

WLC Proposal for Language Minors  
Submitted by Marc Pinheiro-Cadd  
October 25, 2016

The Department of World Languages and Cultures would like to add a third option to fulfill the requirements of the Minor in Arabic (Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish) Language and Culture. Options A and B (already approved) place more emphasis on the linguistic requirements; Option C emphasizes more the cultural requirements. Given the title of the minor, we feel this is entirely appropriate.

I met with David Skidmore, Eleanor Zeff, and Mary McCarthy to discuss some concerns about Option C and the apparent overlapping of many requirements for the International Relations major and the requirements for Option C. We resolved that by limiting the number of hours students may count toward both options, i.e., they can only count nine hours for both the IR major and the language minor.

*Minor in Arabic (Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish) Language and Culture*

Option A

- 18 hours in the language\*
  - for French, German, and Spanish, 18 hours above 051
  - for Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese, 18 hours beginning with 001 or above
- WLC 147 Capstone for WLC Minors (1 hour—currently “East Asian Studies Capstone”—to be renamed)
- WLC 148 Intercultural Communication (3 hours)

Total = 22 hours (a minimum of 12 of these plus the capstone must be taken at Drake)

Option B

- 12 hours in the language above LANG 051 (at least one course must be taken after returning to Drake)\*
- WLC 080 Study Abroad Experience I (1 hour)
- WLC 081 Study Abroad Experience II (2 hours)
- WLC 082 Study Abroad Experience III (3 hours)
- WLC 147 Capstone for WLC Minors (1 hour—currently “East Asian Studies Capstone”—to be renamed)
- WLC 148 Intercultural Communication (3 hours)

Total = 22 hours (a minimum of 12 of these plus the capstone must be taken at Drake)

### Option C

- 12 hours in the language, 001 and above\*
- 9 hours from the following fields: Art, Economics, English, History, Marketing, Music, Philosophy/Religion, Political Science, Study of Culture and Society, WLC<sup>1,2</sup>
- WLC 147 Capstone for WLC Minors (1 hour—currently “East Asian Studies Capstone”—to be renamed)

Total = 22 hours (a minimum of 12 of these plus the capstone must be taken at Drake)

\*Students must complete the required number of hours regardless of initial placement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Courses must be approved by a WLC advisor.

<sup>2</sup> Students pursuing one of these options and also majoring in International Relations must complete nine credit hours that do not overlap between the two programs of study.

Approved

Request to Rename WLC's Concentrations as Minors  
Marc Pinheiro-Cadd  
16 September 2016

I write to request that the Latin American Studies Concentration and the East Asian Studies Concentration offered by the Department of World Languages and Cultures be renamed and reclassified as minors. They would become the Minor in Latin American Studies and the Minor in East Asian Studies. The requirements for these new minors would not change from the existing requirements.

There are four primary reasons for this request:

- The amount of work required of the students pursuing the concentrations is commensurate with the work required for minors in other departments. I believe the amount of work required of WLC students should be reflected in the label provided on their transcript.
- Based on my experience with prospective students and their parents, I firmly believe that offering minors these two areas would enhance the chances that those students ultimately choose Drake. It has been 15 years since Drake has had minors anything other than Spanish, which has only been offered for one year. This also hurts Drake in terms of comparisons to our peer institutions as identified on the Drake website.

Two years ago, students in my post-study abroad course surveyed more than 100 students who had not taken any language courses at Drake. When asked why, a strong majority responded that it was because Drake doesn't offer majors or minors in language or language-related fields. Offering these minors would enhance our enrollments as evidenced by the fact that after offering the Spanish minor for only one year, we currently have 60 students who have officially declared the minor.

- The use of the word “concentration” on campus has different uses. For example, there is a three-course insurance concentration in CBPA. A “minor” is more clearly understood.
- The use of the words “concentration” and “certificate,” which we previously had, makes it incumbent on students to explain to persons offering potential internships, graduate schools, and prospective employers what a “concentration” actually is. A minor is much more readily understood and carries more cache.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that these two concentrations be renamed thusly as stated above.

I would be happy to discuss this with Cabinet and/or Council, as appropriate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marc Pinheiro-Cadd

<b>Current course title</b>	Biological Research and Statistical Methods
<b>Current department and number</b>	Biology 099
<b>Contact person or instructor(s) for this course</b>	Thomas Rosburg
<b>Department submitting change request</b>	Biology
<b>Semester changes effective</b>	Fall 2017
<b>Has this change been approved by the department?</b>	Yes
<b>Current course number</b>	Biology 099
<b>New course number</b>	Biology 140
<b>Other reasons for change</b>	The course is designed for junior or senior level students who are planning to do an undergraduate thesis for a BS in Biology. The course number should reflect its upper level content.

Approved

<b>Current course title</b>	Iowa Natural History
<b>Current department and number</b>	Biology 110
<b>Contact person or instructor(s) for this course</b>	Thomas Rosburg
<b>Department submitting change request</b>	Biology
<b>Semester changes effective</b>	Fall 2017
<b>Has this change been approved by the department?</b>	Yes
<b>Current credit hours</b>	1
<b>Proposed credit hours</b>	2
<b>Rationale for change in credit hours</b>	<p>The course has been taught since 2005 as a lecture with 1 credit and a lab for 1 credit. This was done in order to create a 2-credit Biology field course that minimized class time and made it easier for the class to fit into student schedules. However, experience has shown that one 50-minute lecture period per week does not provide sufficient time to adequately discuss the course topics. Because the course is open to anyone with an interest in nature, there are no prerequisites. Thus there is a substantial amount of overview and background on each topic that needs to be presented. Two hours of lecture per week will provide the time needed to deliver and discuss course content, while still allowing greater flexibility in scheduling than a course with 3 lecture hours (like most Biology courses).</p>
<b>Current course description</b>	<p>A survey of the natural history and biodiversity of Iowa and the midwest with emphasis on conservation principles and ideology. Examination of geology, landscape history, and ecology for the protection of endangered species and communities. Extended overnight field trips. Offered alternate spring interim periods. Co-requisite lab BIO 110L.</p>

**Proposed course description**

Study of the natural history and biodiversity of Iowa with emphasis on understanding the natural processes that created and impact Midwestern ecosystems. Course content will examine geology, landforms, species identification and life history, ecosystem processes, endangered species, conservation and natural history literature. Extended overnight field trips. Offered alternate springs. Co-requisite lab BIO 110L.

---

**Rationale for change of course description**

The new one is more accurate.

---

Approved

<b>Current course title</b>	Iowa Natural History Lab
<b>Current department and number</b>	Biology 110L
<b>Contact person or instructor(s) for this course</b>	Thomas Rosburg
<b>Department submitting change request</b>	Biology
<b>Semester changes effective</b>	Fall 2017
<b>Has this change been approved by the department?</b>	Yes
<b>Current course description</b>	Co-requisite lab for BIO 110.
<b>Proposed course description</b>	Co-requisite lab for BIO 110. A combination of indoor and outdoor lab experiences will provide course content that emphasizes the identification and natural history of fossils, fungi, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, fish, insects, and plants.
<b>Rationale for change of course description</b>	Current description lacks information on content.

Approved

<b>Current course title</b>	Invertebrate Zoology
<b>Current department and number</b>	Biology 123L
<b>Contact person or instructor(s) for this course</b>	Thomas Rosburg
<b>Department submitting change request</b>	Biology
<b>Semester changes effective</b>	Fall 2017
<b>Has this change been approved by the department?</b>	Yes
<b>Current title</b>	Invertebrate Zoology
<b>New title</b>	Biology of Invertebrates Lab
<b>Other reasons for change</b>	Name change is to make the lecture and lab have the same topical name.



Approved

<b>Current course title</b>	Primate Conservation
<b>Current department and number</b>	Endangered Species Conservation
<b>Contact person or instructor(s) for this course</b>	Michael J. Renner
<b>Department submitting change request</b>	ENSP
<b>Semester changes effective</b>	Spring 2017
<b>Has this change been approved by the department?</b>	Yes
<b>Current title</b>	Primate Conservation
<b>New title</b>	Endangered Species Conservation
<b>Current course number</b>	ENSP 127
<b>New course number</b>	ENSP 127
<b>Current credit hours</b>	3
<b>Proposed credit hours</b>	3
<b>Rationale for change in credit hours</b>	N/A
<b>Current course description</b>	<p>This course develops the theory of conservation biology for both new and old world primate species. Using a variety of case studies, students will gain exposure to how the field of primate conservation has developed, how scientists apply the principles of conservation biology in the developing world, and how emerging socioeconomic challenges place increasing pressure on biologists to find innovative ways to merge science and policy. This course satisfies one of the required courses for the Primate Studies concentration.</p>

**Proposed course description**

This course addresses the challenges of species conservation, with a focus on endangered species, from a global perspective. Topics will include relevant treaties and laws (e.g., CITES and the U.S. Endangered Species Act), the development of the IUCN red list, and Species Survival Plans used in captive animal population management. This course will also study how scientists apply the principles of conservation biology in the developing world, and how emerging socioeconomic challenges place increasing pressure on biologists to find innovative ways to merge science and policy.

