

September 13, 2005

Present: Pedar Foss (chair), Vic DeCarlo, Tom Dickinson, Melanie Finney, Ken Kirkpatrick (serving as VPAA representative), Blair McCarthy, Sherry Mou, Bruce Serlin

The meeting was called to order at 4:20 PM.

Agenda:

reviews it solicited of the Political Science department's RAS proposal by political science professors at three GLCA colleges. Also, it was reported that three more letters requesting external review have been sent by the VPAA to faculty members who were on a list of potential reviewers submitted by departmental members.

The committee agreed that the primary question it needs to answer is: Did the Political Science RAS request come from a properly constituted body? Discussion of this question centered on the Handbook language regarding responsibilities of departments and who is eligible to participate in the RAS proposal-writing process.

CAPP decided that the political science request did not come from a properly constituted group. CAPP must now decide what course of action needs to be followed. This will be taken up at the next meeting. In the meantime, members of CAPP were encouraged to use email to engage in a dialogue concerning this situation.

Finally, on a procedural point, it was decided that student rep McCarthy, who is a political science major, will be excluded from further discussions of the political science case.

Future Business

The chair pointed out that two items on the fall agenda - approval of WT subcommittee members and a revised charge of the IEC - are pressing and must be considered by CAPP very soon.

It was agreed that CAPP will hold an additional meeting on Tuesday, September 27.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Vic DeCarlo

September 27, 2005

Attendance: Pedar Foss, chair; Victor DeCarlo; Melanie Finney; Sherry Mou; Bruce Serlin; Neal Abraham, VPAA; and student member Sheila Wilcox

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m.

Proposed Change of the Faculty Bylaws – Departmental Position Request Committee

The committee reviewed the text of the resolution approved at the previous meeting for presentation to the faculty. The chair also presented alternatives to sections #1 and #3 with the proposal that the committee take the core language and the options to the faculty meeting on October 10 for a discussion in the Committee of the Whole. Guided by that discussion CAPP could then present a motion to the faculty to be tabled at the November meeting and to be voted on at the December meeting. The committee approved this plan after making minor amendments to the proposed text.

The following proposed language to the faculty by-laws is meant to specify who in a department

is eligible and required to serve on the departmental group making full-time position requests to RAS (for tenure-track slots) and to the VPAA (for term positions). The language is parallel to two other departmental formulations: for Search Committees, and for Departmental Personnel Committees. Below is 'core language' developed by CAPP, followed by two options that could be swapped in for items 1 and 3. Other formulations are possible, and welcome. We simply want to determine who the faculty thinks should be making full-time position requests, because changes made to the handbook in Fall 2004 did not specify eligibility for this task, and accordingly led to confusion and controversy.

Core language:

c. Full-

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits requests to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Sub-committee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the department eligible to participate must either sign the request for staffing or a dissenting opinion [excluded: or a statement of abstention].

VPAA Abraham noted that the final vote would take place after the deadline for departmental requests for term positions to begin in 2006-2007. The committee advised that until the current bylaws were changed, all faculty members eligible to vote in faculty meetings should be included in departmental discussions of proposals for term positions.

Proposed Change of Faculty Bylaws – Procedures for CAPP to fill the membership of its Subcommittees

The chair presented a proposal for a memo and timetable to be sent to the ten full-time (voting) faculty members in the department. After much discussion, the committee approved the following memo.

Date: 27 September 2005

To: All full-time members of the Political Science Department
DePauw University

From: CAPP

Re: Current and future tenure-track search processes

CAPP, on the advice of RAS, recommended in summer 2005 that the administration fund (authorize searches for) the six most highly ranked proposals, including two in Political Science. The administration chose to fund (authorize searches for) four of the six, and asked CAPP to reevaluate the positions recommended for Political Science in light of comments (attached) from some external reviewers recruited to give advice in light of the fact that the Political Science

3. Opportunity Hires:

VPAA explained the practice of opportunity hires in the past. About ten years ago, as a part of the effort to convert a large percentage of term positions to regular tenure-track positions, Opportunity Hires were put in place, whereupon a proposal to hire someone with special expertise would be sent to the administration. A search committee would be created for the search. By the end, RAS and CAPP would make a recommendation to the VPAA whether to hire

Eight of the 10 members responded to the CAPP memo of September 27, 6 with proposals. Taking advice from all proposals into consideration, the chair presented a draft of two ads. The committee worked on the language at length to ensure they incorporate as broadly as possible ideas expressed in all the proposals received.

