring semester as we shape and evaluate proposals, and eliminates the high-stakes, compressed, intense 3-day ranking process.

This year will likely be transitional in many ways. In the long run, we hope to develop a process that breaks out of the mold of annual rankings and encourages the clear development of long-range departmental and program visions. We have also discussed the opportunity hire program and hope to make the use of this mechanism much less common than it has been in recent years, in part by working to develop tenure-line proposals that achieve goals opportunity hires are frequently used to address.

I expect our other major work, beyond the routine business of the committee, to include coming up with a response to a variety of concerns regarding our existing language and distribution requirements. There are questions regarding the learning goals of the new PPD and International Experience requirements and their implementation; worries that lumping arts and humanities into a single 2-course requirement may compromise the liberal arts experience of many of our students; calls to move from a "testing out" to a

“testing in” policy on language study beyond English, and possible proposed revisions to the science and mathematics requirement coming from the ongoing extensive work on gen ed science courses done in recent years. The committee will need to evaluate these issues and develop plans for ensuring our liberal arts curriculum is coherent and robust.

There were no questions or discussion from the faculty.

9. Faculty Personnel Policy and Review (Meryl Altman)

Prof. Meryl Altman, chair of the committee for 2016-17, offered these remarks:

For those who are new, I’m representing something called the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review committee, affectionately known as, “Review.” (It used to be called the Committee on Faculty, known by its acronym, COF, and we’re still getting used to the name change, so if you hear people talking about “COF,” that is us.) Basically we are the university-wide promotion and tenure committee. We review decision files and reports on those files that come to us from departmental personal committees (DPCs), we deliberate, and we make a recommendation to the VPAA and the President.

Thanks to those of you who have worked hard to prepare the files for us to read, and to those serving on DPCS that are beginning to review those files. We’ll be starting our part of the file-reading in a few weeks. In the meantime, we’ve been going around in teams of two interviewing members of departments about who should be their next chair. Our committee also has a role in formulating and changing policy, and that’s what I’m bringing to you today.

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. Thanks to all those who helped and especially to Jim Mills and Glen Kuecker.

What we’re bringing is a single policy change. It requires three small changes to the Faculty Handbook, so I’m going to move them together. If you’re following along at home, this is appendix D, at the bottom of page 8, in the agenda.) 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 it is 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.

“That the Academic Handbook be amended with regard to inclusion of reports submitted to the Faculty Development Committee in the decision files used in the review process as specified in the following

language.”

~~Deletions marked as struck through, **Additions in Bold Italics**~~

First change:

Under Bylaws, VIII, C. Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee, the paragraph currently reads:

- 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.)~~

For that last sentence (~~struck through~~), substitute the following:

All documents written for competitive awards funded by the Faculty Development Committee, as well as all sabbatical and pre-tenure leave awards, will be included for evaluation in the review file. Academic Affairs will automatically place the proposal, the report, and the response from the faculty development committee in the candidate’s review files. The Faculty Development Committee will include a statement on the Faculty Development application form that notifies faculty members of this policy. (See Article VIII.D.1)

Second Change:

Under D. Faculty Development Committee, add the following paragraph:

The Faculty Development Committee will ensure that documents written for funded competitive, sabbatical and pre-tenure leave awards will automatically be placed in candidate review files. Notification of the placement of these awards in candidate review files will be stated on the Faculty Development application form. Award materials placed in the file will include the proposal, the report, and the response from the Faculty Development Committee. Faculty Development will consult with Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee about changes to this policy as needed.

Third change:

Under Personnel Policies

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

B. Preparation of Decision File.

This currently reads:

The Vice President for Academic Affairs may transfer to the decision file materials from the candidate’s personnel file deemed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to be relevant to the review as stipulated in [Article III.E](#). The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file the following required materials for the review of faculty members not holding tenure as specified in [Article II](#): the faculty member’s annual reports, the chair’s or dean’s responses to the annual reports, peer observations, and student opinion forms. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall include in the decision file 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.

It will be amended as follows (*new language in bold italics*, language being removed ~~struck through~~):

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. The motion will be voted on at the October 2016 faculty meeting.

A faculty member asked: Most of us who are hired on get a pre-tenure leave, but some get a post-tenure leave. Can we make sure that is added to the wording in there?

Prof. Altman replied : Yes.

10. Faculty Development (Jim Mills)

Prof. Jim Mills, for the Faculty Development Committee, moved to modify the charge of the committee in the Academic Handbook.

From Article VIII. D. Faculty Development Committee
Deleted language ~~struck through~~, new language ***in bold italics***.

