

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, Robyn Cooper, David Courard-Hauri, Debra DeLaet, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Todd Evans, Bruce Gilbert, Pat Heaston, Adina Klipatrick, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Nancy Reincke, Elizabeth Robertson, Eric Saylor, Joseph Schneider, LouAnn Simpson, Maria Valdovinos, Darcie Vandergrift, Melissa Weresh, Craige Wrenn, Bob Soltis

Absent: Maria Clapham

The April 2016 meeting minutes were not available.

President Martin Report:

President Martin stated that the Board of Trustees has accepted the University's Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) which has come together in ten months' time. He acknowledged and thanked the many persons who have worked on the University's CIP. The Fall 2016 entering first year numbers are behind the level of the past two years. The approved budget, as a deficit budget, is built on an entering class of 870. That enrollment projection is not obtainable at the current time and many Admission, Financial Planning and college/school personnel are working hard on closing the gap. When looking at where Drake is struggling, he said the CBPA accredited issue is being used against us. He stated, we need to regain that status and one of those steps will be a team visit in October 2016. President Martin concluded his remarks stating the budget will be reviewed.

Interim Provost Lenz Report:

The Board of Trustees approved the recommended set of faculty names presented for promotion and tenure. Additionally a new endowed professorship. The Academic Affairs meeting included a report on faculty trends and he will make sure Provost Sue Mattison also receives this information.

He continued with encouraging faculty to register for the August Learning Symposium and rsvp for the May Commencement ceremonies. The last faculty/staff social will be next Tuesday.

Finally, at his last Senate meeting as Provost, Dr. Lenz thanked President Martin for inviting him to serve this year in this academic leadership position.

Senator Reincke offered her thanks for taking on the task and noted that he seemed to have enjoyed the position.

President Soltis Report:

President Soltis encouraged senators to read the submitted reports from Information Technology Services (ITS) and Human Resources. The ITS report is an update on multiple current projects and outlines three major summer improvement projects. The Human Resources report is titled: Employee Wellness & Engagement Strategy Plan 2016-2017. Also, President Soltis thanked the Senate Secretary Nancy Geiger for her service.

Unfinished Business – None presented

New Business:

Senator Simpson moved and Saylor seconded **motion 16:12**

Approve the Intercollegiate Athletic Council (IAC) Missed class policy

RATIONALE

Drake University sponsors intercollegiate athletic programs. Participants in these programs are bound to the same standard of academic excellence expected of all students. To ensure this standard, the University recruits and enrolls student-athletes who have the intellectual abilities necessary to succeed in the classroom. Since the pursuit of both academic and athletic excellence is a time-intensive activity, it is inevitable that student-athletes will face conflicts between their class and athletic schedules. The purpose of this policy, in compliance with NCAA regulation 3.2.4.13 as stipulated below, is to set forth principles and procedures aimed at reducing conflicts, negotiating those that remain, and insuring both the integrity of the academic process as well as the just treatment of student-athletes.

3.2.4.13

Missed Class-Time Policies.

Active members are obligated to establish policies in all sports concerning student-athletes' missed class time due to participation in intercollegiate athletics and in athletics competition scheduled during final examination periods. In men's basketball, an institution's athletics participation schedule, which shall include the anticipated amount of missed class time due to athletics participation, shall be approved by the institution's faculty athletics representative or faculty oversight committee prior to the beginning of each regular academic term. (Adopted: 4/29/10 effective 8/1/10)

PRINCIPLES

1. In accord with NCAA and the Missouri Valley Conference regulations and with oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics Council (IAC), the athletics program will take every measure to minimize the number of classes student-athletes must miss due to athletic competition.
2. Athletic supervisors and coaches will take the academic calendar and schedule into consideration when scheduling athletic contests, practices and team meetings.
3. No student-athlete may absent him/herself from class to attend a practice session (NCAA Rule 17.1.6.6.1)
4. When an athletic competition takes place at Drake (i.e. a "home game"), student-athletes are authorized to be absent from class beginning one hour before the start of scheduled preparation for the competition. This may include warm up sessions, working with trainers and team meals. See missed class letter for details.
5. Authorized absences for official athletic competitions do not relieve student-athletes of their class responsibilities. They are responsible for any material, assignments or activities covered during a missed class.
6. Student-athletes will not be penalized academically when they miss a class due to intercollegiate athletic competition. Faculty should indicate on the course syllabus, available to students on the first day of class, the dates of all major exams, due dates for paper or project submissions, and dates of field trips and other mandatory class-related activities.