**Rationale for change of course description**

The revision of the Primate Studies concentration into a broader Animal Behavior concentration, along with the introduction of the new Zoo and Conservation Science concentration, has changed the appropriate area of focus for our species conservation course from a single order of mammals to encompass all animal species.

**Current cross-listed courses**

None

**Proposed cross-listed courses**

None

**Rationale for change of cross-listed courses**

N/A

**Drake Administered Programs Abroad:  
Routing and Approval Sheet for International Travel Seminars**

Approved

Travel Seminar Title \_\_The Country and the City: England and Wales\_\_ Course Number \_\_\_\_\_ Eng 60 \_\_\_\_\_

Travel Seminar Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Craig Owens and Melisa Klimaszewski \_\_\_\_\_

Travel Seminar Co-leader (required) \_\_\_\_\_

Is co-leader a Drake employee: Y \_\_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_\_ (Note: If non-Drake employee, the Vice Provost for International Programs and Human Resources must be consulted).

Is the course being team-taught<sup>i</sup>? Y  X \_\_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed Credits<sup>ii</sup> \_\_3\_\_

J-term XXX  May/summer  Embedded (spring/fall break)  Other  \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Dates \_\_31 December – 17 January 2018\_\_

New seminar XXXX But, it is essentially a lower-division version of the travel seminar we have taught very successfully for three years, in terms of the logistics, travel, and over-all pedagogy and “model” we are using.

If it is a new seminar, are you using an existing course number<sup>iii</sup>? Y  X \_\_\_\_\_ N \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed enrollment cap<sup>iv</sup> \_\_21\_\_

Program Location(s) - Please list all countries involved with the seminar. Please note if either the instructor or the co-leader has previously traveled to the location(s):

Country	Previously traveled?
---------	----------------------

<u>__London, England, UK and environs__</u>	Yes/Yes <u>_____</u>
---	----------------------

<u>__Wales, UK__</u>	Yes/Yes <u>_____</u>
----------------------	----------------------

The review process is outlined below. The travel seminar instructor is responsible for attaching the course proposal, course syllabus, itinerary, and budget estimate to this routing form. The International Affairs department will handle routing the documents to the appropriate reviewers.

Stage	Whom	Reviewing
Departmental Approval	Department Chairperson	Course proposal, syllabus, itinerary, workload implications
Curricular Approval	Appropriate Curriculum Committee	Course proposal, syllabus, itinerary
Program Review	Vice Provost for International Programs	Itinerary, preliminary budget, third-party provider proposal
Academic and Budget Review	College Dean	Itinerary, preliminary budget, syllabus
Risk Assessment/Budget Review	Deputy Provost	Risk Assessment Committee review worksheet, itinerary, preliminary budget
Final Budget Approval	University Budget Director	Final budget, itinerary

**This travel seminar is reviewed by:**

1. Department Chairperson\_\_ Craig Owens\_\_\_\_\_ Date: 10/23/16\_\_\_\_\_ Approved (Y/N) \_Y\_\_\_\_\_
2. Curriculum Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Leah Kalmanson \_\_\_\_\_ Date:11/08/16\_ Approved (Y/N) \_\_Y\_\_
3. VP for Int’l Programs \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved (Y/N)\_\_\_\_\_
4. College/School Dean \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved (Y/N)\_\_\_\_\_
5. Deputy Provost \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved (Y/N) \_\_\_\_\_
6. University Budget Director \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved (Y/N) \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>i</sup> If the course is being co-taught, both instructors will share responsibility for course development and delivery. If the co-leader is serving in a support role (vs. instructional), answer “N” to this question.

<sup>ii</sup> Please use the “Credit Calculation Worksheet” found at <http://www.drake.edu/international/dapa/facultystaff.php>.

<sup>iii</sup> If using an existing course number, please refer to the “Course approval process for existing course numbers” policy found in the International Travel Seminar Faculty Handbook found at <http://www.drake.edu/international/dapa/facultystaff.php>.

<sup>iv</sup> International travel seminars normally will be capped at 20 and have a minimum of 10 students in order to be offered. If there are pedagogical reasons for exceptions to the standard minimum (10) or the standard course cap (20), the Instructor may request approval from his or her College Dean or the appropriate unit head and the Provost.

**PROPOSAL: Marijuana Legalization: A Case Study in Law and Social Change**

**Instructor: William Garriott**

**Term: January 2018**

**Topic: Travel Seminar to Denver, Colorado**

**Included in this proposal:**

**1. Syllabus**

Attached.

**2. Draft itinerary**

Incorporated into syllabus.

**3. Credit calculation**

worksheet: <http://www.drake.edu/studyabroad/draketravelseminars/forfacultystaff/>

Attached.

**4. Routing Form:**

<http://www.drake.edu/studyabroad/draketravelseminars/forfacultystaff/>

Attached.

Please also provide answers to the following questions:

**A. Curricular evaluation:**

1. How does the course meet curricular requirements (major, minor, AOI, etc.)

*The course contributes to the Law, Politics, and Society curriculum as an upper division elective. It also contributes to the college curriculum at an Ethics and Values AOI.*

2. How is course content and delivery enhanced by the international or domestic location?

*Travel to Colorado will enhance course content in several ways. First, it will allow students to see the system in action. They will gain a better understanding of key components (grow facilities, medical dispensaries, recreational dispensaries, etc) which*

*will, in turn, provide a better comprehension of Colorado's marijuana laws. Second, it will provide students with opportunities to interact directly with marijuana legalization stakeholders. These will range from lawmakers to dispensary owners to public health and safety workers. Third, it will enhance their ability to complete their final assignment, writing policy recommendations for Iowa. Not only will they have a richer source of knowledge from which to draw, they can speak on the issue with a greater sense of authority having seen the Colorado system first hand.*

3. How does the course propose to integrate students into the host culture?

*As a domestic travel seminar, life in Colorado should feel largely familiar. However, students will be encouraged to take stock of Colorado's unique features. For instance, it is a tourist destination in a way that Iowa is not. How might this be impacting legalization in the state?*

4. How do proposed excursions or site visits link to the learning objectives of the course?

*The primary learning objective for the course is to give students a robust understanding of the current marijuana legalization movement and instill in them the ability to articulate the pros and cons of the various approaches to legalization, Colorado's in particular. By providing students with opportunities to see this particular approach to legalization in action, and by enabling them to interact with key policy stakeholders, students will come to better understand various facets of the legalization policy and marijuana industry from multiple points of view.*

B: Best Practice: (Please note answering no to these questions does not mean that your proposal will not be accepted. Rather, it helps the Drake International staff with the planning of your proposal should it be accepted by the appropriate curriculum committee):

1. How familiar is the lead instructor or co-leader with the proposed international location? (e.g. professional connections, experience visiting/living/working there, language abilities, etc.) If neither have prior experience, please note there is financial support available through Drake International for travel seminar scouting trips: [https://drake.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_bDFI4qFjoQT7KtL](https://drake.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_bDFI4qFjoQT7KtL).

*I have been conducting research on the legal marijuana industry in Colorado since 2014. This research has taken place in collaboration with several student research assistants. I have made four separate research trips to Colorado, and supervised six research trips by my research assistants. As a research team, we have conducted observational research at 23 dispensaries in Colorado, and conducted interviews with 21 industry participants. I also have friends and family who live in the Denver metro area, as well as professional colleagues at University of Denver, Colorado College, UC Boulder, and UC Denver.*

2. Has the faculty member successfully taught the proposed course or a similar course at either Drake or through another academic institution?

*I taught the proposed course in the summer of 2015. It was a different format (online, and lacking the experiential learning component), but worked extremely well. I have also taught a related course, LPS 135 Drugs, Law, and Society on three separate occasions since 2013.*

3. Is the proposed course being offered in collaboration with a university abroad? Does Drake currently have a formal relationship with that university? See list of current partner universities here:

<http://www.drake.edu/studyabroad/exchanges/partners/>

*No.*

4. Is service-learning included in the curriculum? If so, has an appropriate organizational partner been identified to facilitate service-learning activities on site?