~~1. Function. This committee shall plan and execute faculty development programs within the University and coordinate institutional programs with faculty development programs of outside agencies.~~

~~This committee shall make recommendations to the President of the University concerning the granting of institutional research and development resources, leaves of absence, and selection of institutional nominees for grants or awards given by outside agencies. Policies and procedures of internal funding programs are outlined in detail on the Academic Affairs website.~~

This committee shall oversee faculty development at DePauw including support for scholarly and artistic work, pedagogical innovation, course development and renewal, and further development of professional competencies.

The committee shall review and make funding recommendations on proposals from faculty members for internal awards, both competitive (faculty fellowships, faculty summer stipends, etc.) and non-competitive (sabbatical and pre-tenure leaves, professional development fund, etc.). Awards may consist of funding and/or course reassignment. Committee members shall also advise faculty members as they prepare applications for internal awards, and they shall respond to reports based on these awards. This

committee shall not review applications for competitive student awards except in the case of except in the case of collaborative student-faculty projects.

This committee shall also discuss current and future funding needs and shall, on an ongoing basis, consider how policies and priorities for faculty development funding fit with the mission and strategic plan of the University. This committee shall consult regularly with the Faculty Development Coordinator, who shall oversee programming for faculty development (Faculty Forum, teaching roundtables, etc.) at DePauw. Both the Faculty Development Committee and the Faculty Development Coordinator shall work closely with the Dean of Faculty, to ensure clear and consistent communication and collaboration between faculty and administration on faculty development funding and programming.

This committee shall make recommendations to the VPAA on policies and priorities for funding for faculty development, including support for attendance and participation at professional conferences and workshops.

Faculty Development and the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review committees must work in concert as described in the function of the Faculty Personnel Policy and Review Committee. (Article VIII.C.1.).

The following Standing Appointed Committees report to the Faculty Development Committee: None.

The following Ad Hoc Committees report to the Faculty Development Committee: None.

A member of the Faculty Development Committee should be assigned as a liaison to each Standing and Ad Hoc Committee.

Coming from a core committee, the motion did not need a second.

Prof. Dave Guinee offered an amendment to replace the word “oversee” with the words “encourage and facilitate” in the opening sentence of the committee function. The amendment was seconded and approved. The first sentence of the function would read:

This committee shall encourage and facilitate faculty development at DePauw including support for scholarly and artistic work, pedagogical innovation, course development and renewal, and further development of professional competencies.

The motion as amended was approved unanimously.

Written Announcements – The new members for this year are Susan Anthony (Chair), Bryan Hanson, and Angela Flury. Due to finances this year and overspending in the last year, when the Professional Development funds and Conference funds run out this year we will close all requests. Please get your applications in now.

Question from a faculty member: Do you save funding for both semesters?

Response from Carrie Klaus, Dean of the Faculty: Yes, we do put back for both semester, but if you do anticipate needing funded please put that in now.

Question from a faculty member: When you provide an estimate for that conference, do you get what you estimated or can you get more?

Response from Carrie Klaus: Yes, you get what you estimate the amount to be.

After this response, the questioner encouraged faculty to make reasonable, but high estimates of their anticipated expenses.

11. Student Academic Life (Tim Good)

- A. Student Academic Life announced that the proposed changes to the Classroom Atmosphere Policy, as presented in the agenda, would be returned to the committee to make language changes necessitated by the reorganization of the administration. The committee will bring the changes back for faculty approval at a later date.
- B. 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 October 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~~ **Student Academic Life** within three business days of receiving the decision from the committee. ***The Vice President for Student Academic Life will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs while considering the appeal. The decision of the Vice President for Student Academic Life is final and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convener of the URC and to the chair of the URC.***

(Adopted by the Faculty November 4, 2002; revised April 3, 2006; revised October 10, 2016. ***Hearing Procedures are updated and revised periodically by the Student Academic Life administration in consultation with the Student Academic Life Committee.***)

Rationale: concerning changes to the appeals section of the Grade Grievance Policy.

The Student Academic Life Committee concluded that these changes are appropriate in light of the new administrative structure, which seeks to emphasize academic excellence across all aspects of the university. The revised policy keeps process connected to Academic Affairs by requiring the Vice President for Student Academic Life to consult the Vice President for Academic Affairs on all appeals. Additionally, there is a desire to clarify the appeals process to make it align more closely with the existing Academic Integrity policy. Specifically, that is why this sentence is being added to the Grade Grievance Policy: "The decision of the Vice President for Student Academic Life is final and will be communicated to both parties involved in the hearing, to the convener of the URC and to the chair of the URC."