The ads will be sent to all Political Science faculty members as soon as possible for their endorsement, i.e. later this evening or early tomorrow morning. In the e-mail message, CAPP will request each member of the department to declare simply and specifically their endorsement of each of the two ads, and the response should be sent to the chair (P. Foss) by 9 a.m., Friday, October 14. Those who do not endorse the ads should provide comments and rationales for any objections.

There was some concern about whether or not the administration would approve requests of new hires from the Political Science Department before they conduct a self-review, as indicated by the memo from the VPAA (August 16). CAPP decided that the outsiders' letters constituted a small scale self-study, and that waiting for a self-study before a tenure-track search will seriously weaken the strength of the department. Proceeding with the first two positions sequentially now is both necessary and reasonable, since it will also give the flexibility of maximizing the area specialties and expertises.

The VPAA responded that both the department and CAPP had responded and addressed the questions outside reviewers raised in regards to the RAS proposal and modified the recommendations accordingly. He would join CAPP in persuading the president to approve the two new proposals. After further deliberation, the committee approved the following memo.

11 October 2005

To: All full-time members of the Political Science Department

From: CAPP

Re: Current tenure-

Tenure track position. A political theorist with an essential specialization in traditional western

1. Political Science Department

The Chair reported that CAPP's memo had been sent to the Political Science Department and the President. Neal Abraham reported that he had sent a supplemental endorsement to the President and was anticipating another meeting before the President announced approval for the search(es). Abraham also presented a document titled Notes on the Selection of the Political Science Reviews for clarification, which CAPP reviewed.

Pedar Foss also indicated that he had received additional information from two members of the Political Science Department and offered to make it available to the committee. President Bottoms will announce his decision regarding the Political Science Department's job searches, based on CAPP's recommendation, at the November faculty meeting.

2. Language about the Full Time Position Request Committee for the academic handbook.

Foss reported on the results of the small group break-outs at the October faculty meeting. The

President for Academic Affairs, with the approval of the Committee on Faculty, may appoint additional faculty members from the department to serve on the committee. Membership exclusion based on conflicts of interest applying in the case of the Search Committee also apply here.

2. Chair and Organization:

Normally, the chair of the department or the dean of the school shall serve as the chair of the Full-Time Position Request Committee. In the event that the chair of the department or the dean of the school is unable or ineligible to serve as chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will designate a member of the department or school as the convener of the first meeting. In this case, the members will elect a chair at their first meeting.

3. Function and Duties:

The Full-Time Position Request Committee submits a request to the VPAA for a term position, and to CAPP through the Resource Allocation Subcommittee (RAS) for a tenure-track position. Every member of the committee must either sign the request for staffing or a separate opinion.

3. CAPP subcommittee Nominations

Foss reported that he had brought the general issue of subcommittee membership to the Faculty Governance Steering Committee and that they would be reporting back to CAPP at a future meeting.

D. Additional Business

1. Film Studies Major and Latin American and Caribbean Studies Major Proposals

CAPP agreed to invite Peter Graham for Film Studies and Aaron Dziubinskyj for Latin American and Caribbean Studies to the next meeting on November 1, 2005. Foss will send the information concerning these major proposals to the committee. Foss will also invite the chair of MAO and an additional MAO representative to attend our November 1 meeting. Abraham suggested that CAPP review the proposals, specifically in terms of how they address issues of library resources, admissions, and needs for technology.

2. White Paper from Student Congress regarding Group 6 Credit for Varsity Athletics.

Blair McCarthy asked about when CAPP would consider the white paper that Student Congress had presented to CAPP. Foss stated that he would send the white paper, which he had received this semester from Student Congress President Zach Pfister, to the committee and CAPP would consider it at their December 6, 2005 meeting.

