

The meeting of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Bob Soltis. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Dan Alexander, Klaus Bartschat, Maria Clapham, Robyn Cooper, David Courard-Hauri, Debra DeLaet, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Bruce Gilbert, Pat Heaston, Adina Klipatrick, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Nancy Reincke, Elizabeth Robertson, Eric Saylor, Joseph Schneider, Miguel Schor, LouAnn Simpson, Bob Soltis, Maria Valdovinos, Darcie Vandegrift

Absent: Todd Evans, Craige Wrenn

The September 2015 meeting minutes were accepted once two corrections were made:

- 1) within President Martin's report, within the paragraph regarding the neighborhood change President David Maxwell to David Courard-Hauri
- 2) following the New Business section, the paragraph concerning Discussion of Inclusivity and Diversity, the business portion of the September Senate meeting is complete. The following material reflects a record of the Senate's comments regarding 2014-2015 priorities

President Martin Report:

- A White Paper concerning Tuition Pricing was presented to the Board of Trustees (BOT). President Martin indicated the full report with some slight omissions is available for Senators. At the January 2015 BOT meeting, there was interest in tying tuition to a national percentage as opposed to an across the board increase. Various tuition pricing models have been discussed including with the Senate Budget Committee. There will be more on this issue during the Spring 2016 semester.
- Concerning neighborhood issues, he said several groups are coming together to coordinate preparedness efforts for such incidents as an active shooter. These groups include the Des Moines Police, City of Des Moines, Public School officials and individuals from other local education institutions. A table top exercise will happen in the next weeks. He was pleased with the overall cooperation which he has seen to this point.
- President Martin presented a short power point concerning Continuous Improvement. The material will soon be available via blueView. One main point of his presentation is to have University wide and unit planning efforts better aligned to the mission and vision statements, to each other and to be continuous. Based on last year's GWG2 work, piloted Balanced Scorecard effects and the April 2016 Board of Trustees presentation concerning the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation efforts, President Martin brought together a few persons to bring this idea forward to the campus. He stated this process is different than defining a reality for three or five years, rather it asks for a determination of desired outcomes and definitions, based on data, toward those outcomes.

The pyramid slide (#6) is the most important, according to President Martin, as it describes how planning is laid out. The word Commitments may be the only new designation to the campus community. The four draft Commitments are consistent with the HLC criterion. The measures and targets will need to be specific. The elements of the pyramid link back to the mission and vision. President Martin continued with offering an example of the process works noting that ideally there are only one or two measures at a time. While Drake University has done a lot of planning work in the past five years, he acknowledged Continuous Improvement is a new way of planning for Drake. The point is to plan and act and continually plan and continually act. Along with the blueView channel materials, the communication will be coming from all President's Council and Deans Council members to their units. Reactions will be gathered in late fall and early spring so as to have something prepared for the April 2016 Board of Trustees meeting.

Senator Phillips thanked President Martin for the overview and asked for more information about the objectives and tactics. The President replied that is exactly what needs to come out of the conversations in the units, committees and other established bodies around campus. These groups will create the set of tactics. He continued that he does not have the experience to define everything at the beginning. In conclusion, he offered that it is no great failure to miss a goal as if at some point all goals are accomplished, then those goals were not aspirational enough.

Senator Vandegrift noted the group which assisted President Martin in developing the model did not include women or persons of color. President Martin responded that the whole process has been ad hoc. He agreed with her observation.

Senator Owens asked what timeline and frequency exist for reviewing the measures and targets. President Martin responded that the Board of Trustees will review University level commitments at least four times a year. He would expect the conversations will be at various periodic times.

Interim Provost Lenz Report ---

Dr. Lenz noted that no questions were sent to him prior to the meeting and he ceded his time to other matters.

President Soltis Report:

