

The regular meeting of the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Houle. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Chesnut, Courard-Hauri, Cramer, DeWitt, Dore, Esposito, Gilbert, Holman, Houle, Klipec, Knepper, Koch, Lyons, Mosser, Petersen, Reincke, Van Wyke, Vitha, Walker

Absent: Bartschat

Upon proper motion and vote, April 2010 minutes were accepted with one exception (*Maria Clapham was not in attendance at the April 2010 meeting*).

### President Maxwell Report

President Maxwell shared that at last week's Board of Trustees meeting the two main agenda items were a fiscal report and promotion and tenure recommendations. Vice President Payseur presented an extensive report outlining how budgeting is clearly connected to the University's goals. Another major item discussed was the 'going public' with the campaign in October 2010. President Maxwell acknowledged there are challenges with major gifts during these economic times yet stressed that Drake has a good story to tell.

In early June, there will be a planning conference for the Senior Advisory Council and Faculty Senate Executive Committees of both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Senates. The goal will be to review assumptions, review beliefs which go unchallenged, and look at basic operating assumptions. He concluded with describing this session as a time to ask what questions should be asked and for all present to have a thoughtful discussion.

Senator Vitha asked a question regarding the campaign. He asked if President Maxwell could say what percentage has been met towards the campaign's goal. President Maxwell replied that close to \$50 million has been raised of a \$200 million goal. Senator Reincke asked what percentage are deferred gifts. The reply was that the campaign is seeking a maximum composition of 35% deferred gifts and currently the level is less than that maximum.

### Provost Renner Report

Provost Renner began his remarks thanking the Senate members and campus community for welcoming him this first year at Drake. He appreciated the hard work of many persons and said he was glad to be at Drake. Provost Renner congratulated the faculty who recently earned promotions or tenure.

The Associate Provost search will conclude soon with a recommendation. The Search Committee for the Director of Assessment has been staffed and will begin their work soon. Provost Renner encouraged faculty to attend the upcoming commencement ceremonies which are huge student-centered academic events.

Provost Renner described the faculty salary process which included both equity adjustments and a merit pool. Approximately \$400,000 is in a market based adjustment pool. He thanked Deputy Provost Wright for her work and stated he believed the academic division got a good working model. Multiple factors have been included in the process such as time, rank and discipline. Currently the process is in the hands of the Deans.

Senator Cramer asked what institutions were used for comparisons. The reply was that a combination of peer listings was included in the review. Senator Koch asked where Drake will be in comparison to our peers after the adjustments are made. Provost Renner noted that there will be a yearly comparison done on the 'current' year figures when those numbers are available. At this time, he would not predict how Drake salaries would compare.

#### President Houle Report

President Houle thanked the Provost for furnishing treats for the Senate. He also thanked the 2009-2010 Senators for their service.

Senate Committees have been requested to submit written reports. President Houle wished to single out the University Curriculum Committee for a special thanks for their report and the activity of that committee. He noted they had over 22 meetings.

President Houle commented on the Honorary Degree & Drake Medal Committee report stating that it represented a comprehensive historic review and update. Also, he indicated that the Senate Executive Committee put the Drake curriculum proposal on this agenda in two different motions. The separation was done to help the Senate know what pieces are being voted on today.

The Student Senate report included an invitation to the Inaugural for the 2010-2011 Leadership which will be held tomorrow. Student Norah Carroll thanked the Senate for allowing Student Senate to share. She also appreciated being allowed to witness what happens at the Faculty Senate.

Senator Esposito asked what the status was of the Faculty Task Force on Workload. The reply was that Art Sanders would be the most knowledgeable person to answer that question.