3. WT Report and Subcommittee Appointments

These reports will be made and considered at the November 15, 2005 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Melanie Finney

November 1, 2005

Attendance: Pedar Foss, chair; Neal Abraham, VPAA; Victor DeCarlo; Tom Dickinson; Melanie Finney; Ken Kirkpatrick; Sherry Mou; and student members Blair McCarthy and Sheila Wilcox

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m.

1. Announcements:

Remaining CAPP meeting dates were provided to the committee: November 15, 2005 and December 6, 2005

Political Science Department: Language on proposed change to the academic handbook (Full Time Position Request Committee) has been sent to David Harvey for tabling at the November faculty meeting and action at the December meeting; because the Chair of CAPP will be unavailable at this meeting Victor DeCarlo will make the proposal for CAPP. AQIP's focus will be announced at the November faculty meeting.

Report on proposed changes in qualifications for membership on CAPP subcommittees is scheduled for the November 15, 2005 meeting.

Ongoing work on Group 6 requirements in General Education program and possible revisions, Victor DeCarlo and Blair McCarthy, is ongoing.

2. Minutes: Minutes from the October 25, 2005 meeting were amended and approved.

3. Business:

a. Film Studies Major proposal

Prior to meeting with the Film Studies representative, CAPP discussed questions related to the proposed Film Studies Major proposal. Members raised overarching questions of space, particularly the issue of whether the program will return later for more physical space and resources; the impact of this proposal on other existing majors; when the program would be reviewed if approved; the ease of adding programs but the difficulty of reducing them; what resources, both currently and eventually will be used by the program; and questions about the faculty positions embedded in the program proposal.

Foss invited Peter Graham, representing Film Studies to join the group. Graham related that communications had occurred concerning resource use with VPAA Abraham (resources), Niles (admission), Smith (technology), and Dixon-Fyle (library). Additionally, Graham related that commitments have been made from three departments to offer film studies courses:

English, Communication and Theatre, and Modern Languages. Current reassigned time for film studies this year for a chair/coordinator is a one-course reduction.

Questions by members of CAPP addressed to the representative involved the possible growth and impact of the program on the reassigned time for the director; how many courses in the current proposal were pure film studies courses; questions about the senior seminar for film

studies and its construction; the frequency of course offerings, given departmental needs from the committed departments; film production questions involving courses, enrollments and resources.

Graham offered commentary concerning these questions and discussion and questions focused on the senior seminar with questions related to its construction as a course; course credit for advisor offering the seminar; and the issue of hidden curriculum work for advisors offering the seminar.

CAPP continued its questions of the proposal addressing questions concerning the relationship between film studies and the Media Fellows program; the possible categorization of courses into theory, culture, and history and criticism; the issue of who should categorize courses and yet maintain a flexible curriculum; the internal cohesion of the program; the limits on courses from a department (currently, according to Graham, there are none); why nine courses make up the major proposal; possible double-counting of courses; the need for technology support for the program (Graham responded that there is no indication of a major technology shift that would be needed to support the program); and questions about the possible impact of competition for the limited seats in production classes and enrollment pressures in these courses.

Graham related that the collection development in the library for the film studies program is ongoing and an assessment report will be provided to the film studies group in January. Currently the library has a budget for this area and between 50 and 100 books and DVDs have been purchased each year. Foss requested that this element of the director's position should be written into the responsibilities of the coordinator.

CAPP continued with questions for Graham focusing on the possible move of the film studies library to PAC; the use of lab time for film studies classes; the programs in film studies in peer institutions and their approach to production issues and concerns; the intellectual depth for the program—where does this come from—and whether choice brings about depth; and questions about the curriculum model that is being used (interdisciplinary versus disciplinary).

At this point in the discussion Peter Graham was excused.

CAPP raised broad questions about interdisciplinary programs overall, the relationship of demand-driven over principle-driven curriculum and the ongoing question of the relationship of departments and interdisciplinary programs.

Foss determined that because of time factors that Aaron Dziubinskyj, the representative for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, would be deferred to the November 15, 2005 meeting. Discussion continued concerning the implications of interdisciplinary programs and the film studies program specifically. The chair noted that he had previously been involved with film studies but was not currently involved with the effort to establish a major.

Victor DeCarlo and Blair McCarthy, is ongoing.

