

The meeting of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President De Laet. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Courard-Hauri, Esposito, Fejes, Leroux, Pisarski, Reed, Schmidt, Sidon, Simpson, Sleister, Soltis, Summerville, Swilky, Urness, Vandegrift, and Wright.

Absent: Dao, Reel Schmidt, Vitha

The March 2014 meeting minutes were accepted.

The Special April 2nd meeting minutes were accepted.

President Maxwell report:

President Maxwell offered a clarification and update concerning the expected draft report from the Administrative Review consultant. The report is not yet finished. President Maxwell assured the group that careful consideration will be made to the Review process, it will simply take longer.

The President Search process has begun with the hiring of a search firm. Mr. Jamie Ferrare will be on campus for parts of two consecutive weeks in April. His visit will include two open meetings on April 30th and May 1st. Currently a candidate attribute survey is out which all faculty and staff are asked to complete. This is one avenue where campus input will be collected.

At the recent Board of Trustee meeting, the main agenda was the acceptance of the fiscal year 2015 budget. At this point; the final details of the budget are being prepared.

Senator Alexander asked what the current status is of the Strategic Plan and what will be the process going forward. President Maxwell indicated he will speak to the new Senate Executive Committee about how the effort will continue. While there are big issues to be addressed, he emphasized that he'd like to develop a plan of small group meetings to discuss the issues.

Provost Jones report:

Provost Jones began with an update regarding the College of Business and Public Administration's accreditation status. She indicated the first step will be to (1) address the crisis with clear and concise communication, (2) address the standards which were not met and (3) finally review how Drake got into this situation. She stressed that it has not been business as usual and within the three step plan there will be work on items two and three at the same time.

Senator McCrickerd asked if the situation was not a surprise and this is not business as usual, then how did this happen. President Maxwell replied. He stated there had been a mid-term review and Drake was told our review was non-standard with our peers in AACSB. As a result; we changed our standards and thus changed the number of persons who were not qualifying. We aggressively went after that standard and we were told we were making reasonable progress. But when the team came about five weeks ago, they said the progress was not enough.

Senator Vandegrift asked if will there be a change in resources allocation to the CBPA from other colleges/schools. Both the Provost and President indicated there was not plan to plunder other budgets to satisfy the needs of the CBPA.

Senator Courard-Hauri asked if any negative effect is expected on recruitment for next year. President Maxwell indicated there is an aggressive plan to address the situation with incoming students and the continuing students via Marketing & Communications. Additionally the Office of the Provost is tracking transfer out of Drake via tracking transcript requests.

President DeLaet report:

Four faculty members have been elected to serve on the President Search Committee and while the four have not met as a group, President De Laet stated her intention to work to gather broad campus input during the search. She encouraged persons to attend the town hall meetings and to honestly take the survey.

Olivia O’Hea, the Student Senate Liaison, commented on the Student Academic Affairs Committee work this year with the Assessment Office and Kevin Saunders. She indicated there have been some senior focus groups. She commented that these were student led sessions focused on the AOI. The two biggest negatives were an unclear purpose and lack of cohesion. The two biggest positives were the multiple opportunities to broaden the student’s perspective and that fact that it is a unique system. Ms. O’Hea will be the 2014-2015 Academic Affairs Chair and she looks forward to working on curricular issues next year.

Senator Alexander asked if there was a sense of change for the Drake Curriculum or sense to keep the current system. Ms. O’Hea replied that she felt there was an interest from the focus groups to address the negatives within the Drake Curriculum.

Deputy Provost Raylene Rospond was introduced to present the AAUP Peer Comparison Salary Report. She distributed copies of the report for 2013-2014. She noted this was a fascinating and perplexing report to work on and acknowledged Sue Wright for helping create this year’s document. Additionally, Ms. Rospond noted it was not yet on the AAUP website but will be soon. The document reflects four years of data and even though Drake has been holding steady for a couple of years, the Associate Professor average has dropped. This is within Table 2. Also, the 2013-2014 compensation data has just been received and will be worked on yet this spring. Ms. Rospond continued her opening remarks noting that a comparison school had not filed, thus there is a ranking difference and the decision was made to display the rank as if that institution did file with the AAUP. The Assistant Professor numbers display the highest jump in ranking and she did not have an evidence based answer to why. Also, yet to come, is a college/school breakout of the data which will be given to Senate when compiled.

Next Ms. Rospond posed a question of what is the role of the AAUP data vs Human Resources data from CUPA (College and University Association for Human Resources). The AAUP data is not available by discipline. Ms. Rospond encouraged a conversation on this topic in the future as well as a reevaluation of the list of institutions.

Senator McCrickerd noted there has been a gender breakdown in the past. Ms. Rospond replied that will be coming. President Maxwell offered that in looking at the overall list and the institutions above us, he noted they are all in locations with higher costs of living and there may be an index to account for cost of living which would help with the comparisons, too. The discussion included that AAUP data is public and a recognized recruiting source.

Associate Vice President Venessa Macro offered that there may be value in looking at how many Drake individuals are behind in their individual target and by how much. She believed that comparison could be done with the CUPA data. Senator Summerville recalled that in the past the effort was made to increase salaries, the effort was to move the whole rank in aggregate. He noted there would be some short term value in looking at the variances and shrinking the variances rather than just looking at the means. This would be hard to make public when looking within some disciplines. Ms. Macro offered she has a dream of offering a secure web site where an individual could look at their salary and the data of where they stand within the comparison groups.

