

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
September 9, 2010**

**MINUTES**

Present: Kathryn Millis (minutes), Jay White, María Luque, Dorian Shager, Sharmin Tunguz, Carrie Klaus (minutes), Jeff Gropp, Christine Walker.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from May 6, 2010  
([www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/SLAACFiles/May\\_6\\_2010.pdf](http://www.depauw.edu/acad/facgov/SLAACFiles/May_6_2010.pdf))

We will rotate taking notes for minutes. These do not need to be carefully written, Kathryn can do grammar, spelling, etc., but needs help not forgetting details.

SLAAC will meet at 4:05, generally on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month (planned meetings, subject to change to accommodate guests, are 9/9, 9/23, 10/14, 10/28, 11/11, and 12/9). We will try to end by 5:30.

**II. Upcoming University Review Committee (URC) Issues**

Carrie gave a brief overview URC purposes and functions. These are established “because [an academic dishonesty] charge or penalty is disputed or because this is a second offense.” (See [www.depauw.edu/univ/handbooks/dpuhandbooks.asp?ID=521&parentid=518](http://www.depauw.edu/univ/handbooks/dpuhandbooks.asp?ID=521&parentid=518))

SLAAC is charged with assembling pools of teaching faculty members and students willing to serve on a committee if needed. Kathryn has asked the faculty and received about 30 volunteers, and is contacting students who were recommended by various faculty and staff members as having specific interest in the topic, or related topics such as education. She will post a spreadsheet with faculty and student names for all members of SLAAC to review. We’ll vote to approve them next meeting (9/23). Contact Kathryn or Carrie with any questions or concerns.

Heads up: SLAAC will advise on Carrie on URC procedures this semester. Please read the handbook (link above).

**III. Possible agenda items for this year**

SLAAC will or may be asked to work on these:

- Follow up from “Guiding Principles for How We Live at DePauw” document written spring 2010

In each of the last two years, SLAAC was asked by the president to work on specific projects. We have received no charge so far this year.

At last SLAAC meeting of 2009-2010, SLAAC used the “How We Live” document ([www.depauw.edu/univ/handbooks/dpuhandbooks.asp?ID=481&parentid=480](http://www.depauw.edu/univ/handbooks/dpuhandbooks.asp?ID=481&parentid=480)) to brainstorm topics SLAAC might discuss this year. It’s not clear if SLAAC needs to do anything else with these. On some, SLAAC has already made recommendations. Some are not our purview and many are already in place. Please review the minutes to see if current SLAAC members think we should work on any of these.

One suggestion: Importance of attention to classrooms—size, location, equipment etc. Do we talk too much about the outside and not enough about the inside? (This issue will be addressed by other groups such as MAO and CAPP, which focus on more on academics. Faculty Governance Steering Committee is scheduled to discuss the spread of classes across days and across time banks, which is related to how many classrooms are needed, and of what configurations.)

- Greek Life Advisory Council (GLAC)

Dorian gave a brief overview of GLAC's composition and purpose. GLAC is an alumni organization created in 2007 out of the Greek Fact-Finding Commission. They and some SLAAC members met last year. GLAC wants SLAAC to help determine what the faculty wants with regard to engagement from/with Greek houses, and the Greek system.

Briefly discussed what students and faculty members may want from discussions of Greek life and with GLAC. Many students are concerned that specific faculty members have a negative impression of the Greek system which prejudices their interactions with Greek students and might influence grading, etc. Is this true? Is this a problem that should be addressed? By SLAAC?

Possible discussion topics: Should the academic advisory system for the Greek system be overhauled? How can (should) there be more meaningful interaction? Are there concerns about the current system for recruitment and pledging? More broadly, do faculty care what students do outside of class? Whether or not students are Greek? Do faculty feel it is their responsibility to care?

We could consider drafting a statement about faculty perceptions of the Greek system. Such a statement would note that faculty perceptions vary greatly, that there is not a single faculty perception.

- Appointments to various committees/boards

Kathryn will email the faculty seeking volunteers for Nature Park Advisory Committee and Dining Services Oversight Committee, post responses (in Google Docs) for SLAAC members to view, and we’ll vote on them next meeting.

- Topics from Student Congress

Student Congress is expected to resolve that future resolutions and white papers should specify to whom they are addressed, and ask for a response by a given date. Upcoming resolutions could potentially be directed toward SLAAC. Likely topics:

- Many students complain that some faculty members are not returning graded assignments or other feedback. Student Congress may ask the faculty to discuss how long faculty members do or should take to grade and return work to students (and the expectation that papers or tests be graded at all).
- Many students think that they aren't getting into desired classes as much as past students did. Student Congress VP of Academic Affairs is gathering data.
- Bias response protocols

The University has multiple offices and procedures for handling harassment of students, or of employees, but some cases involve both, or have no particular victims. About a dozen representatives from various offices, chaired by Hermen Diaz, Assistant Director of Multicultural Student Services, have begun to meet monthly. Dorian will bring updates and draft documents to SLAAC.

Bias response protocols are being formalized, partly in response to the Cinco de Mayo incident (a theme party was widely considered offensive), but more input is needed. If an incident occurs, a subgroup will be pulled together as needed, depending on the incident.

- Students incurring additional debt to go on Winter Term trips, etc.

Currently, students owe the university about \$2.5 million. There's some discussion about whether students who already owe the University money should be allowed incur additional (optional) debt, particularly on expensive Winter Term trips.

- Nature Park Advisory Committee

In 2008 this was established as a temporary committee reporting to SLAAC, with the intent of reviewing it in fall 2010. Questions include whether it should be made permanent, what constituencies need representatives (and how they should be elected or selected), and should it continue to report to SLAAC?

The Nature Park goes beyond student activity, so SLAAC is not a perfect fit. It also hosts classes, student and faculty research, individual and group recreation, arts, etc., and the local community uses it heavily for individual, school, and group activities. But reporting to SLAAC would emphasize its student-centered mission.

Next meeting: Thursday, September 23, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:17 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
September 23, 2010**

**MINUTES**

Present: Doug Cox (guest, for discussion of the Nature Park), Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, María Luque, Kathryn Millis (minutes), Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Jay White (minutes).

