

Faculty Governance Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
May 3, 2016

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

Guest: President Elect Mark McCoy

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

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

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

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



McCoy—let's brainstorm ways to make this informal interaction happen, especially

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee  
Sept. 9, 2016

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting time Fridays from 1:40-2:40 in the future, in Julian 372 (the room is reserved for the  
UHPDLQGHU RI WKH ID.O:DI SIOHQVWRUPV PWHWLQJV

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

Global Crossroads Initiative David Alvarez sent a request asking for volunteers or an ad hoc committee to work on defining W K H Q H Z <sup>3</sup>, Q W H U Q General Education [ S H U L H Q F H requirement. Governance Committee will direct Curriculum Committee to address this issue.

Faculty salaries The issue of faculty salaries is to be addressed by COA within the new J R Y H U Q D Q F H V W U X F W X U H L W G R N E W I D S P M T H S S O O N e V H H P W R K Strategic Planning Committee. Might be worthwhile to have a continued discussion of workload, compensation, etc.

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

Issues for the future Philadelphia Center situation (need info from VPAA) system for the administration to inform the university

16 Sept 2016 Minutes of Faculty Governance Committee Meeting

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

P. Propsom is away.

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

1. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

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

3. The issue of the Class Dean and Advising Committee (AC) system was discussed. Several faculty members have pointed out to one or more committee members that the AC was developed without proper faculty committee input, nor any general faculty input. Some committee members felt the issue probably should have gone to the Dean's Committee in 2001.

The committee discussed the current situation, how it should have been handled, and how to move forward. There is apparently no particular objection to the programs put in place, but rather the manner in which they came to be. Glen, in his role as chair, plans to have a few strategic conversations to clarify the concerns and perspectives of different stakeholders, and the committee's discussion will need to continue. At the minimum, as of this meeting, it appears that the committee feel0000912 0 612 79

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes  
September 23, 2016

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

Attending: Francesca Seaman, Pam Propp, Susan Hershberger, Howard Brooks, Bryan Hanson, Tim Good

Convene at 1:40m

Minutes approved from last week Sep 16

Chair update (written notes from Kuecker)



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

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

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

- i. The Advising Committee has been active for at least five years, though its activities are not always reflected in meeting minutes.
- ii. Some breakdowns in communications may have been due to the overall change in faculty governance structure.
- iii. Not all liaisons specified in the Handbook were appointed, so there was less communication than there should have been, and less faculty awareness.
- iv. Student Academic Life discussed how much input faculty ought to have, regardless of whether changes are under faculty

Faculty Governance Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
Oct. 7, 2016

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

Anne Harris (guest). VPAA. Institutional Academic Affairs Initiatives.  
Teams: who should the administration be working with, and how?  
Where do we want these initiatives to go?

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Minutes of Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee

14 October 2016

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

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

-- a policy about demonstrations on campus

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

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

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

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

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

Homework: Committee members should read this document with fresh eyes for 1. general clarity and 2. parallel structures between the CLA and SOM. For example, the intent is that the DSOM and VPAA are comparable in role, the Associate Dean in the SOM is lik.98 Tm tp parableq 0.00 612 792 re W\* n BT /ctvt Q q uhBh"atnded to nded to-

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

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

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

Minutes submitted by B. Hanson

Faculty Governance Committee  
DePauw University  
Friday 4 November 2016  
140pm  
Julian 32

Attending: Bryan Hanson, Howard Brooks, Frances Seaman, Pam Probst, Glen Kuecker (Chair), Tim

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

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

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

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

Can we consider Assoc DSOM be appointed by the same process that Chairs are appointed terms of recruitment and review

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

The Academic Handbook specifies voting rights only in the full faculty meeting at this

Faculty Governance Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
November 11, 2016

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

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

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

Discussion of recommendations for internal governance of the school of music.  
Concerns to address? uintern