The discussion continued with speculation how the data will look in five or ten years especially as Drake data is compared to different institutions and may even use different comparison data sources. One suggestion was to cite an average year in rank to add value to the comparisons.

One question concerned the fiscal year 2015 budget and if raises have been factored in. The reply was not at this point as that will depend on the enrollment situation. President Maxwell did state the five year budget projections do include a modest salary increase pool.

President De Laet indicated the Senate will look forward to the additional report and thanked Ms. Rospond for her work and collaboration with Sue Wright.

Old Business – none presented

New Business –

Senators Wright and Fejes moved and seconded **Motion 14-09**:

Create an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Curricular Reform

The Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Curricular Reform is charged with investigating the viability (with a view to both resources implications and implementation considerations) of the alternative models of general education identified by the University Curriculum committee in its March 12, 2014 report to Faculty Senate.

Consistent with the UCC Recommendations, this Ad Hoc Committee shall include a wide range of constituents, including representatives from the UCC, the Drake Curriculum and Assessment Committee (DCAC), representatives from the six colleges and schools at Drake University, and representatives from various administrative offices. Per a recommendation submitted to the Senate Executive Committee by DCAC, the Ad Hoc Committee shall also include student representatives. The membership of this committee shall be selected by the 2014-15 Senate Executive Committee with input from the respective academic units.

There is an expectation the Ad Hoc Committee will submit a preliminary report to Senate Executive Committee in November 2014 and a final report by March 2015.

Senator Wright offered thanks to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for their work this year and stated he sees the motion as setting the stage for an open approach to the Drake Curriculum with input from across campus. He spoke in favor of the motion stating there are questions to answer and there is more investigations to be done of the two identified models. Senator Courard-Hauri reflected that when looking at the timeline, he wondered when changes would become effective. The reply was that it will depend on what is changed. Senator Pisarski recalled the conversation of the plus/minus grading implementation that an important consideration was the communication with current students and being prepared to inform, with clarity, the curriculum model to new and perspective students.

Senator Soltis stated he was in favor of the motion as it is an exercise and so many things can come from the process and try to get some positive conversation. He encouraged Senators to give it a chance. Senator Esposito asked if the Senate Executive Committee gave consideration to an elected committee. President De Laet replied that while past practice has not been to elect persons to an Ad Hoc committee as the Senate Rules and Regulations give that authority to the Senate Executive Committee. It was stated that broad campus representation was desired. Senator Esposito did indicate he was in favor of the motion and wanted to see full faculty support for this process. Senator McCrickerd reflected on her time as a member of the most recent curricular committee stating that they had involved many persons and worked hard to get conversations on the subject around campus. Both Senators McCrickerd and Esposito noted the effort will be a workload issue for faculty. Senator Fejes agreed that Senate Executive Committee was very sensitive to having broad representation and the need for the Ad Hoc Committee to communicate.

Several Senators spoke in favor of the need for some ‘campus buzz’ surrounding the creation of the Ad Hoc Committee which could be helped by electing faculty to the committee, perhaps within each unit. Other comments noted that Senators are already elected thus there is a sense of ‘trust’ in Senate’s actions. The discussion centered on having competent, willing faculty selected by their peers and not merely appointed by the Deans.

Senator Simpson moved and Courard-Hauri seconded an amendment:

Within the second paragraph: insert “*elected*” in front of representatives

Senator comments surrounding the amendment were favorable yet some were cautious of mandating to units for elections. Both Senators Simpson and Courard-Hauri agreed to change ‘elected’ to ‘selected’. The Senate voices wanted a legitimate faculty governance method used to form the Ad Hoc Committee membership.

Previous question was called, seconded and passed.

The amendment passed on a voice vote with some dissent.

Senator McCrickerd asked if the six colleges and schools included the Cowles Library faculty and the School of Law. It was clarified that for budgeting purposes the School of Law is separate. Both units are represented on the UCC.

Senators McCrickerd and Sidon moved and seconded an amendment to:

After “*representative*” list the non-law colleges and schools and include Cowles Library

Senator and audience comments regarding the amendment centered on the fact that the Law School could have representation brought into the process at a later time and their representation will continue on UCC.

The amendment passed via a voice vote.

A concern was raised that now the motion was vague on how many persons were to be elected and that the Ad Hoc Committee did not have a defined membership total. Senate Executive members offered the total count was left vague as to allow some flexibility in the selection of individuals from the UCC and DCAC while not creating a huge group. Senator Wright stated he hoped for a group sized between twelve and fifteen.

Senators Alexander and Wright moved and seconded an amendment:

Add the word “*one*” in front of newly added word “*elected*”.

The amendment passed via a voice vote.

Previous question was called, seconded and passed (with one against) on the main motion as amended.

The motion as amended passed via a voice vote.

At 4:59 p.m. the motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules so that the meeting could continue. The motion was withdrawn once Senator Alexander stated he would not be bringing the Senate Rules and Regulations motions to the floor this semester.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.