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

We approved minutes from the meeting of September 9, 2010, with minor edits and a request to not note which members were absent.

**II. Approve Dining Services Oversight Committee (DSOC) volunteers**

We read statements from three faculty members who volunteered: Jen Adams (Communication and Theatre), Peter Graham (English) and Keith Tonne (Music). Because two volunteers are needed and Peter has already served, we voted to appoint Jen and Keith.

**III. Nature Park**

Doug Cox, Director of the Nature Park, joined the committee to discuss how to formalize the Nature Park Advisory Committee.

In 2008, when the park was new, SLAAC was charged with reviewing this temporary committee (in the fall of 2010, now!) and proposing how to make it permanent.

We are charged with recommending the appropriate variety of representation in faculty (which departments or interdisciplinary areas), students, athletics (or other DePauw constituencies), and Greencastle/Putnam County community; the methods of selecting these representatives, and to whom they would report.

Doug briefed the committee on events and personnel at the Nature Park. The number and variety of events at the park has increased dramatically since opening. He pointed to the strength in student workers as being an important part of the success of the park's operations, because there are only two full time adult staff members. His greatest concern is that there be continued, preferably greater, funding and support for student workers.

The student workers are more than just work-study participants; they contribute in a quasi-internship manner. They lead events and present research to DePauw and Greencastle groups. The minimal staff at the park relies heavily on the support the student workers offer, and the students gain both skills and experience, particularly in environmental and recreational management. Students are given substantial responsibility, working with visitors, staffing the park at all hours, responding to emergencies, as well as grounds keeping, and even janitorial work when needed.

The park's uses have widened significantly, providing class and student/faculty research opportunities in biology, chemistry, environmental studies, geosciences, and other sciences, as well as increasing arts activities (from outdoor sculpture class activities to major public concerts like Carrie Newcomer). Students use the park for recreation; student athletes, like the cross-country teams, use it for practice. Greeks and other student groups are beginning to use the site for informals and retreats.

The park is an area of town-gown interaction, where students and community members share activities. Doug cited one visitor's remark to President Casey that it's the "greatest gift the University gave to the community."

In addition to activity that's "nature" or "park" related, community groups are increasingly scheduling retreats and meetings, and there were eighteen weddings this summer. (Due to the disruption caused, weddings are not scheduled during the semester.) These events can generate revenue for the university, but costs must also cover increased expenses. (For example, overnight camping requires 24 hour staffing, but the cost of renting one site isn't enough to pay for that.)

The committee will help consider how to balance competing educational, research, arts, and other interests, and demand for resources. The committee will advise on the types and amounts of commercial activity it considers appropriate.

Another issue that has arisen is the use of alcohol. One can drink at Prindle but not at the park's Welcome Center (two sites where similar events are held). People have admitted sneaking alcohol into events. Doug hopes that SLAAC and the NPAC will assist in reviewing the efficacy of the "no alcohol" policy. Allowing alcohol would require insurance, and might significantly change the feel of some events.

The committee should also discuss the relationship between the park and the Prindle, which is technically a separate entity, but also an entrance to the park, and people don't see the difference.

The committee will help with topics like how to identify and protect sites of student and faculty research (or creative activity), or ecological importance.

The committee, as it was formed in 2008, numbers eight, including two student appointees, Steve Timm (appointed chair by the VPAA), and Dana Dudle, representing the biology department.

At our next meeting, we will discuss the constituencies that should be represented in a committee. At future meetings we will also discuss how representatives should be chosen (e.g., elected vs. appointed), by whom, the length of terms, etc.

#### **IV. Approve University Review Committee (URC) volunteers**

We reviewed the lists of faculty volunteers and of students who had been asked if they were willing to serve and had agreed. There was a brief discussion on the process by

which the recommended student names were collected. (Recommendations had been solicited from several student related offices, and from faculty in fields like conflict studies, education, philosophy, and political science.) There was a concern about the small number of students of color listed. Kathryn will contact Multicultural Affairs for suggestions and we'll review the list again next meeting.

**V. University Review Committee (URC) procedures**

We discussed composition of a URC. The Handbook says only that the chair must be "a current or former member of SLAAC," but not whether that must be a teaching faculty member (like the other two faculty), or could be a "with rank of" faculty member, or an administrator, or student.

We agreed unanimously and strongly that it would be unfair and inappropriate to ask a student to chair. We agreed unanimously that the chair should be a teaching faculty member, though some administrators' expertise would make them good chairs, if need be.

Carrie will note these interpretations in her procedures, but we will not propose amending the Handbook at this time.

We will discuss procedures for second accusations at our next meeting.

**VI. Student Government Update**

Christine shared several quick items:

- a. Student government has appointed Xinyi (Sunny) Wang (voting) and Gary Pett (non-voting) to SLAAC. One non-voting position remains open.
- b. Congress passed a resolution that future resolutions should specify to whom they are directed in the University hierarchy, and that a response is requested (by a given date).
- c. Congress established a legislative calendar, on which several items are related to SLAAC's charge, and may be addressed (at least in part) to us.

Next meeting: Thursday, October 14, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:28 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
October 14, 2010**

**Minutes**

Present: Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, María Luque, Kathryn Millis (minutes), Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang, Jay White.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from the meeting of September 23, 2010.

**II. University Review Committee (URC) procedure**

Discussed two URC procedure questions.

First whether, in the case of a contested second violation, two separate URCs should be convened, one to hear the contested violation and a second to decide if further sanctions are necessary (assuming the student is found responsible for the second violation). We agreed that it was not necessary to convene two second URCs.

Second, (based on SLAAC's decision about the first issue) was at what point the URC should be informed that it was a second violation. In line with the Community Standards practice (explained by Cindy and Dorian: the panel is not told of a prior violation before the hearing, but is told before discussion the penalty), SLAAC decided to be consistent with this practice, so the URC should not be informed during the hearing itself (unless the student wishes to disclose this information), but only when it enters deliberations. The URC can thus decide simultaneously about an appropriate penalty for the second violation and whether or not additional sanctions are necessary. Approved change in wording to state that penalty decisions may determine the grade *and* additional sanctions (e.g. suspension or expulsion).

Approved of Carrie routinely editing (without consultation) words like “dismissal” or “expulsion” to follow current university terminology.