2. Minutes: Minutes from the October 25, 2005 meeting were amended and approved.

3. Business:

a. Film Studies Major proposal

Prior to meeting with the Film Studies representative, CAPP discussed questions related to the proposed Film Studies Major proposal. Members raised overarching questions of space, particularly the issue of whether the program will return later for more physical space and resources; the impact of this proposal on other existing majors; when the program would be reviewed if approved; the ease of adding programs but the difficulty of reducing them; what resources, both currently and eventually will be used by the program; and questions about the faculty positions embedded in the program proposal.

Foss invited Peter Graham, representing Film Studies to join the group.

Graham related that communications had occurred concerning resource use with VPAA Abraham (resources), Niles (admission), Smith (technology), and Dixon-Fyle (library).

Additionally, Graham related that commitments have been made from three departments to offer film studies courses: English, Communication and Theatre, and Modern Languages. Current reassigned time for film

December 6, 2005

Attendance: Pedar Foss, Chair; Victor DeCarlo; Tom Dickinson; Ken Kirkpatrick; Sherry Mou; and student members Blair McCarthy and Sheila Wilcox. The meeting was called to order at 4:20 p.m.

A. Announcements

Blair McCarthy, who will be studying abroad in the spring, was thanked for her service on CAPP.

B. Minutes:

Minutes from the November 15, 2005 meeting were amended and approved.

C. Business:

1. Major proposals. CAPP will continue to talk with the Film Studies and Latin American and Caribbean Studies programs about their proposals for majors.

2. Russian Studies. CAPP has initiated discussions with the Russian Studies steering committee related to the viability of the program and has asked the steering committee to develop alternate models for the program. With upcom24 5158cbDe9(wav2JET[(models for)5(the pr21 0 0 1 72.024 557.38 Tm C

5. CAPP Subcommittees. New language describing membership and appointment to CAPP subcommittees was distributed for future discussion. The First Year Seminar Committee would like to address CAPP on this issue.

6. Group 6 Credit for Varsity Athletics. The student representative to CAPP presented a white paper issued by Student Congress urging awarding Group 6, but not graduation, credit for participation in varsity sports. Ken Kirkpatrick will formulate the catalog language necessary to implement such a change. CAPP will invite the chair of Kinesiology to a future meeting to discuss this proposal with the committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ken Kirkpatrick, Registrar

February 7, 2006

committee to discuss the White Paper from Student Congress which proposes that Group 6 credit, but not graduation credit, be awarded for participation in varsity athletics.

Ball reported that all kinesiology faculty members were opposed to the awarding of Group 6 credit for varsity sports and that the majority of those coaches who expressed an opinion were also against the proposal. He noted that athletes are athletes by their own choice and shouldn't be given credit for an activity they choose to do, in the same way that students aren't given academic credit for community service work. He followed these remarks with a point-by-point rebuttal of several of the main points of the student White Paper. For example, in response to the assertion that student athletes receive instructions as to healthy lifestyles, Ball noted that many football players are obese, and that in general coaches don't spend a lot of time teaching lifestyle. Likewise, while the White Paper claims that decreased enrollment of varsity athletes in physical education courses allows more spaces for non-athletes, Ball said that, in his time at DePauw, he has not heard of any problems related to students having trouble scheduling phys ed classes. In closing, Ball encouraged CAPP to look at the reasons Group 6 credit is given for certain out-of-classroom activities, particularly participation in WGRE and the student newspaper.

26, and following the Memorial Day holiday, resume on May 30. VPAA Abraham estimated that there may be about ten proposals from departments this year.

The chair pointed out that CAPP will need to prepare summary reports (rend

1. The chair indicated that a meeting with Russian Studies Program had occurred and inquiry into aligning it, in some fashion, with European Studies Program was considered. Further investigation of this was to occur.

Tom found that the academic component of the on-campus Winter Term was strong, while the co-curricular program receives mixed reviews. Concerns about students' conduct during Winter Term remain prominent. There was some discussion of the legitimacy of the co-curricular program and of various proposals to improve on-campus Winter Term, which range from strengthening the co-curricular program to assigning grades for Winter Term courses. Members of the committee did agree that allowing first-year students to participate in off-campus study projects and internships would be appropriate at this time. A motion deleting the requirement that first-year students are required to participate in on-campus Winter Term was drafted and approved for presentation to the faculty at the April faculty meeting.