Faculty Governance Meeting  
Minutes  
Dec. 2, 2016

Present Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Bryan Hanson, Bob Hershberger, Glen Kuecker, Pam Propsom, Francesca Seaman  
Guest Ayden Adler, Dean of the School of Music

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

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

Governance Committee members asked questions of Dean Adler:

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

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

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

Dean Adler has held a number of open forums with various SOM groups, discussing what has gone well and that they would like to continue, and what needs to be done differently. Three themes emerged: building a culture of trust and transparency, aligning around a shared mission that coheres with 21<sup>st</sup>CM Initiative, admissions (last year was one of their smallest classes and this has a negative effect on 42 04BT /F1 12 Tf 1 ET 83(g)4 one of their

What is the relationship between the SOM and the CLA? Dean Adler appreciated our recognition of the difference between a department and school. Area coordinators for some groups are more useful and necessary (for example, Voice Department) than for others. Dean Adler may convene the areas twice a year to discuss the important issues; some duties will probably be rotated. Depending on what people are teaching, they will attend the relevant area meetings during that semester.

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

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

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



Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes  
December 9, 2016

Meeting time: 12:30 on Wednesdays, starting on February 1<sup>st</sup>

1. Updates from Committees
    - a. Curriculum Committee--adding 4 people to assist with new RAS mechanism
    - b. SLAAC Future topics: food scarcity; honor code; sanctuary status
      - i. Glen added that the administrative group has been formed including faculty and students; Glen will share
    - c. FDC Reports lots of reading and worries about budgets
  2. DePauw Centers
    - a. Anne provided framing questions; Are these appropriate? Will these spark the needed feedback from departments?
      - i. Questions 1 and 2 seem to be more directed to the Centers themselves. Maybe the questions should be more forward oriented. Maybe the questions need to ask in terms of  
  
invite faculty input to the shaping of these centers? Glen will communicate this to Anne
    - viii. Why was McDermond center split from Management Fellows?  
B/c McDermond center only served Management Fellows.
    - ix. Who is running the Hubbard Center? Is it Mandy? Is it Alan?
    - x. Ask Anne about the timing for the hires for these centers.
    - xi. Do these centers really need to be connected?
    - xii. Glen will invite Anne to meet with us again in February.
  - b. Glen reported that Anne and Glen will go to Chairs meeting in February so that Chairs can get feedback from departments. That will lead to the creation of a task force. Governance will likely have some role vis-a vis the taskforce.
3. DSOM talk
  - a. Perspectives about the DSOM: confidence inspiring; she seems to be moving in a productive direction.

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

## Faculty Priorities & Governance Committee

being used for McDermond Center Director. Tenzer search already under control in house via Dave Berque & DUR O'Carroll. Pulliam Center will remain with same director for Center and for Media Fellows. McDemond and Tenzer Director searches already in progress. There will be no search for a new Pulliam Center. Alan Hill, VPAA Student Academic Life, is in charge of search for Career Center Director in the Hubbard Center. Now seeking a curricular model for all Centers moving forward. This is the primary benefit for the students. Secondary benefit is marketing the Centers for Admissions. Cur U H Q W O \ W K H & H Q u e l l e n c e / D U K H ^ 3 9 1 S S R \ V R I L Q H I D Y R U R I D ^ 3 O H D G u i d e l i n e s b e t w e e n C e n t e r s , i n t e r m s o f s e e k i n g g r a n t s . S e e k i n g wider student engagement with the Centers. The VPAA reviewed the status of the directors. Pulliam led by full time, tenured faculty member with reassigned time. Will stay that way. McDermond and Tenzer Directors will not hold a tenure line. Prindle Director holds a tenure line, but is not reviewed like other faculty members. Hartman Director still being talked through. Hartman House currently works under Student Academic Life. All Fellows programs will remain under control of faculty, and will not be run by the Center Directors. What is now ITAP will become Tenzer interns.