Agreed on several smaller edits, e.g., remove “witnesses stay in the room.”

Discussed who is notified of decisions and when. The chair writes a letter to the student (with copies to the faculty member, the VPAA, and the dean who administers the policy) explaining the URC's decision. After an appeal period, a copy of the letter may be provided to the Registrar and/or the Dean of Students, depending on the decision and penalty. Discussed parents/guardians, who, in cases of Community Standards hearings, are notified if there is “danger.”

Discussed form – do students understand the gravity of what they’re signing? Add to “acceptance of responsibility section...” Carrie will contact the student after receiving a signed form.

SLAAC minutes 10/14/2010

**Approve University Review Committee (URC) volunteers**

Reviewed the lists of faculty volunteers and students who had been asked if they were willing to serve and had agreed; several students of color had responded, so the pool is now more diverse. Voted unanimously to accept.

**III. Nature Park Advisory Committee**

Postponed significant discussion of which campus and community groups & activities should be represented in an advisory committee.

Next meeting: Thursday, October 28, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:16 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
October 28, 2010**

**MINUTES**

Present: Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus (minutes), María Luque, Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Xinyi Wang, Jay White.

1. Carrie circulated a draft guide for University Review Committees summarizing how the academic integrity policy has *been* implemented over the last five academic years (2005-2006 through 2009-2010), with regard to penalties.

The committee discussed the usefulness of this document and ultimately found it to be more problematic than helpful, as it illustrated the range of severity of penalties without providing qualitative information about what type of violation led to what type of penalty. The document was also found to be problematic in that it would require yearly updates.

After recommending that this document *not* be provided to URC members, the committee looked over another URC guide (from 2004) and noted some problems.

2. The committee then discussed what type of information would be more helpful. Members who have served on URCs in the past recalled wishing for guidance beyond what is explicit in the Academic Integrity Policy when making decisions on final penalties. In hearings through the Community Standards process, violations are categorized according to “level”, and committee members receive a document advising them of the type and range of sanctions that are possible for each level. It might be useful to look back through the academic integrity files over the past five years and see if it would be possible to come with a guide to recommended sanctions for different types of violations (although violations of the Academic Integrity Policy are not categorized by “level”).

At any rate, the possible penalties ought to be clarified. The committee looked closely at the wording of the Academic Integrity Policy with regard to penalties—“The URC imposes penalties for dishonesty according to the nature of the violation. URC penalties may include *a letter of warning, grade penalties, failure in the class, suspension or dismissal*” [emphasis added]—and advised that penalties should be confined to this list, i.e., a URC should be discouraged from coming up with “creative” penalties that fall outside of the course or incident, as has been done occasionally in the past.

3. The committee finally considered what to do when two violations happen in rapid succession, as has happened a few times in the last five years (a student

has been found responsible for two violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, either in the same class or in two different classes, within a few days or weeks). In some cases, the incidents have been treated as a single, large violation of the policy; in others, they have been treated separately. The goal of the Academic Integrity Policy is not to be the "integrity police", but rather, to ensure that learning occurs. One could argue that if two incidents happen close together, there was not sufficient time for learning to occur. (The student might have been working on both assignments at the same time, for example, before he or she was contacted by a professor to discuss the first integrity issue.) SLAAC decided that the dean charged with administering the Academic Integrity Policy should decide, in such a situation, whether it is more appropriate to deal with the incidents separately or together.

Based on SLAAC's discussions, Carrie will continue revising procedural documents for URCs and will bring updated documents to the committee for approval, hopefully by the end of the semester.

Next meeting: Thursday, November 11, 2010, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
November 11, 2010**

**Minutes**

Present: Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, María Luque, Kathryn Millis, Dorian Shager, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang, Jay White.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Unanimously approved minutes from the meeting of October 28, 2010.

**II. Feedback and Returned Academic Work**

Discussed Student Congress Resolution No. 2, "A Resolution Concerning Feedback and Returned Academic Work," which asks that SLAAC consider asking the faculty to add language to the *Academic Handbook* on "the importance of returning work to students in a timely manner."

The first question, there anything already in the *Handbook* that's applicable? Members could not think of anything; there are very few specifics about what faculty members must and must not do. So, could mention in the *Handbook* help? For instance, it contains language (approved by the faculty) requiring that classes be held before and after breaks, but individual faculty members routinely cancel class without (apparent) penalty.

Christine reports that if a student complains to the VPAA it is noted in the personnel file, but does not necessarily have any further impact. We imagine that it might be helpful to have something in the *Handbook* (or someplace else) so that something can be done, at least in extreme cases; it's hard to sanction an employee for not doing something they are not expected to do.

Students need to know if they're learning what they're supposed to, and students need to know how they're doing before the end of the drop period. Carrie reports that a petitions committee would take into account a professor's not returning work if a student petitioned for a late drop.

Do students know they can go to the VPAA to complain, or other steps they can take with this or other concerns about a class or professor? Should directions be added to the *Student Handbook*?

Faculty members of the committee commented on the difficulty of reading & grading papers within a short time period. If given hard deadlines, they think, some faculty members would give fewer, briefer, or easier to grade assignments. Faculty members like control over their own lives. One stated that students in other countries do not get the kinds of feedback DePauw students expect.

Why has this particular issue has come to attention, and not other things? Faculty members could engage in all sorts of bad ethical behavior, or poor teaching behavior,

which are not forbidden one by one in the *Handbook*. Faculty are reviewed for “good teaching,” but DePauw does not specify in detail what that requires. We noted, however, that students, too, could do all sorts of bad things, but that plagiarism has been identified as a specific concern, with so the handbooks provide specific details of what is acceptable and not, and how accusations are handled.

One student on the committee gave an example of one of her classes this fall, in which she has not yet gotten back a paper turned in four weeks ago. That class has fewer than twenty students, so not an especially large number of papers. Christine has been compiling reports from students, and believes that one professor has, for three semesters, returned no graded work at all. This person is tenured, and students (especially majors) are afraid to complain because they may have to take further classes with them.

One administrator on the committee noted that this is very different for staff and administrators, who routinely are told what to do and expected to do it.