*No.*

<b>Course Title</b>	Ecotourism, Conservation, and Development in Post-Genocide Rwanda
<b>Department and Course Number</b>	ENSP 111
<b>Instructor(s) for the course</b>	Michael J Renner
<b>Semester and Year offered: J-term or summer</b>	January 2016
<b>Credit Hours</b>	3
<b>Course Description</b>	<p>This course will help students develop an understanding of Rwanda's growth and development since the genocide, with a focus on how sustainability and environmental protection has been one of the central principles in that process. We will begin with an examination of contemporary Rwanda, including consideration of the 1994 genocide as the touchstone event for everything in this country. We will then use the national parks as case studies, including Akagera (privately managed, and in a different type of ecosystem than the others), Volcanoes (with a very narrow focus on the gorillas, which are a source of hard currency to fund conservation efforts), Nyungwe (a traditional management model, relatively highly developed, in a rainforest ecology), and Gishwati (a new national park and also a reforestation and reclamation project with a significant community engagement component, which is still evolving).</p>
<b>Has this course been approved by your Department Chair?</b>	yes
<b>What semester and year was this course first offered?</b>	January 2016
<b>Are there any significant changes to this course?* *If you are making significant changes to this course (to the</b>	



**course number,  
credit hours,  
catalogue course  
description, etc.)  
please use the  
Course Change  
Form.**

No

---

Approved



Leah Kalmanson &lt;kalmanson@gmail.com&gt;

---

**j-term 2018 course**

2 messages

---

**Timothy Knepper** <tim.knepper@drake.edu>  
To: Leah Kalmanson <kalmanson@gmail.com>  
Cc: Maria Rohach <maria.rohach@drake.edu>

Wed, Oct 26, 2016 at 8:36 AM

Hi Leah,

Maria Rohach tells me that I need to inform you that "I" will be teaching a travel seminar in J-18. (I couldn't find a form for this on-line.)

The "I" is tricky in this case. Elizabeth and I will be listed as the instructors, but with the understanding that if I go on sabbatical next year, Brad will teach the course in my absence.

The course is one of the two India travel-seminars that Elizabeth and I have taught before. We taught this course in J-14 under the number/title: INTD/HONR 85: Developing Democracy: India.

Thanks!

Tim

-----

Timothy D Knepper  
Professor of Philosophy, Drake University  
Chair, Department of Philosophy and Religion  
Director, [The Comparison Project](#)

---

**Leah Kalmanson** <kalmanson@gmail.com>  
To: Timothy Knepper <tim.knepper@drake.edu>  
Cc: Maria Rohach <maria.rohach@drake.edu>

Wed, Oct 26, 2016 at 11:37 AM

Hi Tim,

Thanks! Kayla will be setting up a form for this at the A&S website soon. I'll let you know when it's available. In the meantime, I'll make a note of the class on the Curriculum Committee agenda.

Best,

Leah

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Leah Kalmanson  
Assistant Professor  
Drake University  
[Department of Philosophy and Religion](#)  
Des Moines, Iowa

<b>Course Title</b>	Leadership at Sea
<b>Department and Course Number</b>	LEAD 110
<b>Instructor(s) for the course</b>	Thomas Westbrook, Meghan Blancas
<b>Semester and Year offered: J-term or summer</b>	J-term 2017, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013
<b>Credit Hours</b>	3
<b>Course Description</b>	<p>Leadership At Sea is a blend of classroom and experiential learning focusing on leadership development, team building, and seamanship. The course features sailing in the Bahamas aboard the schooner Liberty Clipper. The goal of the course is to elevate one's ability to navigate new environments (Nassau and a tall ship), learn new languages (culture language of Nassau and sailing terminology) and to work successfully in teams, follow and lead. We will discover and apply the Situational Leadership model to our time at sea and develop a language of leadership for effective communication aboard ship. We will spend one week on-campus followed by six days in Nassau. Our time in Nassau will include meeting with officials at the American Embassy and the Bahamian Government, meeting the first officers and tour a Norwegian Cruise Line ship, completing an historical tour of Nassau and attending a session with student leaders at the College of the Bahamas We will also participate in the Susan G Komen Race for the Cure and Marathon Bahamas (run or staff water stations). We will then set sail for a week exploring the Bahamas Out Islands. The Liberty Clipper, a U.S. Coast Guard licensed 125' gaff-rigged schooner, will serve as our leadership laboratory enabling students to rotate through ship positions while taking more ownership of all sailing-related tasks. While at sea, the itinerary includes small island exploration, kayaking, snorkeling, and small craft sailing (<a href="http://www.libertyfleet.com">http://www.libertyfleet.com</a>). Contact Professor Tom Westbrook for more information (<a href="mailto:thomas.westbrook@drake.edu">thomas.westbrook@drake.edu</a>). Go to: <a href="http://www.drake.edu/lead/sea/">http://www.drake.edu/lead/sea/</a> 3 Credits. LEAD students, students in Adams Academy, student leaders and students in college-specific leadership programs will have enrollment priority. AOI: Global and Cultural Understanding.</p>
<b>Has this course</b>	

**been approved by your Department Chair?** Yes (Team LEAD, the internal faculty and staff advisory board)

---

**What semester and year was this course first offered?** J-term 2013

---

**Are there any significant changes to this course?\* \*If you are making significant changes to this course (to the course number, credit hours, catalogue course description, etc.) please use the Course Change Form.** No

---

Approved



Leah Kalmanson &lt;kalmanson@gmail.com&gt;

---

## J-Term course proposal

5 messages

**Michael Haedicke** <michael.haedicke@drake.edu>

Fri, Nov 4, 2016 at 3:55 PM

To: Darcie Vandegrift &lt;darcie.vandegrift@drake.edu&gt;, Leah Kalmanson &lt;leah.kalmanson@drake.edu&gt;

Cc: Maria Rohach &lt;maria.rohach@drake.edu&gt;

Hello Darcie and Leah,

I would like to propose my travel course for the 2018 J-Term. (Leah, I believe that you are the chair of the curriculum committee?) I've included the course information below.

Thanks,  
Michael

**Course title:** Sustainability and Social Justice on the Gulf Coast

**Course number:** SCSS 196/ENSP 150

**Credits:** 3

**AOIs:** none

**Enrollment capacity:** 12

**Instructor:** Michael Haedicke

**Description:** Students in this course will examine questions of environmental sustainability and social justice in New Orleans and the surrounding area through field site visits, service learning activities, critical readings, and guided discussion and reflection. Broad topics of learning include the politics of environmental management on the Gulf Coast, the impacts of natural and industrial disasters on different communities, the intersections of race and class with environmental problems, social inequalities, the area's diverse cultural and religious traditions, and community-based efforts to create social change. The course includes a week-long service learning component in which students will partner with nonprofit organizations in the New Orleans area that are seeking to address social inequities and environmental vulnerabilities. Although the exact nature of service learning activities will be determined by comparing students' skills and interests with the needs of community partners, they may include wetlands restoration, home construction, community

gardening, and neighborhood revitalization. Students will be required to attend pre-trip meetings with required readings, participate in written and oral reflections and research activities while on the trip, and complete a post-trip final assignment.

Dr. Michael A. Haedicke  
Associate Professor of Sociology  
Drake University  
135 Howard Hall  
2507 University Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50311

(734) 255-5463 (p)  
(515) 271-2055 (f)  
[michael.haedicke@drake.edu](mailto:michael.haedicke@drake.edu)  
[drake.academia.edu/MichaelHaedicke](http://drake.academia.edu/MichaelHaedicke)

*Organizing Organic* is now available from [Stanford University Press](#) or [Amazon.com](#)

[1453819651247\\_Organizing](#)

---

**Leah Kalmanson** <[kalmanson@gmail.com](mailto:kalmanson@gmail.com)>

Sat, Nov 5, 2016 at 2:08 PM

To: Michael Haedicke <[michael.haedicke@drake.edu](mailto:michael.haedicke@drake.edu)>

Cc: Darcie Vandegrift <[darcie.vandegrift@drake.edu](mailto:darcie.vandegrift@drake.edu)>, Leah Kalmanson <[leah.kalmanson@drake.edu](mailto:leah.kalmanson@drake.edu)>, Maria Rohach <[maria.rohach@drake.edu](mailto:maria.rohach@drake.edu)>

Hi Michael,

The curriculum committee meets Monday afternoon, but I will ask that the committee make time to add this to the agenda. Let me know--is this an existing course, which has already been approved, and which you are teaching again? Or, is this a new course that you are proposing for the first time?

Thank you!  
Leah

On Fri, Nov 4, 2016 at 3:55 PM, Michael Haedicke <[michael.haedicke@drake.edu](mailto:michael.haedicke@drake.edu)> wrote:

Hello Darcie and Leah,

I would like to propose my travel course for the 2018 J-Term. (Leah, I believe that you are the chair of the curriculum committee?) I've included the course information below.