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

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

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

faculty member each, chosen from existing committees. Committee is comfortable with  
93 \$\$ TV SURFHVV IRU DSSRLQWLQJ WKH QHYW are HDQ RI )DF  
moving forward with this process.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Good



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

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

Minutes from the 8 Feb. 2017 meeting were approved.

1. Brief updates from committee liaisons were shared.

2. H. Brooks reported that the online version of the faculty handbook is now considered the official version of record. In addition, the definition of a full time faculty member in the CLA is described as "12 hours". This probably ought to be changed to three courses.

3. At last week's meeting, VPAA described her proposed selection process for the next Dean of Faculty. The committee discussed the proposal and how we should respond, as well as what the process should be or could be in the future. Anne will attend our meeting next week.

4. The Centers: After last week's meeting, it is apparent that the emphasis and direction of the Centers has shifted. We will next discuss the issue with the VPAA at next week's meeting and try to clarify faculty role in the Centers.

5. Discussion of confidentiality memo (Chaired by Brooks). The memo was discussed in general terms: for instance, how would the two definitions of confidentiality be applied in various situations typically encountered at DePauw? How does confidentiality affect faculty governance and faculty autonomy? How does it affect faculty-administration relations? Further discussion will be needed. The university lawyer has apparently reviewed the document and that response will be shared with the committee in the near future.

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes  
February 22, 2017

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

Glen pointed out the need to bring Governance Committee members not in  
f -- † • † f • ... † ' • ' • † f > — ' — ' • ' † † † Strategic Plan." † • † † • - i •

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

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

Jackie

**Faculty Open Meeting  
February 23, 2017**

**Dean of the Faculty Priorities Discussions**

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

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

Chair of Faculty convened with announcements about faculty elections.

We have candidates for all core committees except the following:

Still no candidates for:

Curricular Policy and Planning (social sciences)

2 at-large members for Review

1 from Arts for FDC

Student Academic Life 1 at-large

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

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

1 R DG PLQLVWUDWLYH DFDGHPLF SRVLWLRQV DUH GHVFUL  
added some language about the Dean of the School of Music and VPAA not serving on  
VH DUFK FRPPLWVHHV EXW RWKHU ZLVH WKHUH LV QW OD  
selected or their charges.

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

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

It is of the utmost importance that the DoF can work well with the VPAA and vice versa.

The Governance Committee will either endorse this candidate or not after a thorough interview with the candidate. If the candidate is not endorsed, the VPAA may take nominations for other candidates.

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

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

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

93 \$\$ (DFK 'R) KDV SXW KHU LPSULQW RQ WKH SRVLWLRQ  
emphasize more outward-facing grants, Jeff Kenney as FDC coordinator has focused on

inward





Chair thanked attendees and we adjourned.

Faculty Priorities & Governance Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
March 8, 2017

Present





The President shared that the decision was neither quick nor rash and was in response to concerns brought to him from various constituents within the music school.



Faculty Governance Committee Meeting Minutes  
April 5

FA/2016/17  
2016/17. ~~2016/17~~  
~~2016/17~~  
~~2016/17~~  
2016/17  
~~2016/17~~  
~~2016/17~~

16 a ip

n





Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Meeting Minutes  
April 19, 2017

Present Glen Kuecker (chair), Howard Brooks, Tim Good, Pam Propsom, Elissa Harbert  
(note taker) francesca Seamans, Bob Hershberger

We approved the minutes from April 5 and April 12.



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

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

The candidate should see only a report, not all of the gathered materials. The candidate can respond to the report. It will stay, negatives, concerns. It can be developmental or evaluative. evidence.

going to have an open file for faculty but not administrators, we need a strong, explicit rationale. because you are an administrator. Many of them have been faculty and may return being faculty. We want to ensure the candidate has substantive rights in the process. What if we have the open file, letters, mechanism to respond to those, but then we also have a dropbox. We could justify it as input to help shape the conversation. We might want to have to move forward.

What about students?

We may be tasked to constitute a summer working group. Who, what, when, where, charge?

Minutes submitted by Elisabeth.