

DRAKE UNIVERSITY  
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting

February 21, 2001

The regular meeting of the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate was called to order by President Lou Ann Simpson. The following Senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Cairns, Gillespie, Kleiner, Lovell, McCrickerd, Parsa, Phillips, Rankin, Reed, Sanders, Simpson, Symonds, Torgerson, Wright  
Absent: Bartschat

Upon proper motion and vote the minutes of the previous meetings in November and December and January were approved

President Maxwell was out of town on university business and unable to attend.

Remarks from Provost Troyer

- The recent Board of Governors meetings were successful and since then he has been involved in continuing the process of program discontinuance including the elimination of faculty positions.
- 22 various committee and task forces are in the process of being filled as directed by the President's Program Review report. His goal is to have these named by Spring Break.
- An evaluation procedure for the Deans was announced to them in January. The process has been designed and will begin later this semester. The Deans will be evaluated on a three-year rotating basis.
- Soon, three Arts & Sciences Dean candidates will be on campus soon. The committee goal is to have their work completed in March.

Remarks from President Simpson

- The Board of Governors passed a motion at the February meeting to applaud faculty for their effort throughout Program Review. She stated the motion was a spontaneous, heartfelt offer of thanks for the work of many over the past year.

Unfinished Business:

Senator Torgerson moved and McCrickerd seconded motion **01-18**:

*The President of the Faculty Senate shall be elected by the faculty at large to serve a year as President-Elect and then a year as President of the Faculty Senate with full rights as a member of the Senate. The election process shall begin with faculty who are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate being nominated (including self-nomination) for election. Faculty who accept the nomination and agree to have their names placed on the ballot will provide a brief statement stating their willingness to serve as President of the Senate and why.*

*If a present member of the Faculty Senate is elected, that person's position will be filled through normal procedures. The four years of consecutive service rule does not apply. A faculty member may serve as President only once in ten years. The President of the Faculty Senate will receive a one course reduction.*

*After nominations are received, the traditional voting procedures will be used to reduce the final ballot to two candidates. The final ballot will consist of the two faculty members receiving the most votes. The Faculty member receiving the majority of votes cast on the final ballot shall be the next President-Elect and the President.*

Senator Torgerson explained that the motion reflects the expanded role of the senate president in the past couple of years. He offered a comment from Dale Berry, who when elected Senate President, was a Senator from a division of Arts & Sciences and a mere quorum of Senate members elected him president. The motion will expand the role of the full faculty in the election of this important role.

Senator Wright shared comments from Herb Strentz, which concluded that he was not convinced that the faculty would gain much with this change and he is further not convinced the current method is not broken. Senator Lovell also stated that he did not see that the process was broken.

Senator Sanders noted that since the person is being elected as the President-Elect, then the persons 'seasoning' into the position is not an issue. There is already one year to know the workings of the Senate. Senator McCrickerd offered concern that currently a person can be voted onto the Senate by only a small number of persons and then easily into the presidency and this would be far from a faculty mandate.

Senator Allen indicated that she had a tendency to support this motion. She liked the idea of opening up the process to the University of persons who had been nominated. Senator Reynolds replied that if that is what we believe, then all of the Senate positions should be open for general election. Senator Gillespie remarked that if the elections were all open, then the representations would change. Senator DeLaet believed that more faculty would take the whole process more seriously, if they were completely involved.

Senator Allen reminded the group that after the election of the last Presidential Search Committee campus wide vote, there was a change made in the voting procedures. Senator Torgerson offered that when the voting is opened up to a wide, diverse group, interesting things happen. The result may tell us something by the results. Senator Symonds noted that the proposal and broad-based elections appeal to her and it is hard to argue against democracy. She will vote against it because of a workload issue.

Senator DeLaet said that ballots with comments from the nominees indicate that they have taken the time to produce a commentary and that is worth taking the time to vote. Senator Rankin noted that she did believe that persons had been put on the spot during the organizational meetings accepting a major responsibility. Senator Reed wondered then if the real question is the nomination process at the organizational meeting. She asked if the change should occur there. Senator Rankin likes the whole university vote.

There was some clarification discussion concerning the proposed process. The nomination ballot, no matter how large or small, would produce a set of two names to be elected by the highest vote count. The one course reduction began during Judith Allen's presidency and has continued on an unwritten basis.

On a show-of-hand vote, 9 in favor; 6 against, one abstention, motion passed.

*Secretary's note: After the meeting, the motion was declared defeated because a two-thirds majority is needed to change Senate rules.*

New Business:

Senator Reynolds moved and Torgerson seconded motion **01-19**:

*Amend the Academic Charter as presented at the January 2001 Senate meeting*

Steve Hoag, Karl Schafer Jim Reynolds, Lou Ann Simpson and Nancy Geiger were introduced as the sub-committee that worked on this document. Information was distributed pertaining to the procedural motion of Dividing the Question.

Senator Wright requested an explanation as to why the paragraph pertaining to benefits for faculty of discontinued programs (VIII C6) was being deleted. Committee members replied that the wording is not specific to which benefits and is potentially duplicative of the Faculty Manual. Provost Troyer offered that he had researched previous documents to learn which benefits were to be concerned.

Senator Torgerson spoke against deleting the paragraph indicating that he was a member of the group that included this provision yet he agreed this was not the language that was originally written.

Upon proper motion and vote, the two paragraphs regarding benefits (VIII C6 & were divided from the main motion.

Senator Reed requested information concerning the Deans evaluation portion of section XV. Several senators spoke in favor of retaining language of periodic evaluation of Deans. Further information and discussion was requested on this topic.

Upon proper motion and vote, the section on Dean evaluation was divided from the main motion.

Senator Wright questioned why the word consent was being taken out of the Deans search committee description (section XVI. D). Senator McCrickerd shared that as a member of a current Deans Search committee, she understands that the process produces recommendations for selection only. The deleting of the word consent would be consistent with the committee's function.

Senator Sanders requested clarification on the collapsing of language in section IA regarding the description of faculty. The response was that this simplifies how faculty are defined, thus automatically including the library faculty personnel into the definition of faculty.

Senator Rankin requested information concerning the new language in section VI. G regarding faculty appointments. Steve Hoag replied that this language acknowledges current practice rather than sets up new faculty employment categories. There were some concerns raised as to how many and how long a person might hold a non-tenure position. Steve Hoag agreed to gather some college/school specific information for the Senate on this issue.

Upon proper motion and vote, Section VI. A on faculty appointment was divided from the main motion.

Senator Torgerson asked if adding language 'and advising' to the tenure section (Section VII B) and to the promotion section (Section 10 B) was adding policy or merely cleaning up the question. Arts & Sciences has already voted this function into the requirements. Senator Gillespie indicated that School of Education has actually voted against adding the wording as a separate requirement. There was Senate interest in having additional information on the present wording from the college/school specific faculty handbooks brought back to the body.

Upon proper motion and vote, tenure section (Section VII B) and promotion section (Section 10 B) was divided from the main motion.

Upon proper motion and vote, the remaining main motion passed unanimously

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.