Thanks,  
Michael

**Course title:** Sustainability and Social Justice on the Gulf Coast

**Course number:** SCSS 196/ENSP 150

**Credits:** 3

**AOIs:** none

**Enrollment capacity:** 12

**Instructor:** Michael Haedicke

**Description:** Students in this course will examine questions of environmental sustainability and social justice in New Orleans and the surrounding area through field site visits, service learning activities, critical readings, and guided discussion and reflection. Broad topics of learning include the politics of environmental management on the Gulf Coast, the impacts of natural and industrial disasters on different communities, the intersections of race and class with environmental problems, social inequalities, the area's diverse cultural and religious traditions, and community-based efforts to create social change. The course includes a week-long service learning component in which students will partner with nonprofit organizations in the New Orleans area that are seeking to address social inequities and environmental vulnerabilities. Although the exact nature of service learning activities will be determined by comparing students' skills and interests with the needs of community partners, they may include wetlands restoration, home construction, community gardening, and neighborhood revitalization. Students will be required to attend pre-trip meetings with required readings, participate in written and oral reflections and research activities while on the trip, and complete a post-trip final assignment.

Dr. Michael A. Haedicke  
Associate Professor of Sociology  
Drake University  
135 Howard Hall  
2507 University Ave.  
Des Moines, IA 50311

(734) 255-5463 (p)  
(515) 271-2055 (f)  
[michael.haedicke@drake.edu](mailto:michael.haedicke@drake.edu)  
[drake.academia.edu/MichaelHaedicke](http://drake.academia.edu/MichaelHaedicke)

*Organizing Organic* is now available from [Stanford University Press](#) or [Amazon.com](#)

1453819651247\_Organizing



--

Leah Kalmanson  
Assistant Professor  
Drake University  
Department of Philosophy and Religion  
Des Moines, Iowa

---

**Michael Haedicke** <michael.haedicke@drake.edu>  
To: Leah Kalmanson <kalmanson@gmail.com>

Sat, Nov 5, 2016 at 2:37 PM

Hi Leah,

This is an existing course taught in January 2015.

Apologies for the late submission. I wasn't quite clear on the submission procedures.

Thanks,

Michael

---

**From:** Leah Kalmanson  
**Date:** Saturday, November 5, 2016 at 2:08 PM  
**To:** Michael Haedicke  
**Cc:** Darcie Vandegrift, Leah Kalmanson, Maria Rohach  
**Subject:** Re: J-Term course proposal

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Leah Kalmanson** <kalmanson@gmail.com>  
To: Michael Haedicke <michael.haedicke@drake.edu>

Sat, Nov 5, 2016 at 2:46 PM

Hi Michael,

Thanks for the quick response! No worries--the procedures for these cases are still in flux. I'm still trying to coordinate with Drake International to clarify things. We'll add your travel seminar to the agenda on Monday.

Best,  
Leah

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Leah Kalmanson** <kalmanson@gmail.com>  
To: Matthew Zwier <matthew.zwier@drake.edu>, David Skidmore <david.skidmore@drake.edu>

Sat, Nov 5, 2016 at 2:49 PM

Hi all,

I am still working with Drake International and the dean's office to clarify what's going on with the travel seminar notifications, but please note the following submission from Michael Haedicke for Monday's meeting. Note: this an existing travel seminar, already approved. There's nothing for us to really review or evaluate, but Drake International needs us to be notified when existing travel seminars are taught.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

1453819651247\_Organizing

--

Leah Kalmanson  
Assistant Professor  
Drake University  
Department of Philosophy and Religion  
Des Moines, Iowa

## College of Arts and Sciences Pilot Mentoring Program

The Pilot Mentoring Program [PMP] was developed out of the recommendations prepared by the Diversity Committee to improve recruitment and retention of diverse and underrepresented faculty and the proposal of the Ad-Hoc Mentoring Committee to extend this initiative to serve all faculty members in the early stages of their careers. The PMP is designed to:

- 1) create a more welcoming and inclusive work environment
- 2) build productive collegial connections across campus
- 3) enhance success and satisfaction for all members of the College

The PMP will not take the place of other crucial institutional responsibilities to provide departmental mentoring, professional development training and resources to participate in national and international programs offering more specialized resources for particular areas of expertise. Rather, the PMP will support and supplement existing efforts to retain and promote faculty.

Due to the urgent need to support untenured faculty, the Arts & Sciences Pilot Mentoring Program will be launched at the end of the 2016 Fall semester with a social event including all potential participants in the PMP, as well as all staff members who are potential participants in the staff PMP (currently being drafted for proposal). The PMP will run from 2017-2018 and feature a professional development workshop at the start of each semester and a social at the end of each semester (inclusive of staff and responsive to staff training needs if the proposed staff PMP is approved). In addition to paid professional development and social events, participants will be offered a small stipend to share a meal during the semester, and will be provided with relevant online resources to use for mentoring purposes. During the fall semester of 2018, the PMP will be assessed to determine whether it should be revised and/or continued.

Throughout the pilot, the following principles and associated features will define the program:

- *Sensitivity to targeted needs*
  - The program will distribute the work of mentoring in equitable ways, ensuring that it does not fall to those most underrepresented

in the institution. Hence, outreach to and training of tenured and senior faculty members will increase campus-wide awareness of and sensitivity to particular challenges faced by underrepresented faculty members (such as sexism, racism, harassment, bias, microaggressions, lack of access, ect.), creating a more welcoming, inclusive, and responsive workplace for all.

- Trainings will consistently include attention to the specific challenges that underrepresented faculty (faculty of color, for example) experience in in a predominantly white institution (PWI).
- Existing survey data will be used to identify specific needs to feature in program training and resources. An anonymous survey mechanism will be used to collect feedback from participants.
- Recruitment and training of mentors will address the need for equity in the distribution of labor and additional burdens that often inhibit retention and success for underrepresented faculty members by providing current research and promoting proven solutions to these problems.
- *Institutional support*
  - Funding for professional development workshops to train mentors in January and August of both 2017 and 2018 will be provided. This will include compensation for trainees and stipends for workshop directors, who will be responsible for recruiting participants, providing training, and matching trained mentors with interested mentees—prioritizing the need to assign mentors to the most junior and least represented faculty and ensuring that mentors are never in a supervisory role for their own mentees.
  - The College will promote, recognize, and reward successful mentoring partnerships, and acknowledge mentoring as a valuable service contribution.
  - A central online hub will feature resources and information about upcoming events and other news. Guest speakers will be provided to facilitate career development through mentoring.
  - A small stipend for each mentor/mentee partnership to have lunch once per semester will be provided.
  - Information about and opportunities to enroll in the PMP will be incorporated into new faculty orientation and existing professional development programs.

- A PMP coordinator will be appointed to share information about the program and monitor its success throughout the academic year.
- *Flexibility*
  - All tenured faculty will be invited to attend training to serve as mentors. All junior faculty (visiting and tenure track) will be invited to join the program. Workshop directors will match trained mentors with mentees across departments using information gathered about shared interests and aims.
  - Mentoring partners will establish the frequency of meetings suitable for their own needs and schedules.
  - Mentees will have the option of locating a mentor outside the matching program and applying for enrollment to access training, resources, and funds.
  - Either party in a mentoring partnership will have the option to exit the arrangement/leave the program at any time or to request a new mentoring match.

Online resources consulted:

<https://www.insidehighered.com/career-advice/how-be-great-mentor>

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/pdf/PELMentorReport.pdf>

[http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/ccfl/faculty\\_mentoring\\_program.php](http://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/ccfl/faculty_mentoring_program.php)

<http://vpf.berkeley.edu/faculty-mentoring>

<http://www.niu.edu/facdev/services/newfacmentoring.shtml>

NOTE: The major changes (in red) below represent an attempt to make the introductory language of each of these sections less adversarial in tone and more open to acknowledging the complexity of the task of assessing work across disciplines. The actual work that is considered (the list or provisions that follow) is not significantly different from what the college has considered important before. There are some additions, some suggested shifts in language, placement, and how such work is to be valued. Key words that have been added are “effective” concerning teaching rather than “excellence,” and “balance” among different areas.

A further revision is that the guidelines for the preparation of materials have been incorporated into this document, rather than offered as a separate document. Currently candidates expend unnecessary effort in working back and forth between the two statements, attempting to attend to both and to reconcile them.

October 4, 2016

## **P and T Ad hoc Committee: Revision of Section 3.1.3: Criteria for the Review of Faculty Performance**

### **3.1.3 Context and Criteria for the Review of Faculty Performance**

Fundamental to Drake’s stated mission “to provide an exceptional learning environment” for students is the intellectual vibrancy of its faculty. This primary goal of promoting learning and intellectual growth among our students is achieved through faculty who: continually develop and revise their teaching practices based on engagement with current pedagogical approaches in their discipline; are active scholars who reflect thoughtfully about the relationship between their scholarship and their teaching; and are committed institutional citizens who perform strategic service to the university and the profession in ways that draw on and contribute to their teaching and scholarship.

What does this mean in terms of the criteria for the review of faculty for tenure and promotion?