Discussed adding mention of the importance of returning student work to the email that is sent reminding faculty to submit midterm grades. However, faculty members are only required to give midterm grades to first year students and those on academic probation. Students report that in some classes, everyone gets the same midterm grade.

Briefly discussed what’s in the *Handbook* defining or explaining what’s “good teaching,” or setting expectations.

Kathryn will look into what might be expected at peer schools.

Several committee members checked sections of the *Handbook*, and found that it contains requirements, with a possible penalty of termination, on electronic communication, alcohol and controlled substances, “drug free workplace,” sexual harassment, and whistleblower retaliation. Other expectations that don’t specify termination include holding classes before breaks, accommodating extracurricular activities and religious holy days, handling disruptive students, and conflicting exams. But nothing addresses actual teaching strategies or methods.

Discussed addressing this as mutual expectations of students and faculty members. However, in existing cases, students can be penalized for not living up to an expectation, while it is not clear that faculty members can be.

Kathryn and Christine will spend more time looking over the *Handbook* and come up with draft ideas for SLAAC to consider bringing to the faculty for a vote.

### III. Nature Park Advisory Committee

We deferred discussion of which student constituencies, and which community groups & activities (if any) should be represented in an advisory committee, to a later meeting

**IV. Kegs**

We discussed White Paper No. 3, "White Paper Concerning Overconsumption of Alcohol on Campus" which is addressed to Dorian Shager, and asks that the University reconsider the ban on kegs. SLAAC had participated in the discussions about banning kegs. Cindy gave an overview: several years ago national fraternities thought that banning kegs would reduce drinking. It didn't work. Kegs create central distribution sites, and involve standing in line and waiting for others to be served, then being given a single beverage, but cans of beer can be served from many locations, people can easily grab several, and they are easy to keep for later.

The administration is talking with Interfraternity Council about possible guidelines, such as the requirement that one person register and monitor a keg, and establishing a keg to guest ratio.

The administration and student government are also concerned with reducing consumption of hard alcohol, which is the major source of alcohol poisoning.

**V. Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday, December 9, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:33 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee**

**December 9, 2010**

**Minutes**

**Present:** Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, María Luque, Kathryn Millis, Gary Pett, Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang, Jay White.

**Guests:** David Harvey, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Rick Smock, Chair of Committee on Faculty

**I. Feedback and Returned Academic Work**

David Harvey, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Rick Smock, Chair of Committee on Faculty, join the committee to discuss Student Congress Resolution No. 2, "A Resolution Concerning Feedback and Returned Academic Work," which asks that SLAAC consider asking the faculty to add language to the *Academic Handbook* on "the importance of returning work to students in a timely manner."

We started by asking Rick and David to share their sense of what's happening: do significant numbers of faculty members not return work in a timely manner, is it most prevalent among any specific group(s), has this increased in recent years, how is it addressed currently, and do COF and the administration have what's needed for addressing problems?

Rick reports that in recent years COF has had a handful of problematic reviews. Perhaps one or two per year show evidence of no feedback at all, and a number appear not to have given relevant feedback before succeeding assignments. Some student evaluations report this as a problem, but they do not consistently give low ratings in other areas, or overall, so COF does not have evidence that the problem is a serious barrier to learning. Many faculty members write in annual reports that they do not enjoy grading. Chairs' responses to annual reports do not criticize candidates for not returning work promptly. Personnel committee reports have not criticized candidates or suggested improvements when there is evidence that they are not returning work in a timely manner.

We discussed two places in the *Academic Handbook* that SLAAC could propose changes. First, in "Personnel Policies," in section V. Criteria for Decisions on Faculty Status,<sup>1</sup> A. (Teaching), particularly in 3. Teaching Methods, or 4. Effectiveness. This motion should probably come from COF, the committee most involved with review criteria. Though primarily intended as criteria for reviews, this section could be used by the administration as evidence of performance expectations for faculty members even when they are not up for review.

---

<sup>1</sup> Of which there are two versions; which one applies depends on whether the candidate was hired/last promoted during or prior to 2004-05.

Second, SLAAC could propose a new section for "Academic Policies," which contains several expectations faculty to follow, such as excusing absences for Holy Days and approved extracurricular activities, holding classes on days before and after breaks, limits on exams at the end of a semester, and handling disruptive students.

In either case, an occasional complaint would not lead to disciplinary action. Only multiple events (possibly over multiple semesters) would lead to a required plan for improvement. The university has a standard set of steps (that span several semesters) to take if there's not sufficient improvement.

Students on the committee pointed out that students are hesitant or afraid to complain, especially if it's not anonymous. They are uncomfortable saying that a faculty member is failing at their responsibilities, and are afraid of retribution.

We talked about students citing a lack of graded work as a justification for requested withdrawals and in grade grievances. Committee members knew of specific instances, but all agreed that this is not a solution.

We asked if some kinds of faculty members are more likely to not return work. It appears that tenured faculty members may be more likely to *consistently* not return work promptly. New faculty members may accidentally take on too much at first, but that's because of inexperience. The problem seems to grow as people become acclimated to teaching, and switch their focus from teaching to professional activity. Any policy will be felt most by junior pre-tenure and term faculty though.

We acknowledged student frustration that they face penalties for not doing what they're supposed to, while faculty members do not.

Kathryn has done some searching, and found several schools that lay out teaching assistant expectations that work will be graded within (generally) one week, but few sites with clear guidelines for faculty.

David will ask his GCLA colleagues about peer institutions' experiences. Questions to that list get frequently get replies of essentially "yes, we have same problem, tell if you find a solution!"

Can faculty members be asked to set their own deadlines or state, e.g., in the syllabus, when students can expect work back? No, that's micromanaging. The *Academic Handbook* includes "By publishing a list of class meetings in the Schedule of Classes and issuing a course syllabus, each faculty member enters into an agreement with his or her students as to *when* [emphasis added] class is held." But there are no requirements for what's in a syllabus.

We acknowledge the importance of autonomy, and in will craft wording that's not rigid, about reasonable expectations, for instance, but not specific deadlines. That should be enough for enforcement in problem cases.

We asked about enforcement. David explained that if multiple students report the same problem in evaluations, after the second semester or class either the Dean of Faculty or the Vice President of Academic Affairs emails the faculty member. If there are further complaints, they meet to discuss the problem. If it continues, a formal improvement plan is established. Not improving leads to sub-standard raises, then increasing levels of discipline.