In recent years the Grade Grievance Policy has been administered by the Dean of Academic Life or his designee and this administrative structure will continue. Since the Dean of Academic Life (also Associate VP of Student Academic Life) is now part of the Student Academic Life Division, the appeals process is being updated so that it is handled in the new division.

- C. 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 October 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~~ **Student Academic Life who will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs while considering an appeal.** Appeals must be made in writing to the Vice President for ~~Academic Affairs~~ **Student**

Academic Life 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~~ **Student Academic Life** 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~~ **Student Academic Life** 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 October 10, 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.)

Rationale: concerning changes to the appeals section of the Academic Integrity Policy.

The Student Academic Life Committee concluded that these changes are appropriate in light of the new administrative structure, which seeks to emphasize academic excellence across all aspects of the university. The revised policy keeps process connected to Academic Affairs by requiring the Vice President for Student Academic Life to consult the Vice President for Academic Affairs on all appeals.

In recent years the Academic Integrity Policy has been administered by the Dean of Academic Life or his designee and this administrative structure will continue. Since the Dean of Academic Life (also Associate VP of Student Academic Life) is now part of the Student Academic Life Division, the appeals process is being updated so that it is handled in the new division.

D. Student Academic Life gave advance notice of its intent to ask the faculty to vote on 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.

Written Announcements – None

Reports from other Committees

12. University Strategic Planning Committee (Jackie Roberts)

University Strategic Planning Committee’s report was an offer to answer questions. There were no questions.

Written Announcement–

The Strategic Planning Committee will be working with the administration on the development of a university strategic plan and communication strategies. There are seven faculty representatives on this committee: Julia Bruggemann (elected), Jackie Roberts (elected), Greg Schwipps (elected), Michael Roberts (elected), Howard Brooks (chair of faculty), David Newman (Faculty Development) and Scott Spiegelberg (Curriculum).

13. Honorary Degrees & University Occasions (Debby Geis)

Prof. Geis shared the names of honorary degree candidates which will be presented to the Board of Trustees in October.

Additional Business

14. Unfinished Business –

There was no unfinished business.

15. New Business –

There was no new business.

16. Announcements

Prof. Laurent Vesely, representing the Advertising and Mobilization" subcommittee for DePauw Dialogue 3.0, encouraged faculty to invite students to participate in the event on September 28. Last year, he promoted it in one class and 16 out of 16 students attended. He did not promote in another class and only 4 out of 20 went to the event. Please promote DePauw Dialogue is in all of your classes.

Written Announcements

From Nahyan Fancy: Support for Syrian Refugees

Following up on the visit in May of Dr. Sonja Brentjes who discussed her work with Syrian refugees in Germany. The Red Cross fund has now been established and I sent an e-mail to the faculty staff listserv on August 6, 2016. This announcement is to remind the faculty of this opportunity to support the refugee work and just to indicate that I will send a final follow-up e-mail with the information for donating to this project at the conclusion of the Faculty meeting.

From Danielle Kane: Tips for Pronouncing Chinese Students' Names

When speakers of English see a name that starts with an 'X' or a 'Q,' we might not even know where to begin! Following up on Anne Harris' point at the Faculty Institute that making an effort to pronounce students' names correctly contributes to their sense of being included in the DePauw community, below are some hints for pronouncing Chinese students' names. The romanization is an approximation, and don't worry about speaking it perfectly; your students will appreciate your effort!

Q=Ch, so the name Qing is pronounced Ching (rhymes with ring)

X= Sh, so the name Xu is pronounced Shoe

Zh=J, so the name Zhang is pronounced Jang (rhymes with rang)

C=ts (as in tsetse), so the name Cai is pronounced "tsie" (rhymes with lie)

These are some combinations of letters that frequently occur together:

ou sounds like oh, so the name Zhou is pronounced Joe

iu sounds like eeyo, so the name Liu is pronounced Leeyo

ui sounds like way, so the name Cui is pronounced tsway

17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Howard Brooks, Chair of the Faculty
Ashley Dayhuff, Assistant

Faculty Voting Status, Fall Semester 2016-17

Name	Status
Abed, Larry	voting
Achtman, Rebecca	voting
Adams, Jennifer	voting

Alexander, Rebecca	voting
Altman, Meryl	voting
Alvarez, David	voting
Anderson, Jeremy	voting
Anthony, Susan	voting
Aures, Inge	voting