Drake seeks to encourage its faculty members to develop, ideally, a balanced approach to the demands of university life. Teaching becomes more effective, more urgent, if fully informed by disciplinary best practices and if continually refreshed by the current knowledge of the practicing scholar. An active scholarly life renews the intellectual energy and drive of the scholar/teacher and grants students participatory access to the most recent advances in disciplinary knowledge and development. Service, whether faculty governance, curriculum development and oversight, the advising of students, service to the profession, or any number of other commitments to the maintenance of college life, also deeply involves faculty in creating the environment within which good teaching and scholarship can flourish.

Tenure or promotion can be earned through substantive and high quality activity in all three areas, all of which are evaluated within the tenure and promotion review.

At Drake, the bedrock of all such development is necessarily teaching. Discharging our responsibilities to instruct our students is core to our mission. Excellent scholarship or a fine service record or both cannot compensate for lack of success in teaching.

The college recognizes that all three areas present some difficulty in assessing performance. These include acknowledged differences in both teaching and scholarly practices and standards across different disciplines, the near impossibility of determining, for example, the exact contribution of an individual faculty member to the growth of particular student in a single course, the collaborative nature of most service responsibilities, and the lack of ready documentation of an individual's contribution. In addition, the college is aware that research about how diverse faculty fare in tenure and promotion considerations across the country has shown the presence of conscious or unconscious discriminatory practices on the part of both students and faculty.

In the specific guidelines of criteria for review that follow, we have sought to provide a comprehensive description of current teaching practices, of types of scholarship in a variety of venues, as appropriate to different disciplines, and of service responsibilities as they reflect the many avenues a professional career might take. We have tried to avoid long lists, since inevitably, such lists may inadvertently exclude a perfectly legitimate practice or worthy venue of scholarship. Departments are free to be more explicit in their disciplinary guidelines. In naming the criteria which constitute "success" in any of the areas, we acknowledge the limitations of such criteria to fully account for individual differences in approach. We attend to the possibility of hidden or overt discrimination in the case of diverse candidates, and seek to neutralize or discount it. All departments are encouraged to make clear in their own guidelines how they evaluate each area according to their disciplinary practices. In addition, departments should make clear any ways in which their particular disciplinary requirements differ from or add to the general requirements. Despite these limitations, and the acknowledgement of differences across disciplines, we think it possible to give here reasonable expectations for how a faculty member can demonstrate the focused and purposive fulfillment of his or her responsibilities.

What follows then are specific requirements for each area. Each section includes suggestions for assessment at the departmental level, and guidelines for candidates on how best to prepare materials for the tenure review.

### ***3.1.31 Teaching***

Effective teaching, as suggested above, is at the core of all faculty work, and essential to the university mission. And at the core of effective teaching is reflection and

revision. We recognize that effective teaching is an ongoing process rather than a single “achievement,” that methods and activities may be revised based on developments within a faculty member’s discipline, or based on experimental pedagogies. The development of a teacher’s own scholarship may factor into course revisions. Or new understandings of students’ patterns of cognitive growth and/or social adjustment may occasion a shift in emphasis or teacher responses within a course. Thus, the progress of a faculty member’s teaching over time will reflect continual attention to and development of the following qualities:

- a. Expertise in the discipline or interdisciplinary areas and mastery of the subject matter one teaches.
- b. **Development and maintenance of high standards in what is taught and how it is taught.**
- c. **A commitment to student learning which includes** the ability to: articulate learning outcomes and define instructional objectives; **provide students with explanatory course statements, assignments and other materials; give timely and useful feedback; respond to student communications outside of class in a timely fashion; give clear grading guidelines; and generally foster a respectful atmosphere in which students can work collaboratively with each other and with their instructor, during class sessions or outside of class through conference or online activities.**
- d. **A commitment to creating an atmosphere of mutual respect which both challenges and supports student learning.** This includes the ability to: conduct classroom, laboratory, studio, or tutorial activities purposefully; engage students' minds and motivate them to perform to the best of their ability; develop students' skills consistent with course objectives.

In addition, effective teaching activities may include

- e. Mentoring, which encompasses activities similar to apprenticeship-preparation for entry into a profession or career. Mentoring activities typically occur outside the classroom and may include assisting students on choosing graduate or professional schools; preparing letters of recommendation for graduate scholarships, graduate studies, or employment; discussing career options; directing independent studies and undergraduate research, and assisting students in identifying and obtaining internships and/or professional experiences.
- f. The development of models, equipment, inventions, **printed or** computer-based instructional materials, or audiovisual materials that further the teaching of a discipline.
- g. Other activities the candidate's department identifies and justifies as meriting consideration as directly related to teaching performance, such as developing service learning or study abroad experiences. Departments are expected to recognize teaching done in interdisciplinary areas, including team-taught,



cross-disciplinary courses, and to consult with the director of applicable programs in conducting the evaluation.

- h. **Department Assessment:** Within the guidelines outlined above, each Department will, of necessity, develop its own practices to assess instructional skills and accomplishments as they apply to effectiveness in teaching in its disciplines. Thus, each Department will develop a statement that describes:

i. any special requirements not described above, if any, or unique standards of teaching effectiveness and performance expected within its disciplines. For example, departments may develop instruments such as an exit survey or a rigorous analysis of student work. Individual samples of student work that have not been rigorously analyzed should not be considered as evidence of quality teaching.

ii. departmental policies concerning the frequency and type of peer observation that will take place for pre-tenure and tenure reviews. Peer observations should not merely list the candidate's strengths but be written from a critical perspective. For example, in addition to discussing what a candidate did well in the classroom, the observation could discuss aspects of a candidate's teaching that could be improved, it could analyze the degree to which learning outcomes were achieved in class, or, if department observation guidelines provide a rigorous procedure that protects the interviewee's anonymity, student interviews could be used.

iii. departmental practices governing student evaluations for individual courses, including providing the candidate with sample evaluation forms, or a standard form, if a department has one. While student evaluations *in toto* can provide useful indications of the nature of the classroom atmosphere—how timely the faculty member responds to students' communications, how quickly assignments are graded and returned, and how useful students find the faculty member's feedback—student evaluations have fundamental flaws that need to be kept in mind: student self-assessment of learning can be unreliable; some students have personal biases against an instructor; and good teaching is not a popularity contest. Moreover, systematic biases present in the broader culture, for example, those based on gender, ethnicity, or color can be reflected, often subtly, in student evaluations. With this mind, any careful analysis of student evaluations should focus on overall patterns and not on comments that could be outliers; in particular, an opinion voiced in an individual evaluation should not be heavily weighted unless similar opinions are echoed in other evaluations.

iv. any specific mentoring practices the department has in place for tenure-track faculty, and what these may require of the untenured faculty member.

Departmental assessment practices and any statement of special or unique standards must be approved by the Dean of the College. All members of the

Department must be apprised of these assessment practices. **All statements should be readily available to all department members, and especially, should be drawn to the attention of tenure-track faculty.** These should not be changed by the Department or the Dean without giving notice to tenure-track faculty members. Faculty members must be given time and opportunity to demonstrate the ability to perform within these standards, before the next review. **When a candidate comes up for tenure review or for promotion to full, departments will provide the dean and the Tenure and Promotion Committee a statement of departmental policies and practices. Departments will also provide copies of peer teaching observations of the candidate.**

**i Guidelines for Candidates Preparing Credentials for Tenure and Promotion/or Promotion to Full Professor: (note: these guidelines are taken from the A and S Guidelines for preparing credentials for tenure. They are not entirely new (main changes are in red) but have been shortened/ revised).**

**i. The full tenure narrative should not exceed 20 (single-spaced) pages. In the opening teaching section, candidates should describe their teaching philosophy and goals, the evolution of their pedagogical practices, and should demonstrate how student learning is achieved. Within this context, a careful and rigorous examination of course assignments, exams, and classroom activities should be provided and should reference the materials presented in the file. Candidates should also discuss, as appropriate, student evaluations and the ways in which they have revised or rethought their courses accordingly. See 3.1.31 h iii for a discussion of the proper role student evaluations in the review process. Equally important is a discussion of how the candidate sees reciprocal connections between his/her teaching and scholarship.**

**ii. Description of Courses taught: Candidates should provide in the narrative the titles, dates, and number of credit hours for the courses taught during the years leading to the tenure and promotion review. (For promotion to full professor, materials from the previous 5 years will be sufficient). Materials submitted should include syllabi, representative handouts, assignments, and exams and should be keyed by letter and number to the letters and numbers specified in the narrative.**

**iii. Mentoring: Candidates should describe the ways in which they act as mentor, how that mentoring relates to teaching and/or scholarship or service, and should provide any materials that give evidence of the quality of mentoring activities.**

**iv. Student evaluations from the three years preceding the tenure review should be submitted. These should be submitted in their entirety rather than**

in the aggregate, since aggregate results do not allow the reading of positive and negative comments within context.