3. Film Studies Major. The revised proposal from the Film Studies program for a major in film studies was considered. There was considerable discussion of substance and coherence of the proposed program. Few of the participating faculty have formal academic training in film studies and while the proposal includes descriptions of core courses in film studies, the categories for the electives are broad and do not clearly distinguish between courses about film and courses that use film to study culture. A motion to bring the proposal to the faculty was approved on a 4-3 vote.

A second motion to bring the proposed Latin American and Caribbean Studies major to the faculty did not receive a second.

Meeting adjourned: 6:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ken Kirkpatrick

April 4, 2006

Attendance: Pedar Foss (chair), Vic DeCarlo, Tom Dickinson, Neal Abraham, Melanie Finney, Sherry Mou, Emmalynn Brown, Shelia Wilcox, Bruce Serlin, Caroline Jetton, Ken Kirkpatrick

Meeting called to order at 4:08 p.m.

A. Winter Term proposal- general approval from Winter Term subcommittee as well as the Presidents Cabinet as reported by Neal and Tom. Several questions have arisen so keeping those in mind will be beneficial for future discussions.

B. Minutes: minutes from the March 21, 2006 meeting were approved.

C. Business

1. School of Music: CAPP went into executive session.

1. Numbers

- Number of majors and of minors
- General enrollment in program courses
- Contribution in servicing general education (FYS, W, S, Q, etc.)
- How many courses need to be offered for viability of a program?

2. Sufficient Faculty Support

- Critical mass of willing participating faculty members – how much is necessary?
- Are depts. and/or dean willing to let faculty members teach program courses
- Is there any guarantee that individuals / dept. / admin/ will continue to volunteer / allow / fund participation?
- Are programs linked to curricula or to faculty?

3. Standards for a program

- What meets the standard for sufficient course content in a program (50% often used)? Who decides? Program or other disciplines/departments? Individual instructors?
- What criteria should we have to approve / keep / drop programs?
- How important is student interest for creating/maintaining programs?
- How distinctive is the area?
- Can students articulate why they need this program instead of x ?
- How do interdisciplinary programs "play" in post-graduation endeavors compared to the "traditional" departmental majors? That is are persons in the former programs disadvantaged?

4. Ideology of Interdisciplinary Programs in General

- Is there a finite number of interdisciplinary programs that an institution our size can do really well?
- What purpose or purposes should any interdisciplinary program meet? What are the University's obligations to students or its missions and goals?
- How is the potential impact of a new interdisciplinary program on a department or departments assessed and how is re-alignment to be brought about?
- What is the relationship between interdisciplinary programs and the nature of a liberal arts institution? Could students combine classes from existing departments or could we streamline the independent interdisciplinary option already on the books to achieve the same results as having a formally established interdisciplinary program?

II. Regarding Administration of an Interdisciplinary Program:

1. Steering Committee Membership and Director

- How is the committee selected? Length of service?
- How is the director selected? Length of service?
- What should be the reassigned time for a director? Does it matter if it is a new program?
- What are the possible work expectations and corresponding compensation for a director?
- What are the arrangements for support staff?

2. What role does a program play in the review of people in the program?

- Who serves on DPCs? Must everyone on the steering committee?

- Should reviews be annually or only at formal performance reviews?
- Should program directors respond to annual reports of untenured members who teach in the program?
- Should a program automatically be asked to review the performance of the program director for a contribution to a decision file for promotion and tenure if that service appears in the years in rank? What about for future promotions?

3. How are staffing decisions made?

- Should interdisciplinary programs be permitted to make open-ended RAS requests (disciplinary department to be selected later)? If so, what is the equivalent of a full-time position request for a program?
- Should all programs or appropriate programs have the opportunity to review application files of final department candidates for openings and provide some input?
- If interdisciplinary programs are transient, that is, easily cancelled, should an obligation to teach in a program appear in anyone's contract?
- How are departments covered when they contribute faculty members to programs?
- How does a program get its staffing for courses and cross-listed courses?
- + By recruiting, hampered by lack of guaranteed replacements (as departments are permanently enlarged)?
- + By obligation of departments to contribute to interdisciplinary and honors programs?
- + By faculty application and then program screening, hampered by lack of guaranteed recruiting?
- + By application only if there is permission by the department?