Autman, Samuel	voting
Babington, Patrick	voting
Balasubramanian, Suman	voting
Balensuela, Matthew	voting
Ball, Thomas	voting
Barreto, Humberto	voting
Beauboeuf, Tamara	voting
Beckel, James	voting
Bedard, Lynn	voting
Beekley, Matthew	voting
Belguellaoui, Cheira	voting
Benedix, Beth	voting
Benedix, James	voting
Benegal, Salil	voting
Berque, David	voting
Berry, John	voting
Bhan, Mona	voting
Biehle, Susanne	voting
Bitner, Ted	voting
Boerger, Kristina	voting
Bogaerts, Steven	voting
Bordt, Rebecca	voting
Brickell, Meredith	voting
Brockmann, Nicole	voting
Brooks, Howard	voting
Brown, Eliza	voting
Brown, Harry	voting
Bruggemann, Julia	voting
Byers, Chad	voting
Call, Rex	voting
Cameron, Richard	voting
Caraher, John	voting
Carkeek, Maureen	voting
Castañeda, Angela	voting
Chao, Weiwei	voting
Chiang, Li-feng	voting
Chiang, Yung-chen	voting
Chiba, Hiroko	voting
Coburn, Pamela	voting
Cohen, Adam	voting
Conceatu, Marius	voting
Cope, Tim	voting
Name	Status
Cox, Brooke	voting
Crary, Sharon	voting
Crouse, David	voting

Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan	voting
Cullison, Andrew	voting
Danforth, Robert	voting
Dewey, Robert	voting
D'Haeseleer, Tineke	voting
Dickerson, Vanessa	voting
Dixon-Fyle, Joyce	voting
Dixon-Fyle, Mac	voting
Dudle, Dana	voting
Dunn, Jeffrey	voting
Dye, Ronald	voting
Dziubinskyj, Aaron	voting
Edberg, Eric	voting
Edwards, Carla	voting
Eppley, Hilary	voting
Eslami, Elizabeth	voting
Everett, Jennifer	voting
Fancy, Nahyan	voting
Fenlon, Gigi	voting
Field, William	voting
Finney, Melanie	voting
Flegal, Kayla	voting
Flury, Angela	voting
Forcadell, Maria Soledad	voting
Ford, Derek	voting
Fornari, Chester	voting
Foss, Pedar	voting
Fox, Vanessa	voting
Foy, Leonard	voting
Friedman, Seth	voting
Fuller, Jason	voting
Geis, Deborah	voting
Gellman, David	voting
Gilson, Caroline	voting
Glausser, Wayne	voting
Glessner, Justin	voting
Gloria, Eugene	voting
Goins, Leigh-Anne	voting
Goldberg, Rachel	voting
Goma, Ophelia	voting
Gomolka, CJ	voting
Good, Caroline	voting
Good, Tim	voting
Gourley, Bridget	voting
Graham, Peter	voting
Grammel, Deborah	voting

Gropp, Jeffrey	voting
Guinee, David	voting
Name	Status
Gurnon, Daniel	voting
Hadley, Craig	voting
Hahn, Susan	voting
Hale, Jacob	voting
Hall, Kelley	voting
Hansen, Jeffrey	voting
Hanson, Bryan	voting
Harbert, Elissa	voting
Harms, Douglas	voting
Harris, Anne	voting
Harvey, David	voting
Hayes, Andrew	voting
Hazel, Wade	voting
Hebb, Tiffany	voting
Heithaus, Joseph	voting
Herbertz, Matthew	voting
Hershberger, Robert	voting
Hertenstein, Matthew	voting
Holmes, Christina	voting
Hopson, Amanda	voting
Howard, Brian	voting
Howley, Kevin	voting
Hristova, Maria	voting
Hunt, Jarrod	voting
Ishikawa, Lynn	voting
James, Leslie	voting
Jennings, Kerry	voting
Jetton, Caroline	voting
Johnson, Paul	voting
Kane, Danielle	voting
Kannowski, Mark	voting
Kenney, Jeffrey	voting
Kertzman, Mary	voting
Kim, Sujung	voting
King, Thomas	voting
Kinney, Kevin	voting
Kirkpatrick, Kenneth	voting
Klaus, Carrie	voting
Klinger, Geoffrey	voting
Komives, Alexander	voting
Kuecker, Glen	voting
Kuo, Ming-Hui	voting
Lafontant, Pascal	voting