v. If unusual or experimental pedagogies constitute part of a teacher's repertoire, the usefulness of such pedagogies can be documented in ways additional to student evaluation, e.g. with reference to published LEAP assessment programs, "Reacting to the Past" assessments, etc. This could provide a balanced view in the event of student resistance to change or new challenges in the classroom. Candidates would still need to demonstrate through materials and discussion in the narrative how they, individually, enacted such pedagogies in the classroom.

vi. The department will provide copies of peer teaching observations. The candidate may choose to comment on these in the tenure narrative, if needed for clarification or explanation of what effects they have had on the candidate's teaching development.

vii. The department or program committee for annual evaluation of a candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor shall consist of at least three tenured members of the department. If this is not possible, the chair of the department should work with the dean of Arts and Sciences to find tenured faculty from other departments within Arts and Sciences to serve on the candidate's committee. If a candidate's position is spread among multiple department or programs, the composition of the committee should reflect the conditions of appointment, and should be worked out in consultation with (and approved by) the dean.

viii. The purpose for the department or program's annual evaluation is to guide the candidate towards tenure and should carefully and critically analyze the candidate's teaching, mentoring, research and service activities. It should also comment upon the candidate's progress towards tenure. While it is important to describe the positive progress of the candidate towards tenure, it is crucial that the department also explicitly point out areas for improvement. The committee should send its annual report to the dean, and the dean shall use this report as a basis for her/his annual review of the candidate. Once the dean's annual review is written and returned to the candidate, both the committee and the candidate are allowed the right to respond in writing to the dean's annual review. These responses will be included in the candidate's files kept in the Arts and Sciences offices along with both the department and dean's annual reviews.

ix. Keeping in mind that the candidate is only required to submit student evaluations of her/his teaching for years three to five of the pre-tenure period, the department committee should pay particularly careful attention to the student evaluations of the candidate during years one and two of the pre-tenure period.

### ***3.1.32 Scholarship/Creative Activity***

The evaluation process of scholarship/creative activity focuses on the trajectory of a faculty member's scholarship over time. Departments look for a record of scholarly and creative achievement that demonstrates a commitment to continued growth and accomplishment, and offers the promise of future contributions to their field. Scholarship and creative activities may be demonstrated in a variety of ways; they show a candidate's mind and body at work and his or her skills in practice in the appropriate field(s) of endeavor. They help to ensure that those responsible for teaching and learning remain current in their disciplines, particularly when their fields are among those whose protocols, norms, methods, and tenets change relatively rapidly.

Often these activities not only advance knowledge and understanding, they also contribute to high quality teaching. That is, they connect faculty to the daily lives of students, whom we all expect to contend with difficult ideas, engage with new concepts, and take part responsibly in the production of knowledge. An active creative or research agenda, then, maintains faculty credibility as faculty assign and evaluate student work. Our own engagement in scholarship and creative activity is one way we continually "earn" the privilege, in other words, of passing judgment on our students' work.

Scholarly and creative activity enhances the academic reputation of the university and demonstrates the quality of its faculty as measured by terms set outside the university itself. Ideally, the public dissemination of such work models a courageous and receptive attitude toward critique, dialogue, and dissent, and provides opportunities for us to think deeply about, and even rethink, our disciplinary and professional assumptions. Thus, scholarly and creative work may contribute to public conversations and policy change as well as to a professional discourse.

There are many ways to demonstrate engagement in scholarly and creative activities; as suggested above, for the purposes of tenure and promotion, these activities must be public – that is, they must be presented in a form that allows others to enjoy, critique, and evaluate them according to the standards of their field. An idea, product, or performance which cannot be subjected to some form of critical examination by peers is not scholarship or creative activity as here defined. Although the definition of what constitutes scholarship and creative activity may vary across individual disciplines and artistic fields, the college asserts their

importance in the evaluation of candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

The record submitted for review may include elements in the following list. This list is suggestive rather than fully inclusive, but in all cases, refers to work that exists in some public form or forum, and is work that can be evaluated by peers. The items are given in alphabetical order rather than in order of importance. This allows for the undoubted difference across disciplines in considering what “counts” as important to publication in the field. Thus, it is up to individual departments to define in more detail what kinds of research, scholarship, and creative activities most fully represent advancement and development in their fields, and which thereby constitute reasonable expectations for tenure and promotion within their programs and disciplines.

- a. Artistic activities that are subject to critical evaluation, where practicable, including musical recitals and/or concert performances, publication or performance of original musical compositions, exhibitions of art work in individual or group displays, involvement in creative aspects of theatrical productions (i.e., stage/costume/lighting design, direction or choreography, acting or play writing), public readings of one's own creative work in prose and/or poetry, or other appropriate evidences of artistic activity.
- b. Community-based and community-engaged scholarly and creative activities that has some public dimension—presentations or publication locally or nationally.
- c. Editorial work in the production of an edited volume, the editing of a journal, work as a peer reviewer for funding agencies, journals or or academic publishing houses.
- d. Grants and awards received for scholarly and creative activity.
- e. Interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary work published in venues outside the candidate's discipline .
- f. Invited publications (books, articles, book chapters, book reviews, etc.).
- g. Peer-reviewed articles, books, book chapters.
- h. Presentations at conferences, public lectures, peer-reviewed or invited.
- i. Scholarly and creative activity translated for public or policy audiences, such as op-eds, position papers, policy analysis, websites, open-source technology
- j. Scholarship and creative activity that involves students in significant ways.
- k. Scholarship undertaken *for the purpose of* allowing undergraduate research, that is, research a faculty member may have undertaken in addition to his/her primary research, so that students could participate.
- l. Textbooks, learning materials, computer-based instructional materials that are published or otherwise evaluated and distributed by appropriate organizations and groups.
- m. The scholarship of teaching and learning, including evaluation of pedagogical strategies or research designed to broaden or improve course offering

- n. **Department Assessment:** Since the recognition of scholarship varies among departments and disciplines, each department must develop its own practices to assess scholarly and artistic achievement as they apply to its disciplines, and each department should develop a statement that describes any special or unique standards of scholarly or artistic achievement within its disciplines. **Such statements will be made available to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee when a candidate comes up for review.**

**The College recognizes that there is a significant distinction between scholarship that can be satisfactorily demonstrated by reporting on results of a particular idea that has not been explored before, and scholarship which involves long periods of gestation during which major ideas are worked and re-worked in ways that do not admit of intermittent publication or other demonstrable critical examination by peers. There is good reason to provide time for such reflection rather than requiring premature publication as a criterion for scholarship. Tenure and promotion review is meant to understand the development of the scholar and teacher and to understand that moments of design, research, reflection, and writing all deserve ample time in which to develop. At the same time, there must be strong indicators that any delay in making research public is not merely procrastination.**

Thus, the department and the candidate may choose to present other activities for consideration such as unpublished research—papers or manuscripts that have not been published or presented in a public forum but are in process, existing at a stage where critical review by peers from off-campus is feasible; printed material, judged by peers to demonstrate scholarship, prepared for classroom use; awards and citations for excellence or for contributions in a discipline. The obligation to demonstrate that an activity cited merits consideration as scholarship or creative performance rests with the candidate and the department. **If much of a candidate's "research" is "published" in non-traditional ways, that person would need to provide their department committee with some assurance of their work's quality. In year 3 and following, it would be in the candidate's interest to demonstrate the quality of their research by whatever means are available to them. This could include published reviews, responses to online blogs, evaluator comments from other scholars working in similar venues, etc.**

**For the tenure review, the department must secure at least 3 outside reviews from professors in institutions comparable to Drake and/or from professionals in the field, as appropriate for creative/artistic work**

Reviewers should have neither a close personal relationship nor have been in a close collaboration with the candidate.

The assessment practices and the statement of special or unique standards (which may be elaborations on or extensions of any of the above items) must be approved by the Dean of the college. Departments are expected to incorporate into their statements their procedures for taking into account work of an interdisciplinary nature. All members of the department, especially tenure-track members, must be apprised in a timely manner of the department's assessment practices in relation to scholarship, and of any additional statements on special or unique standards for the department.

**o. Guidelines for Candidates Preparing Credentials for Tenure and Promotion/or Promotion to Full Professor:**

- i. In this portion of the tenure narrative, candidates are encouraged to construct a narrative that highlights the key parts of their scholarly and creative record, indicating areas of growth and challenge, and describing the nature of their contributions to their field of inquiry. Such narratives may elaborate how the work fits with the institutional mission, as well as the stated goals of their departmental home, and the particular appointment of each candidate. The narrative may also emphasize the extent to which a candidate's scholarship informs and is informed by teaching and service.
- ii. If the candidate's work typically includes publications, a bibliography of published work should be provided in the form standard for the discipline. Candidates should discuss the focus and direction of this work. In the case of collaborative work, candidates should describe their individual contribution.