III. Regarding Structure of an Interdisciplinary Program:

1. Size of program

- How many courses are offered per year?
- How many different faculty members teach in a program?
- How many majors and minors?

2. Course requirements

- What are the course requirements for a major?
- How many courses are required?
- How many for a major?
- How distinctive should the courses be for a student with a double major in a complementary department? (How many courses should be able to count for both?)
- Should interdisciplinary students get the same priority to enter classes as a departmental majors and minors? (If departments are not willing to give interdisciplinary majors equal priority, why do they sign on to partner with the program?)

3. Location of interdisciplinary programs

- Should programs be housed within a department?
- What kinds of affiliations should programs have with departments?
- How well do programs and departments work together?

What problems has CAPP identified?

- Inability of programs to make RAS requests. Since requests come through departments, there was no way to oversee the staffing.
- Problems with making sure courses are available to students majoring/minoring in the programs.
- Participation of programs in faculty reviews.

Models for strengthening interdisciplinary programs might include:

- Locate interdisciplinary programs in departmental home
- Do away with departments completely
- Create an interdisciplinary department of programs (somewhat on the model of Modern Languages)
- B

- Three current or recent members of CAPP are selected by CAPP to serve on RAS for threeyear terms, with rotating terms of membership.

As a general goal, there should be no fewer than one member of a division, preferably two from each, and no more than three from any one division.

Bruce Cvision.

We also need to keep in mind that scholarship is not the same across board. In some fields, it may take people 8-10 years to publish their first book. Should those people be doomed not to be promoted for 10-12 years? A change of structure may mold people's careers in different directions. In comparison to our peer institutions, we have the lowest requirement for tenure and are on high end of service requirement.

Since many committees also have student representatives, we need to keep Student Congress informed about any changes.

(The VPAA left the meeting around 5 pm.)

4. Change of Honor Scholars Program

The Honor Scholars Program requested changing HONR 401 and HONR 402 into required classes, with HONR 401 taken in the fall for 0.5 credit, and HONR taken in the spring of the senior year for 1.0 credit. Currently, the honor scholars may register in either or both courses from 0 to ½ to 1 credit. While the honor scholar's thesis is required, these two courses are not.

The credits will count towards graduation, so students will not fall short of the 31 credits required for graduation. This makes it possible for students who want to do double majors and an honor thesis.

There was some discussion of whether students should be allowed to write two theses in one semester. There were examples of seniors completing both their senior and Honor Scholar's theses successfully. While some departments accept students' honor scholars' theses as their senior seminar theses, others do not.

After weighing various issues, the committee voted not to accept the change request.

5. AQIP—Student Engagement

One charge to the new CAPP in the fall is to discuss how to engage students. Macalester College's study defines student engagement as academic success, although some disagree. We need to arrive at a definition, so that we can look into the issue more effectively.

Our own records of (first-year) students' retention rate, performance, and satisfaction since 1999 (the year when FYS was instituted) show that FYS really engaged students. The generally lower grades in second semester of the first year, some argue, result from student disengagement.

Nevertheless, more factors need to be considered. While we are successful with 1st-year students, we seem to fall behind with engaging our seniors (Wabash is more successful with seniors). We also need to look at what kinds of programs engage people. For instance, some schools (e.g., Macalester) are successful with their co-curricular programs; many of our students have had very positive and creative experiences with service learning programs. How we define engagement may affect the conversation in the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sherry Mou

May 2, 2006

Attendance: Pedar Foss, Chair; Victor DeCarlo, Tom Dickinson, Melanie Finney, Sherry Mou, Bruce Serlin; Sheila Wilcox, Emma Brown; Neal Abraham, Ken Kirkpatrick (VPAA rep/nonvoting), and Caroline Jetton (representative of the Dean of the School of Music/nonvoting).