Lee, Sarah	voting
Lemon, Gary	voting
Liu, Jinyu	voting
Lobdell, Nicole	voting
Luque, Maria	voting
Mackenzie, Michael	voting
Manickam, Nachimuthu	voting
Marshall, Lydia	voting
Name	Status
Martoglio, Richard	voting
McCall, Jeffrey	voting
McCoy, Mark	voting
McInnes, Marion	voting
McKelligan, Marcia	voting
McVorrán, Marcelle	voting
Menzel, Kent	voting
Miles, Lori	voting
Millis, Kathryn	voting
Mills, James	voting
Miranda, Julianne	voting
Moore, Harriet	voting
Moore, Kevin	voting
Morrisroe, Darby	voting
Mou, Sherry	voting
Musser, Thomas	voting
Nasr, Ghassan	voting
Newman, David	voting
Nichols-Pethick, Jonathan	voting
Nightenhelser, Keith	voting
O'Bannon, Brett	voting
O'Dell, Cynthia	voting
Oh, Hye-ri	voting
Ota, Pauline	voting
Oware, Matthew	voting
Paré, Barbara	voting
Paré, Craig	voting
Pejril, Veronica	voting
Peterson, Clarissa	voting
Petreaca, Melissa	voting
Phang, May	voting
Pollack-Milgate, Howard	voting
Pope, Jeanette	voting
Poturovic, Selma	voting
Prakash, Deepa	voting
Propsom, Pamela	voting
Provine, Rick	voting

Puga, Alejandro	voting
Puzzo, Ashley	voting
Rachford, Natalia	voting
Raghav, Manu	voting
Rahman, Smita	voting
Rashid, Mamunur	voting
Reading, Amity	voting
Reynolds, Anne	voting
Riley, Emmitt	voting
Risdon, Michael	voting
Roberts, David	voting
Roberts, Jacqueline	voting
Roberts, Michael	voting
Roberts, Stephen	voting
Name	Status
Rodriguez, James	voting
Roehling, Allison	voting
Ross, Scott	voting
Rowley, Sarah	voting
Rusu, Dan	voting
Sage, Clark	voting
Sahu, Sunil	voting
Salman, Randy	voting
Sanders, Bruce	voting
Sayili, Koray	voting
Schindler, Rebecca	voting
Schneider, Henning	voting
Schwartzman, Maria	voting
Schwipps, Gregory	voting
Scott, Daniel	voting
Seaman, Francesca	voting
Seaman, Michael	voting
Serlin, Bruce	voting
Shannon, Daniel	voting
Shifa, Naima	voting
Sieg, Brandon	voting
Sinowitz, Michael	voting
Sirotkin, Leonid	voting
Smith, Caroline	voting
Smith, Orcenith	voting
Smock, Richard	voting
Smogor, Louis	voting
Snyder, Steven	voting
Soster, Frederick	voting
Spiegelberg, Scott	voting
Stasik, Tamara	voting

Stepp, Scotty	voting
Stevens, Robert	voting
Stewart, Khadija	voting
Stinebrickner, Bruce	voting
Stockton, Jamie	voting
Stolle, Kara	voting
Suarez, Alicia	voting
Sununu, Andrea	voting
Szpunar, Ruth	voting
Tabor, Jaclyn	voting
Thede, Scott	voting
Timm, Steven	voting
Townsend, Gloria	voting
Travers, Tarn	voting
Tremblay, Sheryl	voting
Tunguz, Sharmin	voting
Upton, Rebecca	voting
Vaglia, Janet	voting
Vesely, Laurent	voting
Vijay, Sianne	voting
Name	Status
Villinski, Michele	voting
Wachter, Daniel	voting
Wagner, Christina	voting
Weinstein, Anthony	voting
Weisz, Eva	voting
Wells, James	voting
West, Robert	voting
White, Christine	voting
Whitehead, Barbara	voting
Wielenberg, Erik	voting
Wilkerson, Scott	voting
Willey, Brenden	voting
Williams, Alexander	voting
Wilson, Susan	voting
Wilson, Wesley	voting
Wimbley, Karin	voting
Worthington, David	voting
Wright, Brian	voting
Wright, Lili	voting
Wu, Zhixin	voting
Yang, Zoua Sylvia	voting
Yuasa, Ikuko	voting
Zach, Ariel	voting
Ziegler, Valarie	voting

Name	Status
Alvis, Andra	non voting
Brightman, Cheri	non voting
Clarke, Andrea	non voting
Evans, Paula	non voting
Jackman, Dorian	non voting
Kirkeiner, Marie	non voting
Linville, Steven	non voting
Pollack, Tamara	non voting
Priest, Brian	non voting
Reynolds, Nicholas	non voting
Seymour, Peter	non voting
Sloan, Heather	non voting
Solberg, Daniel	non voting
Spivack, Miranda	non voting
Thielmann, Cristiana	non voting
Watson, Eric	non voting
Yoak, Stuart	non voting