David can only think of one case where VPAA Neal Abraham got to this level. Rick can remember a term person being fired in the middle of a semester due to multiple problems, but that was many years ago.

In wording, would we be better with “a student has the right to expect...” or “faculty should...”? It should be brief, not proscriptive; could be modeled after the handbook’s expectations for students.

David suggests we play with language, talk informally with other faculty members, and department members. The earliest possible vote is March, but nothing can apply before fall 2011. To change the handbook, we must at the latest bring to faculty by the April meeting, for voting in May.

We thanked David and Rick for their time.

In brief discussion, we agreed that a reasonable policy suggestion ought to pass with broad support.

## II. **Minutes and Meetings**

Approved unanimously the minutes from the meeting of November 11, 2010

## III. **University Review Committees**

Did a final review of URC procedures discussed at earlier meetings. Unanimously agreed they are OK for use.

## IV. **Kegs & Greek Life Advisory Council (GLAC)**

Update from Cindy Babington. GLAC chair Chris Johnston (aka CJ) had met with some SLAAC members last year, and the group agreed to have another (larger) meeting. Chris has contacted several campus offices this fall, so Cindy has scheduled a meeting with GLAC and staff from those offices. Hopefully some SLAAC members can attend.

The meeting is Thursday, December 16, at 4 p.m., in UB 231 – 232.

Dorian also working with a group of faculty members talking about Greek issues.

It’s not clear if GLAC has a specific agenda or goals beyond their desire to be informed and/or consulted about campus planning on topics they see as related to

Greek houses. Some GLAC members manage the houses (so have clear interest in, rules & procedures that apply to them - or don't) and many serve in advisory roles to Greek students, but most graduated many years ago, so are not necessarily more in touch with today's students than are current employees.

Cindy will propose setting up a council of alumni, faculty, staff, etc., which might be approved by the president. The president's cabinet has decided to use the keg white paper as catalyst for a broader discussion of alcohol and campus social life.

**V. Community Standards Hearings**

Update from Kathryn Millis – Eleven faculty members from eight departments (including the libraries) volunteered.

**VI. Spring 2011 Meeting Schedule**

Default spring meetings will be:

February 10 & 24

March 10 & 31 (1 week late, due to spring break)

April 14 & 28

May 12 (the last day of classes - last year the last meeting was mostly wrap up & transition with incoming members)

**VII. Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday February 10, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned ### p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
February 10, 2011**

**Minutes**

Present: Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, Maria Luque, Kathryn Millis, Gary Pett, Greg Schwipps, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang, Jay White.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Kathryn did not distribute minutes from December until today. We'll edit and vote to approve either by email or at next meeting.

**II. Feedback and Returned Academic Work**

Kathryn is concerned that about this proposal coming from a group that is not predominately teaching faculty. Do we need to work on getting greater input? Others on the committee are not concerned.

We edited a draft Cindy had provided; our proposal now reads:

"Timely and adequate feedback is essential to student learning. Faculty are expected to respond to students' work in a manner that allows students to learn from and apply this evaluation to subsequent work."

Kathryn will send this draft language to Rick Smock, David Harvey, and Dave Berque. If they approve she'll send it to department chairs, asking for feedback before our next meeting. Kathryn will work with Dave to get it on the agenda for the March faculty meeting, to be voted on in April.

**III. Nature Park Advisory Committee**

Discuss picking community constituencies; to represent the community, should someone be selected by the community? Kathryn will ask Mayor Murray if she or City Council would do it, and find out if that's OK in DePauw procedures.

**IV. GLAC**

Christine, Cindy, and Kathryn gave a summary of the meeting with GLAC and other campus representatives. Some GLAC members seem to think that house managers are not being involved early in (or sufficiently informed of) discussion of issues that impinge on them. Some GLAC representatives see themselves as significantly representing a huge percentage of students, but current students have multiple identities & don't think of themselves as Greek first.

When should GLAC be informed, have input, have a vote?

GLAC may particularly be concerned that developing a senior neighborhood will take residents from Greek houses. They may have had input, but the decisions are not going as they might hope. Christine noted that Greeks may want/need to change how they handle

housing. Some sorority contracts say women may be required to move back into a house if space is available.

GLAC interprets the shrinking number of 8 a.m. classes as impacting them, because they think that more early classes would result in fewer drinking problems.

Several noted that older alumni had much stronger ties to Greek houses when they were here, and continue to feel closer to them than to DePauw.

V. **Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday, February 24, 2011, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:22 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
February 24, 2011**

**MINUTES**

Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, Kathryn Millis, Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from the meeting of February 10, 2011.

**II. Feedback and Returned Academic Work**

**a.** Discussed revisions to our proposed policy, which, in the agenda for the March faculty meeting will approximately read:

SLAAC gives notice of our intent to ask the faculty to vote in April 2011 on the following proposed change to the Academic Handbook. Motion will be to add to "Academic Policies" of the *Academic Handbook*, a new section, XI, titled "Timely Feedback," reading:

"Timely and adequate feedback is essential to student learning. Faculty members are expected to respond to students' work in a time frame and manner that allow students to learn from and apply this feedback to subsequent work."

**b.** We had received feedback on our draft from last meeting (2/10/11 minutes), suggesting the word "time frame" instead of "manner," lest "manner" raise concerns that we were setting quality criteria. We recognize the concern, and decided to use both time frame *and* manner, as both are necessary parts of good feedback. Students were concerned that a time frame only might lead to feedback that's prompt but minimal.

We discussed feedback about where to ask that this be placed in the *Handbook*. "Academic Policies" puts this with similar faculty-approved expectations like holding classes before and after breaks, and not giving cumulative tests in the final days of classes. "Personnel Policies" is more likely to be read it and taken it as a serious requirement, but it would be by far the most precise part of that section, and seem to be more a concern for those still going through regular reviews than tenured full professors. We agreed on "Academic Policies."

If passed, Kathryn will ask appropriate administrators to remind the faculty of this policy as (or when) they write about other things like midterm grades and holding class before/after breaks.

Discussed some draft supporting material for the agenda, which will address likely concerns. Kathryn will flesh these out and send draft for feedback by Monday. Agenda items are due to Dave Berque Monday.