Old Business – None presented

## New Business

Senator Walker and Van Wyke moved and seconded **motion 10-12**:

*Accept the April 21, 2010 report from the Honorary Degree and Drake Medal Committee and approve the seven recommended action items (bullet points found on the April 21<sup>st</sup> report first page).*

*Secretary's note: There are 9 recommendations (7 from the first page and 2 on the second page). The Senate agreed to include all 9 in the motion.*

Senator Gilbert asked if this will require a change to the Academic Charter. Karen Wallace, chair of the Honorary Degree & Drake Medal Committee, replied no. She commented that there was surprising little in University governing documents on this subject.

With a voice vote, the motion (all nine recommendations) passed.

Senator Vitha and Esposito moved and seconded **motion 10-13**:

*Insert the words 'and sitting Board of Trustees' within the consideration criteria for an Honorary Degree and Drake Medal (revised statements shown below)*

*Present members of the staff and the faculty and sitting Board of Trustees and in-office and campaigning politicians are excluded from consideration. (page three bullet point six)*

*Present University faculty/administrative/staff and sitting Board of Trustees are not eligible, but emeritus faculty/administrators or retired employees may be nominated. (page seven bullet point two)*

President Maxwell indicated that he agreed with the spirit of this motion. He did suggest a slight modification. He suggested language which would indicate that Board of Trustees are normally are not eligible during their term as a Trustee. He could think of cases where an individual might be on the board with a service worthy of the honor. Sue Wright offered that there is a category of life member of the Board of Trustee where the person is not an active member of the board. The discussion consensus was that sitting, active board members were not to be eligible on a normal basis. The discussion raised the question but did not define "normal basis".

An amendment (friendly) was accepted by the movers to insert the words: "are normally not eligible".

*Insert the words and sitting Board of Trustees are normally not eligible*

Senators Courard-Hauri moved an amendment and Esposito seconded to alter the first sentence of the motion. The amendment would strike the words "an Honorary Degree and".

*Insert the words 'and sitting Board of Trustees' within the consideration criteria for ~~an Honorary Degree and a~~ Drake Medal (revised statements shown below)*

The motion to amend passed.

Senator Lyons stated that she understands the two awards serve different purposes. Ms. Wallace agreed with Senator Lyons and that existing documentation on both awards was aged or non-existent.

Ms. Wallace continued that the committee was in favor of including trustees, yet was not unanimous in that belief. The committee talked with other campus persons and organizations and the main concern was about conflict of interest. The committee thus is presenting the issue to Faculty Senate. Ms. Wallace stressed that the committee did not think there was a problem but wanted to have the question talked through so that perceptions could be addressed.

Senator Reincke indicated she would be interested in the opinion of current Board of Trustee members. President Maxwell indicated that it could go onto the agenda of the Board Affairs Committee. Senator Dore indicated her interest in deferring this item until there was Board of Trustee input.

The motion to table the motion passed with one against.

Senator Gilbert and Cramer moved and seconded **motion 10-14:**

*Accept Drake Curriculum report from the UCC (distributed April 19, 2010) and direct the 10-11 Faculty Senate President to appoint an ad hoc committee from the Senate Executive Committee and 10-11 UCC with the charge of drafting one or more specific motions for action by the Faculty Senate regarding the Drake Curriculum revisions. Also included in the ad hoc committee charge would be to create the process for a General Faculty vote on created specific Drake Curriculum revision motion(s).*

Senators Gilbert and Petersen moved and seconded an amendment which would include that the minority reports also be accepted.

*Accept Drake Curriculum report and minority reports from the UCC*

Senator Gilbert stated that he appreciated the work of the UCC and wanted the entire submissions included. The amendment passed.

Senator Esposito questioned the wisdom of postponing this issue to the next senate. He expressed how the turnover of Senators and committee personnel makes him feel that this Senate was putting the receivers “to be hung out to dry.” He was concerned as to how this would adversely affect the consideration of the curriculum. He felt like this was passing the buck. Senator Esposito wanted this year’s Senate to have a constructive discussion of the issues.

The Senate considered if the motion might be put off until the fall and what that effect might have on Motion D.

Upon proper motion and voice vote, the motion as amended was divided.