If a candidate's work typically **includes** plays, concerts, music compositions, or art exhibitions, candidates should provide evidence of artistic achievement, such as reviews, selection in artistic competitions, purchase of work by museums, galleries, etc. In cases of multiple authorship or collaboration, candidates should describe their individual contribution.

- iii. Scholarly or creative works in progress/or soon to be published/exhibited/performed should be described and presented in the same format as above, with additional information about projected dates of submission, publication or performance.

- iv. Copies of published works in other venues (e.g. professional blogs) as well as copies of oral presentations given before peer professional groups should be provided, along with dates, venues, and the identity of the group.
- v. All other grants, contracts, fellowships, awards, prizes, and honors should be listed and discussed in terms of their purpose and their relationship to the scholar's work. Any critiques and comments of reviewers or review panels can be included if available.

### **3.1.33 Service**

Service is a vital and valued component of academic life and is integral to the healthy functioning of the college and university. The nature of service at the college and university level provides many opportunities for faculty members to participate in various types of service appropriate to individual interests and talents and to different points in an academic career. In order for faculty to have a voice in the development of departmental, college, and university goals and policies, each member must play a part over the course of his or her career in appropriate committees and in the deliberative and governing bodies of the university.

The College of Arts and Sciences emphasizes that all faculty should participate in service but makes clear that service, however extensive and noteworthy, within the university or professional service outside the university, cannot *substitute* for strong, effective teaching and sustained scholarly/creative activity. Nevertheless, service is *required* for the awarding of tenure and promotion; thus a candidate with no or negligible service may be denied tenure or promotion. Departments are urged to make clear their expectations for service that faculty could/should perform within and beyond the department, and are advised to mentor new faculty appropriately to help them achieve a balanced program in the years leading up to the tenure.

Service includes constructive work in the activities named below. This list is illustrative, and may not include all possible service activities in all disciplines. Moreover, there are often service duties that we cannot anticipate that are particular to an individual faculty member, and these should be noted too. For example, faculty from an historically underrepresented group, such as persons of color, women, LGBT faculty members are often sought out for advising by students who identify with them.



The categories listed are intended to make clear the different levels (or types) of service, but “level” does not imply that one sort of service is better than another. “Level” simply refers to whether the candidate is serving on committees or in a leadership role within the department, the college, or the university. When service obligations overlap significantly with teaching or scholarship or both, it is in the candidate’s and the department’s best interest to make that overlap clear and describe as fully as possible, any significant connections they see among service, scholarship and teaching.

- a. Service in support of the department or program. e.g.
  - i. Administration
  - ii. Department committees for policies, procedures, hiring, etc.
  - iii. Operations (e.g. labs, shops, studios)
  - iv. Accreditation
  - v. Curriculum development
- b. Service in support of the College or the University
  - i. Administration
  - ii. Governance committees
  - iii. Task-oriented groups (ad hoc, subcommittees, task forces)
  - iv. Search committees
  - v. Directing a program or interdisciplinary unit outside of the department.
  - vi. Promoting collegiality and university goals through attending and participating in university activities
  - vii. Serving as a representative of the department, college or university by designation of the President, the Provost, or the dean of the college.
- c. Service in support of students
  - i. Academic advising re student scheduling etc., but also including future plans, adjustment to college, references to other resources, study abroad, **as well as additional advising duties faculty members from an historically underrepresented group may undertake with students who identify with them and who seek them out.**
  - ii. Advising student organizations or publications.
  - iii. Adjudication of student events and competitions, both for present students and adjudications connected to recruitment and admissions.
  - iv. Encouraging student research, publication, conference presentation
  - v. writing letters of recommendation and support.
- d. Service in support of the candidate’s field of study, profession
  - i. Leadership roles in professional organizations or at conferences.

- ii. Serving on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or advisory groups or as an officer or board or committee member within a professional organization.
  - iii. Editing a professional newsletter.
  - iv. Contributing professional expertise, advice or commentary to a newspaper, radio show, TV show or other media outlet.
  - v. Lecturing or otherwise contributing professionally to community groups and organizations.
  - vi. Involvement in P&T reviews for other Universities.
  - vii. Program review and accreditation work for other Universities.
  - viii. Consulting work, paid or unpaid
  - ix. Journal editing and other significant forms of editing, if *scholarly* in nature, should be considered in the scholarship section.
- e. **Department Assessment:** Departments are encouraged to assess the quality of service, as well as noting the quantity, and should develop procedures and guidelines to let candidates know what sorts of evidence are expected (e.g. a full description of their specific contributions to committees, letters from committee chairs, or from members of a committee that a candidate has led, documents produced for conferences or community events, etc.). If a *particular* service is required within a department, (e.g. adjudication, student recruitment) that requirement, and all assessment practices associated with it should be described clearly and in a timely manner to all faculty, especially tenure-track faculty undergoing yearly reviews leading to tenure. In the case of faculty members directing interdisciplinary programs, the department needs to make clear what its assessment practices and expectations are with regard to that work. The assessment practices and the statement of special or unique standards (which may be elaborations on or extensions of items a through d) must be approved by the Dean of the college.
- f. **Guidelines for Candidates Preparing Credentials for Tenure and Promotion/or Promotion to Full Professor:**
- As with other portions of the tenure narrative, candidates are encouraged to offer an account of their service which highlights the connections the candidate sees among their service activities and their scholarship and teaching. All service activities should be listed by type, level, (e.g. college, department, professional), and dates. Candidates need not discuss every activity at length, but rather should comment on aspects of their service that they have found particularly rewarding and/or challenging. The list and narrative could include the following:

- i. Department committees, years served, and role (e.g., chair) on the committee; if necessary, describe the purpose and accomplishments of the committee.
- ii. University, division, school, or college committees, years served, and role (e.g., chair) on the committee; if necessary, describe the purpose and accomplishments of the committee.
- iii. Advising activities and approach. Issues that might be addressed in describing advising include discussion of approximate number of advisees and contacts with each advisee per year and the general philosophy that guides advising activities. Submit any materials that provide evidence about the overall quality of advising activities. If advising is not part of a candidate's responsibilities, so state.
- iv. Other departmental, college, or university responsibilities that constitute service.
- v. Contributions to scholarly or professional organizations. These contributions may include holding office, serving on a committee, reviewing manuscripts, and so on.
- vi.. Unpaid community service directly related to one's area of professional or academic area of expertise.

**October 4, 2016**

**Ad Hoc Committee for the Revision of the College of Arts and Sciences  
Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

**Introduction**

In May, 2015, then Dean Joe Lenz appointed an ad hoc committee in order to review and possibly revise the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Arts and Sciences College. The committee, Dan Alexander, Renee Cramer, John Pomeroy, and Elizabeth Robertson, met throughout that summer to begin the review. Over the course of the summer, and during the year that followed, the committee's perception of its undertaking changed. It became evident that a simple "tweaking" of the guidelines would be inadequate to achieve the tasks we had been charged with, that is: the inclusion of a fuller awareness of diversity among both students and faculty; a clearer acknowledgment of different forms of scholarship in non-traditional venues; a more precise evaluation of service responsibilities and their connections to both teaching and scholarship. These issues, and a number of connected issues have required a rethinking of the approach—and thereby, a rewriting of the language—not only of the current guidelines for evaluation, but also of the College P and T Committee operational procedures for review, and the guidelines for candidates for the preparation of materials.

"Why now?" is a question we have considered at length. Given the change in leadership at Drake, the all-campus climate survey, and the push from a number of sources to give deep and sustained attention to how we can achieve and retain a more diverse faculty and student body, a review that attends to how comprehensive and equitable our review procedures are seems both necessary and timely.

To prepare for this task, in addition to rereading our own P and T documents, the committee has read a number of P and T statements and guidelines from other colleges and universities. The "lists" of activities are very similar to ours and to each other in most such guidelines, but of those that most impressed us, the language of the preface paragraphs introducing such lists was more discursive and inclusive, and thereby, less terse and adversarial than ours tends to be. Several such statements discuss briefly, for example, such matters as interconnectedness among teaching, scholarship and service, and the difficulty of making an exact assessment of how much a faculty member influences student learning. Such statements typically offered the acknowledgement that teaching and learning are intensely personal activities, with no two persons approaching them in exactly the same way.

To contextualize guidelines in such a way is not to weaken or lower standards; it serves rather to acknowledge some inherent difficulties in the review process. Candidates are thus invited to present and interpret their materials openly with a

view toward articulating their own patterns of teaching and learning, given both the demands and the limitations of the guidelines.

Over the course of the academic year 2015-2016, the committee has revised the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, including within them, instruction to both departments and candidates. The committee has also produced a more detailed document “Operating Procedures for the College Promotion and Tenure Committee,” which is intended to be used each year, rather than created anew each year by the College Committee, as is the current practice. These revisions have been discussed several times at chairs’ meetings under Interim Dean Keith Summerville. The guidelines have been further revised based on those discussions.