A. Minutes: The Minutes from the meeting of April 18 were amended and approved.

B. Announcements:

1. The results of the RAS membership for May 2006 were announced

Three-yr. members on RAS:

1. Sheryl Tremblay, Communication & Theatre (term ends in '07)
2. Tom Chiarella, English (term ends in '07)
3. Scott Wilkerson, Geosciences (term ends in '06)
4. Clarissa Peterson, Political Science (term ends in '07)

the current policy of allowing students to enroll for thesis work without credit invited them to adopt overloads without the usual indicators (credit) of the total workload. There is an increase in the number of these students are writing in the senior year.

Points made in the discussion included the following.

- Required credit for a thesis would force planning.
- Registration for credit would activate the normal review processes (petitions, extra tuition payments) for students registering for overloads.
- Supervised independent work represented real work and service from the institution and should be matched by credit and payment of tuition.
- Registration for credit would lead to better recordkeeping of faculty workload.
- Quality of student work and student mental health is threatened by a system that invites students to not budget time for satisfactory completion of their theses.
- Compared with other honors programs, HS is on low end of requirements. All others require at least some credit for the senior experience.
- Would these requirements (registering for more credit, and possibly having to pay for this registration) dissuade students from attempting to complete theses?
- Current students could be grandfathered, with the new requirement applying to newly admitted students; or the new requirement could apply as early as to current sophomores.
- Most students in most of recent years are already registering for some thesis credit.
- Perhaps students with double majors and the honor scholar program are becoming too focused and avoiding the liberal arts diversity.
- Credit for theses would give students an academic structure and make it more likely that students will succeed.

Tom Dickinson recommended that along with its curricular agenda item on interdisciplinary programs for next year, CAPP should take a look at the Programs of Distinction and their curricular requirements and the systemic issues of articulating proposals for the curricula of majors and Programs of Distinction. He proposed that special arrangements might be investigated for the 20-some students who might have opportunities for three theses.

Pedar Foss noted that Anne Harris had brought a revised proposal (from the one considered by CAPP earlier) for 401/402 VARC 1.0 to 2.0 cr. PF observed that he had been persuaded that this might be a good thing, and had changed his mind on this proposal. He asked how the change would be made (tabled and voted at the faculty? voted at the faculty meeting? decided by CAPP and reported to the faculty? CAPP direction to administration for bookkeeping?). This needs to be investigated.

PROCEDURAL QUESTION:

Melanie Finney asked if it was appropriate that a recent decision by CAPP could be so easily overturned. Neal Abraham noted that Roberts' Rules allows reconsideration of a prior decision on the motion of someone who voted on the prevailing side.

Anne Harris was then excused.

POINTS MADE IN CAPP'S DISCUSSION

- Concern that proposals were for tinkering when systematic review and change might be

needed.

- Some indicated a change of mind on this proposal but also hoped for a global discussion. Sherry Mou moved to defer the topic to the May 9th agenda of CAPP. Seconded by Tom Dickinson. On a vote, the majority favored consideration of this topic at the next meeting.

NEED: an actual proposal:

Such as: Effective for the Class of 2008 (2009?; 2010?), HONR 401 and HONR 402 be required courses for the Honor Scholar Program, to be taken for variable credit (0.5 or 1.0 academic credit).

D. Workload and Faculty Sanity

Neal Abraham was asked to forward to all CAPP members a revised document on requests for revision of the governance structures and selection procedures for directors/coordinators of Interdisciplinary Programs, including the latest information from SRF, and information from the VPAA on the membership of the steering committees of other programs which had not yet proposed governance changes.

E. Academic Engagement

The Committee briefly discussed the issues regarding how to define, assess and measure changes in student academic engagement.

F. Interdisciplinary Programs

The committee discussed how to make its consideration of this topic more effective next year? CAPP and/or the Administration could create a policy on the registration priority for interdisciplinary majors in courses listed as being contributed to the program as approved by the faculty.