*8.c.1 Accept Drake Curriculum report and minority reports from the UCC (distributed April 19, 2010)*

and

*8.c.2 Direct the 10-11 Faculty Senate President to appoint an ad hoc committee from the Senate Executive Committee and 10-11 UCC with the charge of drafting one or more specific motions for action by the Faculty Senate regarding the Drake Curriculum revisions. Also included in the ad hoc committee charge would be to create the process for a General Faculty vote on created specific Drake Curriculum revision motion(s).*

With a voice vote, the first portion of the motion passed.

Senator Reincke spoke in favor of the second portion of the motion as it gives direction to the Senate Executive Committee. Senator Clapham wondered if the charge should include a discussion of what process will be used by the faculty to vote on the curriculum. The body was reminded that Faculty Senate has the charge to vote on the curriculum as it represents the faculty. Several concerns were raised that the Curriculum Revision issue should not be delayed although several did not wish to vote on the total package right then.

With a show of hand vote, the motion to defer the second portion of the motion (8.c.2) failed.

(7 in favor, 9 against)

With a show of hands vote, the second portion of the motion passed.

(9 in favor, 6 against and 1 abstention)

Senator Courard-Hauri and Reincke moved and seconded **motion 10-15:**

*Approve the formation of the JTerm Working Group (Item VII.B.2. page seven) including a November 2010 report and to approve the E-Portfolio Pilot (Item II page four) including the February 2011 report.*

Senator Clapham indicated a serious concern about having these groups when the curriculum has not been approved. Senator Courard-Hauri noted the January term has been talked about for several years and there continues to be questions raised about how it will work. He feels strongly that even if the curriculum got voted down, this idea would be worth considering and needs to be studied. President Maxwell wanted to make clear that he is supportive of the possibilities of the the J-Term. He agreed that there are issues to be clarified and the implementation will not happen for a full admission cycle after any approval. He also reminded the group that HLC rule changes will impact the curriculum discussions.

With a voice vote, the motion was divided.

*Approve the formation of the JTerm Working Group (Item VII.B.2. page seven) including a November 2010 report*

and

*Approve the E-Portfolio Pilot (Item II page four) including the February 2011 report.*

Several persons indicated an interest to have the two topics studied and reports be made back to the Senate. Senator Petersen understood the need for evidence especially concerning the EPortfolio. She was concerned about the faculty workload to participate in committee work which might simply fail. UCC members offered to Senate that presenting the two working groups was not to present a work around the entire Curriculum Revision proposal.

The procedural motion was made and passed to extend the Senate meeting past 5:00 p.m.

With a show of hands vote, the first portion passed. (10 in favor, 4 against)

Senator Cramer indicated she was skeptical of the EPortfolio and desired more information about them. Provost Renner responded that the Fall 2010 pilot would help to provide such information. Senator Gilbert was concerned that if the Senate passed any motion concerning the project it would be considered an endorsement of the EPortfolios. Provost Renner replied that he did see the distinction. There was a general discussion of how the survey results were not conclusive concerning the EPortfolio nor the AOI's. Senator Mosser indicated the UCC had concerns and they did not have the information to answer the questions which had come up in the survey. Also discussed by several was whether or not there would be only one assessment tool, the EPortfolio system. Senator Esposito wondered if there would continue to be an Arts & Sciences tool in addition to a university wide system and how any one college or school would use the results from a common tool. Several senators spoke in favor of proceeding with a study even if that method of assessment did not remain at Drake.

Senators Courard-Hauri moved and Gilbert seconded an amendment to add "*and encourage collection of data about other methods of assessments.*"

*Approve the E-Portfolio Pilot (Item II page four) including the February 2011 report and encourage collection of data about other methods of assessments.*

With a voice vote including dissensions, the amendment passed.

With a show of hands vote, the second portion of the motion as amended passed. (10 in favor, 6 against)

With a motion and vote, the Faculty Senate moved into Executive Session at 5:30 p.m.