Listed below are some areas of change suggested by a number of individuals and groups, including both department chairs, and the College P and T Committee. All have come under review, and the revised guidelines reflect attention to these areas. In our discussions with chairs and other groups or individuals, there has not been, of course, perfect agreement as to how these matters should be addressed. The revision reflects our attempts to accommodate different views and concerns while retaining the integrity of the promotion and tenure process. We have sought to define coherent, equitable, and open procedures that reflect the mission goals of the university in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service.

## **OVERALL CONSIDERATIONS**

### Teaching Evaluation Considerations

- guidelines should describe how students evaluations are read/understood
- describe best practices for composing useful student evaluation forms, e.g. ones that ask about learning and challenge
- the need to look at data within context rather than in the aggregate
- the recognition that evaluations of minority candidates may reflect “inverse discrimination” and description of ways to acknowledge/assess that data

### Peer Observations and Annual Reports

- make clear what is required of a peer observation
- annual reports may need to be more precise, critical, in line with the actual evaluative practices of the P and T Committee
- the dean may need to insist more clearly that departments follow their own procedural guidelines
- address inconsistencies across departments in terms of procedures, evaluative practices

### Materials

- describe kinds of scholarship accepted to include digital media, the scholarship of teaching and learning, the work of the “public intellectual”
- find ways to evaluate service in meaningful ways—not just quantity
- how can service be properly acknowledged and valued?
- connections among the three areas need to be recognized and valued

### Gaps in the Process

- guidelines for the College Committee review procedures are so sparse that essentially, each committee sets its own procedures each year, too great a latitude for consistency. Candidates need to have a better sense of how the committee reads documents,
- The tenure letter that is produced is vague (deliberately so presumably). It describes the file in relatively neutral language, but does not give a candidate who has been refused tenure or promotion a clear reason for the refusal, thus making an appeal difficult.
- The guidelines use adjectives such as “excellence” to describe teaching, but give no clear description of what that translates into in terms of practice, student evaluations, or peer observations.

### Efficiency of Procedures (suggestions)

- reduce the amount of material sent to the College Committee (e.g. student evaluations only for courses since the third year review)
- include departmental evaluations and peer observations from the third year review onward
- streamline the tenure narrative (no more than 20 pages?)
- BUT ALSO, allow more agency for the writer: faculty members should feel free to construct narratives that more effectively represent how they see themselves and their work.
- recognize that teaching, service, and scholarship are not entirely discrete categories



**September 18, 2016**

**Ad Hoc Committee for Review of P and T Guidelines:**

**OPERATION PROCEDURES FOR COLLEGE COMMITTEE ON  
PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Note: a major difference between this version of the guidelines and the originals is that they have not, heretofore, been published along with other P and T procedures, but have been created and yearly revised by each committee, despite the fact that they are reasonably consistent from year to year. Since much of the tension surrounding tenure seems to focus on questions about what the college committee actually does, it seemed to us good policy, therefore, to formalize the guidelines and make them entirely accessible. Individual P and T committees will still have year-to-year flexibility in determining the day to day running of the committee, within the broad guidelines suggested here.

Operating Procedures 2015-16  
Committee on Promotion and Tenure – College of Arts and Sciences  
First approved by the committee for use in 1992-93 on October 12, 1992  
Last previous revision 2013-2014

**Operating Procedures: Arts and Sciences College Promotion and Tenure  
Committee**

In order for candidates to understand more clearly the nature of the tenure review, it is imperative that the A&S P&T Committee act with appropriate transparency regarding its operating procedures. Thus, the guidelines below speak to ongoing standard procedures of the committee, and will be made available online to all members of the College.

1. In person attendance will be required of all members at all meetings in which candidacies are considered. Remote attendance is not permitted. Only in extraordinary circumstances will a member be excused from a meeting, for example, a car accident, a sudden family emergency, etc. In such cases this absence must be approved by a Dean and must be indicated in the Committee's minutes.
2. Members from a department who are putting candidates forward for tenure should absent themselves from the *departmental* final tenure review and vote of the candidate. This will allow them to be present for the College Committee discussion and vote. If this policy causes an unusual hardship or disruption for a department, the department chair will consult with the dean to work out an acceptable alternative for the College Committee.

Note: This is a controversial issue. Present policy is to exclude from discussion and voting, any member from the College P and T Committee whose departmental



colleague is coming up for review. The result of that is an uneven number of votes for different candidates, and arguably, unequal treatment. Allowing the person to vote, but not discuss, is also controversial. We include this issue because we feel it needs fuller discussion.

3. Prior to the consideration of each candidate, the dean provides the members of the committee with the departmental statement of criteria and procedures, as well as the candidate's initial letter of appointment. The members of the committee also have in their possession the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
4. As required by the faculty handbook, the dean also makes available to the committee a copy of each candidate's PAEs, Department Committee annual reviews, and the Dean's annual reviews.
5. The deliberation of the P&T regarding a candidate shall be as follows:
  - a. A secretary pro tem shall be designated for each candidate. The secretary maintains an informal record of the issues
  - b. All members of the committee read and review the teaching, scholarship, and service of the candidate following the materials provided by the candidate, the department, and the dean.
  - c. The committee will not compare candidates, except for consistency in writing the final letter, as stated in #8 below.
  - d. The committee identifies questions, as needed, to be asked of the candidate's department chair which are recorded by the secretary pro tem.
  - e. The committee may request from the candidate's chair required materials it has not received. It may also request other materials it deems relevant to its discussion with the candidate's chair, as specified in #6. The committee may also request to see the candidate's course evaluations from her/his first or second year.
  - f. The chair meets with the committee in accordance with item #6 below.
  - g. Following full discussion of the materials and after the meeting with the candidate's department chair, the secretary pro tem drafts a clear, formal summary of the committee's discussions, in bulleted form. The draft statement will be edited and refined by committee members in a group session.
  - h. The bullet points should accurately reflect the committee's deliberation.
  - i. After the letter is produced, the promotion and tenure of the candidate, where applicable, are considered simultaneously, and a preliminary, non-binding vote is taken.
  - j. The draft letter will be reconsidered and modified after the conclusion of the committee's deliberations, as stated below in #8. Modifications of the draft letter will include a clear and compelling argument for the decision taken by the committee. That is, any reader of the letter should understand why the committee made a decision for or against tenure and/or promotion. Upon approval by the committee, this statement shall be incorporated into the general minutes maintained by the dean.
6. Each candidate's department chair or appropriate designate will meet with the P&T committee to answer questions the committee has generated during its discussions of the candidate. *If the committee has no questions for the department, the chair will be given the option not to meet with the committee.* The meeting with

the chair generally will occur after initial review and discussion of the individual's candidacy. During initial discussion, questions will be formulated **and/or further materials may be requested. Such requests will be submitted to the chair before the scheduled meeting.** At the meeting, committee members may ask follow-up questions in addition to those sent to the chair.

7. At the conclusion of the committee's work, committee members shall review the statements drafted by the secretaries pro tem on individual candidacies to ensure that the statements are consistent in wording and format and are an accurate reflection of the committee's judgment.

8. After considering all candidates, the committee will review its preliminary recommendations and affirm or amend them with a final vote; in other words, all actions until the final vote is taken are tentative. The committee's work is not completed until the chair of the committee and all its members review the recommendations on all the candidates and attest to their accuracy by signing the appropriate recommendation form. In the event of a tie vote, the department's recommendation will be considered to break the tie. If the department recommended the candidate be granted tenure, then the vote of the P&T committee will be considered a recommendation for tenure; if the department recommended the candidate not be granted then the vote of the P&T committee will be considered a recommendation against tenure.

9. The dean **will be** present at all meetings of the committee as an observer **rather than a participant. The dean may, however,** be invited to provide information concerning the candidates. The dean may also be given an opportunity to question the committee concerning its recommendation, after they have been presented, in order to gain information to be used in forming an independent judgment on the strengths of the candidates. Providing information and addressing questions to the committee are judged to be in keeping with the dean's observer role.

**NOTE: Questions have been raised by a number of people about whether the dean really needs to be present as an observer, and whether this is a good use of the dean's time. We have left the provision in here, but suggest that it should be discussed. If, indeed, we agree that the tenure letter should show clear and compelling reasons why the candidate should or should not be tenured, the need for the dean to attend all meetings may be less urgent.**

10. The general minutes maintained by the dean are not expected to summarize the discussion concerning the candidates nor to provide the committee's rationale for its recommendations. They merely record meeting times, who was present, and any votes taken.

11. All aspects of the committee's work—the discussions, debates, votes, and materials reviewed—are absolutely confidential. Committee members are also enjoined from having private conversations with each other about candidates and their files outside the committee meetings.

12. **Revisions to these procedures must be approved by the Arts and Sciences Faculty Cabinet and Arts and Sciences Council.**