- i. Why? – Widespread concern expressed to Student Congress, who brought it to the faculty governance process. Individual faculty members have expressed sympathy, or frustration that they're working hard to return well graded material promptly while others don't.
- ii. What counts? – Almost anything that meets the goal of helping students identify progress & areas to work on. Need not be individual grades or corrections. Can be work on drafts of a paper or project, reviewing & discussing quiz answers in class (before grading & returning), etc.
- iii. Why no specificity? – Need varies by subject, topic, assignment type and length/quantity, etc.
- iv. What if I'm late? – Communicate with students about what to expect (in advance and/or if late), some feedback is better than none, offer options or adjustments.

Kathryn will ask David Harvey and Rick Smock to be prepared to answer about what might happen to faculty members who don't provide timely feedback, and if this proposal would lead to a substantial difference from current practice.

### III. Cell Phones & Academic Integrity

At the request of an individual faculty member, SLAAC discussed whether we should propose changes to the "Academic Integrity" section of the handbooks (or some other obvious place), to more clearly say that faculty may restrict cell phones and other electronic devices during tests, quizzes, and class.

Carrie gave an update on fall 2010 academic integrity cases, and the hearing procedures we had updated. They just finished the last hearing, and found the updates helpful and appropriate. There were 25 cases, the norm is fifteen; most were plagiarism, and faculty members very easily found the text. Briefly discussed Turnitin (which the university has not subscribed to due licensing/ownership concerns, and an implied atmosphere of surveillance and distrust), the increase in cases, what to tell students & how they might interpret it (e.g., does knowing numbers make students think they're likely to be caught or not). Community Standards statistics are publicly available.

We agreed that use of a phone (etc.), e.g., to check the time, is not automatically "cheating," so can't go in "Types of Academic Dishonesty." It also does not belong in "Electronic Communications and Acceptable Use Policy," which is not written by the faculty and is extremely broad and restrictive, and does not focus on educational goals.

We agreed that setting rules about use of phones, etc., is well within the spirit of current expectations of what faculty members can require on their syllabi in specific requirements for exams or classes.

Kathryn will reply to the faculty member who raised the concern, and if SLAAC hears of wider problems the committee will look further into what student materials might be edited to make clear that newer technologies are covered. Much of what the university has now was written before common use of cell or smart phones, etc.

**IV. Nature Park Advisory Committee**

Discuss which student constituencies should be represented in an advisory committee and how they should be selected.

Past methods have included: VPAA and administration selected students doing research in the park, the student environmental club named a member, student government took applications and interviewed then made selections, and Doug Cox named an interested employee.

Kathryn will propose draft language for appointments made by the administration and Doug.

**V. Student government Spring 2011**

Topics this semester are more conversational; student congress is not likely to request action by SLAAC. Topics include a parking fee for faculty and professional staff, international student support, dining services, career services, how tenure & reviews work, bottled water, how student evaluations are used.

Questions immediately arose about parking fees (why? how would funds be spent?) Students are responding to their parking fee, a possible "green" fee, and greater parking restrictions.

Questions also arose about tenure, reviews, and student evaluations. Many students have little idea of how reviews work, and how evaluations are used, so these discussions are primarily informative.

**VI. Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday, March 10, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:10 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
March 10, 2011**

**Minutes**

Present: Cindy Babington, Carrie Klaus, Maria Luque, Kathryn Millis, Gary Pett, Sharmin Tunguz, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from the meeting of February 24, 2011.

**II. Feedback and Returned Academic Work**

Faculty meeting:

Kathryn announced our proposed resolution at the March faculty meeting, for a vote at April meeting. Questions so far are about what else is in this section of the handbook, and how will it be enforced. What else does Kathryn need to prepare to answer in April?  
Possible concerns and responses:

1. It's very vague: we're not setting one size fits all guidelines for individuals and departments.
2. I don't want to be told what to do: few people do; we are not saying what to do, this is not a requirement of anything specific, but intended to help in cases where no or almost no feedback is given.
3. Is this really a problem: there appears to have been an increase in longstanding, tenured faculty not returning work for much or all of the semester, though no data has been kept over the years, so we can't be sure.
4. What problems come from not returning graded work: Students need feedback to know if they're learning what they're supposed to in class, & also for making decisions about add/drop, selecting majors & minors, etc.
5. Will it be applied unevenly: this is intended not as punitive, but as public acknowledgement of the faculty's expectations. Much of the handbook is written by the faculty as an expression of values. Like other expectations or policies in the handbook, enforcement is up not up to SLAAC.

**III. January 2011 Working Group Report "Building Academic Community and Engagement"**

Is there a SLAAC interest or role? Yes.

1. The recommendation of only two events at a time is excessively limiting. What is meant by "event"? Only those things sponsored by departments, or does it also mean clubs, student organized speakers & performances...? There's a clear benefit to students who learn how to plan & run things, which means they need opportunities to organize events. Liberal arts education requires a diversity of interests and activities. Limiting the number of events won't make people attend events.

Several events have overflowed this year. Extra credit or other rewards are increasing turnout, as does selecting events of wide interest, but events of narrower appeal do not necessarily have less value to participants.

2. Having a convocation hour in which other activities are not scheduled seems positive; we see no downside. There used to be one, but eventually it was not enforced and so fell apart.
3. Revising time banks has no student downside. Faculty members who only want to teach at certain specific times may not like it, but it should provide much better choice and flexibility for students.

#### IV. **Nature Park Advisory**

Kathryn provided information on other largely advisory committees at DePauw, so we can suggest a membership structure consistent with current practice. Also distributed info on student groups related to nature, which might be designated to nominate members. Please review for discussion at next meeting.

1. Postponed until next meeting a review of positions & how they would be appointed.
2. Do we have any say over charge? – Cindy says there is a charge already; she'll send and be sure it's on the web.
3. President has already approved appointment of Denise Sigworth, Past President of the Putnam County Community Foundation.

#### V. **Recent Student Congress White Papers**

Unavailable. Will discuss on the 31st.

#### VI. **New Business**

None.