- No Student Senate report was given.
- Gary Johnson, Human Resources Director, presented an updated form of his presentation during the Spring 2015 semester on faculty salaries specifically market adjustments. A Faculty Salary Administration Review Group (FSAR) assembled by Provost Jones, reviewed the sources which were used to assess Drake faculty salaries. The decision was to use CUPA_HR data. It was determined it did represent the professional groups well. He explained and reviewed the comparison group with market target methodology which was used. Mr. Johnson also explained how salary adjustments were made for persons who received promotions in the previous two years. Within his presentation a summary by college/school was displayed showing a total of 67 faculty were impacted, and an additional 33 faculty need more market adjustments. The Law School is not included. Concerning transparency and getting information out, the FSAR committee created an individual report with cooperation of the Deans Council. He presented an example of a report which a third year Associate Professor would have received (slide #10 of the distributed handout).
The next steps include reconvening FSAR, review the progress, assessing communication and moving into a conversation about faculty hiring levels.
Senator Valdovinos noted that a person who is promoted too quickly is possibly behind in actual salary. Mr. Johnson agreed that this is an example of why compression adjustments need to be considered. Also, asked was whether there was a control being considered for the difference in merit and market monies. The reply was that market adjustments are not guarantee. Salary increases are awarded on merit and performance.
Senator Clapham noted that professors do not have any consideration after seven years. Senator Saylor asked about the remaining 33 persons. Mr. Johnson replied their consideration is part of the fiscal year budget plan. Venessa Macro, Chief Administration Officer stated the University is making the formula transparent which is important. She added that on the staff side of the Drake's employees, similar concerns are being raised and watched. President Soltis suggested Senators take this conversation to their departments and share the information.
- Senator Vandergrift gave a short update on the Provost Search process. The committee expected to have neutral site interviews on November 20th with an expectation of on campus visits following Thanksgiving. She stated the recruiting process is not complete so nominations are welcome.
- Michelle Rogers, Assessment Coordinator, shared the good news of student growth within the many of the Drake Curriculum sited outcome skills. She stated the focus groups gave positive feedback to the broad exposure allowed within the AOI's. Senator Robertson asked if it is self-perception, then would students report or Drake assess 'less' growth. Ms. Rogers shared these are longitudinal perceptions. Several Senators offered questions about the assessments being direct or indirect and how the students were assessed and whether pre-measures were used. Ms. Rogers indicated that work from selected classes was reviewed this summer and Associate Provost Art Sanders stated pre-measures were not used.
Senator Clapham asked if there is a plan in place to do further and broader examination. The reply stated current effort focuses on what we have found rather than merely looking for more areas of improvements. Senator Phillips noted the measures are not of the Drake Curriculum specifically, rather measuring how the student has improved overall. Ms. Rogers agreed.

The business portion of the October Senate meeting completed at 4:42 p.m.

The following material reflects a record of the Senate's comments regarding remarks made in an open session concerning a decision-making process and timeline for potential revision of the Drake Curriculum (DC).

President Soltis started with some background information as to how the Senate got to this point. He asked "what does Senate want to do now concerning the Drake Curriculum?" Senator Gilbert distributed a spreadsheet which summarizes the set of options which have been presented to date. He offered this as an informational piece for the discussion. Senator Clapham stated she would like to start with the First Year Seminar motions citing there are some assumptions and she questioned why it would be reviewed outside the other portions of the curriculum. Also, a

two semester first year experience would require more resources and currently covering one semester is not easy thus she proposed that an alternative could be a revision of the one semester First Year Seminars. Senator DeLaet indicated she did not see intentionality in the DC. Her thought was that assessment does not come first. A coherent, mission driven curriculum, which is assessable, should be the goal. Senator Owens added the University mission has some language which can use. He is in favor of revision and sees the mission statement as the basis for developing small measureable core items. Also, not starting with the mission risks building a model without knowing what achievement are really truly wanted. Senator Gilbert pointed out resources are needed for any of the possible motions. He noted that ultimately what we start with will be the first year students and so one avenue is to start with the First Year Seminars.

Senator Clapham agreed with Senator Owens comments and cited the Wabash report which comments on the number of outcomes being too high. She did not want to lose the breadth in our current system yet the DC is one component of the mission. These reports have what is wanted out of a curriculum, that work has been done, yet some of the items are not measurable.

President Soltis asked for what the next steps are for Senate or the Executive Committee. Senator Alexander liked the notion of deciding if we like the current curriculum. "Let us find that out first". Megan Brown, University Curriculum Committee (UCC) Chair joined the discussion. She offered that her committee, many of whom were present, wants to know what they should do regarding revisions. Some Senators mentioned having a full faculty vote concerning the topic. There was no consensus as to what purpose or stated goal would accompany such an effort.

Senator Simpson offered there seems to be the sense that what the DC is now is not perfect. She noted from the discussion today and the committee efforts the current DC should be reviewed. Senator Courard-Hauri stated he was not sure what is meant. He is not clear what would be made as a motion today. Senator Bartschat reminded the group "we are always supposed to think of improving". President Soltis offered that as Drake has become more effective in assessment and has become more reflective about the courses offered, the task is not as straight forward as in the past. Senator Heaston stated it was not clear that we have connected the mission statement to what we can teach. Is there a small set of goals and skills which we can connect to the mission statement?

Senator Owens suggested a next step: charge the 2015-2016 University Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review the existing multiple Drake Curriculum outcomes at their broad and high level. The UCC will report back to Senate a small set (three or four) of the ultimately desired outcomes of the Drake Curriculum AOIs. The existing University Mission is a foundation for the review.

Senator DeLaet does not want to lose the breadth and avoid the checklist mentality. She offered that one critical thinking course does not a critical thinker make. Senator Clapham wants to know the students go beyond their own disciplines.

Senator Gilbert stated the change process may come down to "what does teaching an AOI mean". The conversation will end up depending on teaching and the pedagogical examinations. Senator Owens said that conversation would "take guts".

President Soltis stated the Senate Executive Committee would take today's discussion under review.

The body concluded the open session at 5:17 p.m. Secretary, Nancy Geiger