Procedures could be established for review of the health/viability of programs. Should there be an automatic sunset for programs when they are approved? What about reviews of the health and viability of a department; how would these procedures be different? What are the review criteria?

made? Perhaps the administration could make decisions on resource allocation and program viability under faculty guidelines; thereby avoiding pitting faculty members against each other. Presently programs are created by faculty action; and can only be terminated by faculty action. Criteria for viability could include: impact on the liberal arts curriculum, impact on faculty

contributions to intellectual dialogue, contributions to first-year seminars and other general education programs.

CAPP might try to set some framework for what should be persuasive in the creation of new programs (student interest, faculty interest, institutional need, national need, etc.). Melanie will be the reception person for information and points about Interdisciplinary Programs

The administrators were asked to investigate what other institutions have done with these issues.

G. Tasks for committee members for the meeting on May 9th.

Identify kinds of information the administrators could collect over the summer about viability of our interdisciplinary programs.

What other institutions have done about interdisciplinary programs

What are the fundamental issues

Consider modified Honor Scholar motion

Consider advice on measures of academic engagement

Grade trends

Student engagement surveys

Internship census

Measures of and meaning of academic engagement outside the classroom?

(talks, dinners, speakers, internships, research, theses)

Advice to President's Fact-finding Commission on Greek Life

Number or % of faculty members who make changes in spring semester syllabi and requirements.

Grade drops in spring

Possible survey questions

Ask of faculty membeonMCID 3.91 0 0 1 72.024 Tm[(Advic)4(e)4(to P)-5(BT1 0 022orT1 0 0 1 77.30dF1e)] T

Caroline Jetton

Meeting called to order at 4:05 p.m.

Announcements: Meeting of CAPP members with RAS, Tues., May 16, 4-4:30 p.m.

A. Minutes: Minutes of the May 2, 2006 meeting were amended and approved.

B. Business

1. Winter Term Subcommittee Report

Jeff Hollander, Director of Winter Term, and Kevin Kinney, Chair of the Winter Term Subcommittee, answered questions about their latest report. In response to a question about the effect of the changes in the Winter Term requirements on first-year students, Hollander reported that students still see on-campus winter term as a bonding experience and that most are not prepared to develop internships or independent projects. This year, there are a limited number of slots on off-campus study projects. Hollander suggested advising students to take on-campus courses. In response to a question about encouraging connections between regular semester courses and off-campus study projects, Hollander responded that this was a very good idea, but that it would have to wait for next year. There will be information sessions about winter term options during orientation week. These will run in tandem with the sessions on off-campus study. It was suggested that students ought to be encouraged to do a winter term project in their first year through their First Year Seminar.

Hollander also reported on the proposal from Student Services for winter term programming. This proposal would eliminate the co-curricular workshops and instead require 2-3 campus-wide learning experiences for all who stay on campus. Optional educational opportunities would also be offered. Drug and alcohol violators will be asked to leave campus immediately.

There was general discussion about the costs associated with winter term off-campus study projects and off-campus study. The off-campus study fee will need to remain as will the charges for the winter term trips. Costs are rising but budgets are not. We may have to look for ways to control the costs of trips, including going to fewer places and staying longer at single locations.

2. RAS membership.

There is a need for a 3-year Division 3 person for RAS. CAPP decided to ask Jeff Hansen, who was already selected as an at-large representative, to fill the Division 3 opening. CAPP then selected Orcenith Smith for the now vacant at-large position. [[note: Orcenith later informed us that he was no longer available for the position, so Meryl Altman agreed to serve for 2006. It will be necessary to see if Jeff is willing to serve out the 3-yr. term for division 3, or whether a new election will be needed for that division, along with the others, for 2007.]]

3. The proposal to make the Honor Scholar thesis course (HONR 401/402) a requirement

of the program was withdrawn. CAPP needs to look at the question of allowing students to do the work without registering for the course. Is this consistent with how we define program requirements? The Honor Scholar program is also up for review soon; it might be best to look at the question in that context.

4. School of Music Report (executive session)

5. Advice on AQIP, Greek fact finding and interdisciplinary programs.

CAPP questions for the Greek fact finding have been conveyed to Lisa Hollander. The response has been positive. For academic engagement, see what the strategic plan says about extending engagement outside the class and building intellectual community.

6. Other business items for CAPP next year.

Examine co-curricular and PE credit in Group 6.

Meeting adjourned, 6:15 p.m.