#### VII. **Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday, March 31, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 4:47 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee**  
**March 31, 2011**  
**Minutes**

**Present:** Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, Kathryn Millis (minutes), Gary Pett, Greg Schwipps, Sunny Wang, Jay White. Keith Nightenhelser, Coordinator of Convocations, guest.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from the meeting of March 10, 2011

**II. Competing Events**

Meet with Keith Nightenhelser, Coordinator of Convocations, to discuss concerns about competing events, as raised by the January Working Group and others. SLAAC members had agreed at last meeting that a diversity of events is important for student learning and growth. If faculty are overscheduled, but not students, or if limiting faculty sponsored, but not student sponsored events is the goal, then this is not much of a SLAAC concern.

Keith reports that Public Occasions Committee sponsors approximately 40 - 50 events per academic year. Estimating the average number of events and attendances, probably people attend, on average four per year, though numbers vary widely by individual.

We have faculty complaints, but no data showing students feeling or being stressed by number of events. Students in groups like Media or Management Fellows, which require attendance at certain events, may feel pressured because of those events.

There has been some increase in events in recent years, largely due to new programs (Kelly writers, Prindle, Media fellows, biology, conflict studies) that have their own money, all sponsoring multiple events. There has not yet been a decrease in the number of events due to the economic downturn and tighter finances.

Groups might do better at pooling money & planning. Currently, events sponsored by academic units can be planned fairly well, but student groups plan later, have revolving leadership so are not as familiar with budget and other processes. Student government, which oversees finances, could look into improved planning.

One main impediment is that students can't see the Planning Calendar, so don't know of planned and potentially conflicting events until they're already on the University Calendar. Can they get access?

The January working group wrote of improved "community" if people attend common events. To whom do we report our reactions? Probably FGSC, as the January working group is not officially active any more?

We discussed the concentration of events, which leads to conflicts or peak busy times, while other times have few (or no) events. To increase possible attendance, spread more

events onto Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Events are typically not scheduled on Monday evening due to Greek chapter meetings (although films are scheduled then, because Ashley's owner makes the theatre available then), or Tuesday and Thursday due to evening classes, so the main evening currently scheduled is Wednesday.

Discussed attendance (by CLA students, etc.) at music events.

Discussed the possibility of picking a few a highlight events and trying at least to block conflicts with them. This is impractical if there's no enforcement; people who don't want to cooperate will still schedule competing events.

Discussed P.R.: Facebook is overwhelming, posters overlooked. Collaboration and visibility might be improved by using the Google Calendar system instead of the current one, maintained in Oracle. Make the calendar display campus events on the web site's home page. Set up clubs, departments & other groups with "calendars" so they can be listed. Teach consistency in scheduling and data entry, so date, location, etc. are accurately displayed. This is a major problem with the current system, which isn't user friendly, different groups/events are entered and display differently; and it doesn't transfer information well to the calendars individuals use. We might look at what other tech savvy schools that also use Google Apps are doing with their calendars.

We asked student members their perspectives: is there enough/too much to do? Do you regularly have the experience of missing & later hearing about an event you would have wanted to attend? Do you choose not to attend desired events due to conflicts? With what?

Agreed to ask members of student congress, who are probably more scheduled than the average students, their opinions about the number, distribution, etc., of events. However, if there is need for increased common events to improve intellectual community, then personal opinions, including those of students, may be less important.

Cindy had a few suggested questions, will send Friday morning for feedback, with the goal of asking at Sunday evening's Student Congress meeting.

### **III. Nature Park Advisory Committee**

Discussed methods of selecting faculty representatives. Instead of elections, we agreed that we're likely to get more informed and committed participants if SLAAC appoints two faculty members (one sciences, one non-sciences) for two-year alternating terms. Make the call for one each fall, same time as URC, Community Standards, and Dining Services.

Discussed methods of selecting student representatives. Decided that SLAAC should appoint two students each year, solicited broadly, and in addition specifically contact nature related student organizations soliciting volunteers.

Agreed to ask that someone involved in Prindle serve.

SLAAC Minutes 3/31/2011

Nature Park Manager/Ranger Brien Holsapple and a Student Life representative should serve ex officio,

Looked at description ideas. Kathryn will draft a version largely following ATAC for discussion.

**IV. Next meeting**

Thursday, April 14, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 5:52 p.m.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
April 14, 2011**

**Minutes**

Cindy Babington, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, Kathryn Millis, Gary Pett, Greg Schwipps, Dorian Shager, Christine Walker, Sunny Wang.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Minutes from the meeting of March 31, 2011 were approved.

**II. Event Scheduling**

Discussed Student Government responses (which Cindy emailed to members on 4/4/11) to our short poll seeking student input about the “too many events” concern raised by January Working Group.

Most students agreed that having only two academic events at a time would be helpful, but about 40% disagreed or were neutral. If there were fewer academic programs, most would still not attend events that they weren’t already interested in. About half said they couldn’t attend desired events due to other commitments. Kathryn will report to FGSC that as long as the intent is only to limit events planned and sponsored by academic units, not those planned & sponsored by students, SLAAC is not concerned.

**III. Nature Park Advisory Committee**

Nature Park management and staffing are going to be significantly reviewed and revised during the next year or so, with some areas of responsibility collaborating or merging with the same departments and/or functions on the main campus. Because of this, and because the faculty is discussing an overhaul of the faculty governance committee structure, we will recommend that an advisory committee continue as “ad hoc” to help with organization and planning for up to two more years. Codification of a standing committee should be done as part of the governance re-structuring, or in AY 13/14.

DRAFT:

This committee advises the Nature Park staff and University administration on matters of planning, policy, and procedures, and assists in formulating plans, goals, and priorities, and in determining the overall role of the Nature Park in providing education, research, reflection, and recreation for the members of the University and neighboring communities.

It shall report periodically to the Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee.

Membership:

Voting members:

- Two faculty members (one from Biology, one from any other department) appointed by SLAAC for staggered two-year terms.

- Two students appointed by Student Congress for one-year terms.
- One representative of the community appointed by the President, in consultation with the Mayor of Greencastle, for a two-year term.
- The Director of the Janet Prindle Institute for Ethics (or his or her representative).
- A Student Life representative appointed by the Vice President for Student Life.

Ex-officio members (without vote): the Nature Park Director, the Nature Park Manager.  
[Cindy – are these titles likely to stay appropriate? Should we say something more generic?]

The chair will be selected from among the voting members of the committee.

**IV. Who should students contact with problems?**

Discussed the concern raised in the April faculty meeting that our motion on timely return of student work did not specify to whom a student turns with a complaint. This is also true of other parts of “Academic Policies.”

Student Congress is in the middle of activities to increase awareness & understanding, and working on related white papers. They may have recommendations later.

Cindy & Carrie will review the Student Handbook and suggest (or make) revisions that tell students who have concerns to speak with their advisor, or the relevant department chair, or . . . other possibilities. This won’t cover every scenario, and won’t dictate exact hierarchical steps.

**V. Student update:**

Elections for Student Government offices are this weekend, with inauguration on May 1. The incoming President will (probably) attend our April 28 meeting. Other student positions should be appointed in September.

**VI. Next meeting:**

Scheduled for Thursday, April 28, 4:05 p.m. in JSMC 300.

Adjourned 4:45.

**Student Life and Academic Atmosphere Committee  
May 12, 2011**

**Minutes**

David Alvarez, Hermen Diaz, Jeff Gropp, Carrie Klaus, Kathryn Millis, Arezoo Nazari, Greg Schwipps, Caroline Smith, Sharmin Tunguz, Jay White.

**I. Minutes and Meetings**

Approved minutes from the meeting of April 14, 2011 (attached), contingent on there being no significant corrections requested by members not in attendance.

**II. Elect new chair**

Caroline Smith has agreed to run and was elected unanimously and with gratitude for her willingness to serve. Only faculty who are tenured or in their seventh full time year, and are not currently serving as chair, are eligible.

**III. Who should students contact with problems?**

Cindy and Carrie have drafted language for the Student Handbook; Carrie distributed a section to which it might naturally be added ("Student Assessment of Teaching"), and a current draft of suggested language.

We discussed whether students look in the Handbook to find information like this, and which section(s) they would most likely consult.

We discussed whether, given that several positions are named, they should be listed in a clearly specified order, with students expected to start at the first and to continue on only if they have reason to skip that person or are dissatisfied with the outcome. Or is our intent is to provide multiple options, so a student could pick someone they feel comfortable with. For instance, what if the student speaks to an academic dean bypassing the department chair (or even the professor)? The faculty member and department chair should normally have a chance to address the matter first.

We also discussed what faculty members should be expected to do if a student complains to them? Chairs have clear responsibility to handle all sorts of problems, but what do advisors and other faculty members need to (know how to) do?

We had questions about how complaints about untimely feedback or other matters could be handled. There are very precise procedures used for a grade dispute procedure; how are/should other complaints be addressed?

Carrie will gather more feedback, discuss alternative language with colleagues over the summer, and bring a proposal or practice in the fall. Because this is procedure, not policy, it doesn't have to be in the Handbook before new students arrive (in order to apply contractually in the next year).

**IV. Student update:**

Arezoo reports that kegs may be discussed again next year.

**V. Academic integrity:**

Carrie gave advance notice of topics on which SLAAC might be asked to advise next year. The biggest one is about pools and panels. This year, we had a large, diverse pool of faculty members available to serve on University Review Committees. In part because most were not likely to be asked to serve (there are relatively few hearings), Carrie did not do training. Should the pool be smaller, or are people OK with volunteering and not being asked to serve? Would a training session be helpful? Would printed guidelines be helpful?

Community Standards has guidelines (included in the Student Handbook) about “Lower Ramification Items” and “Mid-Higher Ramification Items” and typical penalties for each. If URCs had similar printed guidelines, would different panels be more likely to judge and sanction similarly the same basic misconduct? The Academic Integrity Policy in the Student Handbook and the Academic Handbook provides some guidance, but currently different URCs may, without realizing it, punish some students more harshly than others.

If we drafted printed guidelines, what would they include? We would not want to label some violations as “lower ramification” or “higher ramification” and thus send the message that, for example, mosaic plagiarism isn’t a big deal.

Training workshops would likely consist of a discussion of the Academic Integrity Policy and of procedures used in hearings and deliberations, and some work with scenarios (inspired by past cases).

There was some discussion about when the burden of proof is on the faculty member (when a student is disputing a charge of academic dishonesty) and when the burden of proof is on the student (when the student has been found responsible for a second violation and is trying to persuade the committee not to suspend him/her).

We discussed whether SLAAC should consider revising the method of picking panels, so that members of a smaller pool might hear multiple cases and treat them more consistently. It was suggested that we consider making it an elected/appointed body that is more clearly part of the University committee and service structure. The URC does important work, making a contribution that is equally as valuable as that of some other committees (if not more so!) within this structure.

It was suggested that the Academic Dean who convenes the URC could be more active in discussions. Currently the dean observes and takes notes, but does not participate or influence questions, decisions, etc. All members of SLAAC who were present thought the dean could—and should—participate more without fear of unfairly influencing the process, especially if his or her participation led to more consistent treatment across cases. Members who have served on URCs noted that because the chair sometimes also

tries not to shape the decision, outcomes maybe influenced heavily by the least experienced members, including students.

In other matters: next year SLAAC may consider changing the title of the settlement form from "Academic Dishonesty Settlement Form," creating web information about academic dis/honesty, whether to do a workshop for faculty members on best practices for avoiding problems, and discuss some key points of the policy (such as the intent of suspension--is it punitive or developmental?) SLAAC may also be asked to reaffirm (or not) the policy that first violations remain strictly confidential, so that we are confident and consistent in our responses to employers and graduate schools who if students "have ever" been found responsible. We currently only report if there has been a second violation.

**VI. Next meeting:**

Assuming we continue the tradition of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursdays at 4, the AY 2011-2012 schedule would be:

August 25

September 8 and 22

October 13 and 27

November 10 (24<sup>th</sup> is Thanksgiving, schedule meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>?)

December 8

February 9 and 23

March 8 and 22

April 12 and 26

May 10 (may have same conflict as this year, with faculty scholarship event at Prindle)

New/returning members, please let Kathryn know ASAP if this is unlikely to work.

**VII. Other business:**

None.

**VIII. Adjourn:**

Adjourned at 5:03 p.m.!