PROCEDURES

1. In the first week of class, preferably by the end of the first class, student-athletes must give each of their professors a copy of the 'missed class letter' issued by the Athletic department which details missed class dates and times for the student-athlete.
2. In the first week of class, student-athletes are responsible to review the syllabus, note potential conflicts, bring them to the attention of their professors and request reasonable accommodations in the event of missed quizzes, exams and assignments.
3. The faculty member will determine the accommodations, which shall neither penalize the student-athlete nor unfairly advantage him/her relative to other students. In the case of missed quizzes or exams, a faculty member may choose to have the quiz or exam administered and proctored through academic resources or athletics administration at the host institution.
4. The process of establishing accommodations should be concluded by the deadline to drop courses each semester. If after sincere efforts to reach agreement, the number of missed classes projected would jeopardize the student-athlete's successful completion of the course, the faculty member may recommend that the student-athlete enroll in another course where fewer scheduling conflicts would occur.
5. If a student-athlete is advised to select another course, he/she may ask for assistance from their advisor or Associate/Assistant Dean.
6. In the event that there is a conflict between missed class dates and core academic activities which cannot be avoided or resolved, the student-athlete shall immediately contact the Assistant Athletic Director for Student-Athlete Success to ascertain course impact or NCAA eligibility and discuss the best course of action.
7. In the event that there are changes to the course schedule and/or requirements distributed during the first ten days of the course, faculty should work with student athletes to accommodate any unforeseen conflicts.
8. In the event that there are unforeseen changes to the athletics schedules after the travel letter has been given to faculty, student athletes will proactively contact faculty to address any conflicts or missed work and seek accommodations.

Senator Bartschat asked why the policy was needed. He asked if this would not be covered 2.114 portion of the Faculty Manual. Why are athletes being singled out? DeDe Small, chair of the Intercollegiate Athletic Council offered these procedures are needed to comply with NCAA guidelines. She continued that the motion offered has been the result of a two year effort. The intent is to clarify words which are used within the missed class letter. She indicated that a vast majority of faculty are very willing to accommodate student-athletes, yet the language update is needed to outline the procedures.

Senator Schneider thought the language was strange when he reads “no additional’ penalty. Ms. Small indicated there are options to help the student and the faculty. Also offered was that a FAQ may be developed as this was a Deans Council suggestion. Senator Klipatrick asked if this language will be applied to other students. The reply was that it could be. Senator Dunham-LaGree liked the procedures section where the student has responsibility and they are clearly delineated. Megan Brown, University Curriculum Committee (UCC) Chair, stated her committee received information this semester supplied by Associate Dean Johanna Mosser and considered how the content of this motion could be adapted for non-athletic needs. Senator Alexander did not think number six would be very workable. He felt it was overly restrictive. Ms. Small noted how items 7 and 8 try to spell out instances and the direction to go back to ‘best effort’.

Senate DeLaet accepted there is an external obligation and yet wondered if this could be pushed out for one year.

Senator Owens moved and Wrenn seconded an amendment. The amendment makes the policy effective for one year.

The amendment was passed with a voice vote with only limited descent.

Senator Reincke asked what the consequences for non-compliance are. Senator Gilbert asked where the policy would reside and the reply was in the Faculty Manual. Senator Heaston noted the amendment has been done and the UCC has already begun looking at the issue, thus he was in favor of Senate helping the UCC get it done.

Senator Wrenn shared that while professors do not like to be told what to do; he looked at this from the student point of view. He concluded it protects the student athlete from a minority of faculty. He saw value in it being applied university wide. Senator Phillips pointed out the section where coaches have to plan and communicate, thus there are some protection from the student on both sides.

Several voices questioned why a team meal was a reason to miss a class.

The motion passed as amended with a show of hands vote (14 yes; 5 no)

Senator Simpson moved and Evans seconded **motion 16:13**

Changes to the Board of Student Communications (BSC) Rules & Regulations changes

Discussion on the motion started with two students (Caleb Potretz and Linley Sanders) speaking in favor of the changes.

Senator Phillips indicated concerns about stating a dollar amount for the minimum wage. Clarification was given that DRaek follows the federal minimum wage.

A friendly, uncontested amendment was made and accepted to strike stating a dollar amount in section D.1.a.

The motion as amended was approved.

As of 4:19pm, after President Soltis described the procedure, the Senate, with motion and second, went into a Committee of the Whole to discussion the Revised General Education Model.

Senator DeLaet expressed gratitude to the persons who have worked on the document and she now wants to lay the ground work so Senate can move forward. She described the objective of the revised general education as having meaningful content with a smaller footprint. She expressed her desire that Drake has an attractive curricular reform which has diversity and inclusion throughout. Senator Owens also thanked faculty for giving the issue effort and he did not want a divisive tone with the motion. Senator Owens distributed a set of amendments to the proposed revision of the general education motion.

The desire now is an adhoc committee to look at the outcomes and perhaps some items may be deferred. Senator Courard-Hauri wondered if faculty input, perhaps via a survey, would be helpful. He suggested effort should be made to reach the group of faculty who are not on Senate. Senator Valdovinos asked why the Senate could not be the working group. Senator DeLaet agreed the Senate needs to be involved and currently Senate is the most informed who then can get input. Concerns were raised that the proposed committee is too small and exclusive. The response was the group would need to be mindful to ask for information. The discussion included how the Senate can work as demonstrated by how the College of Pharmacy & Health Science senators communicated with their faculty.

There was interest in having whatever proposed change is determined by a committee and Senate to be subject to a faculty vote. Specially, the call was for the undergraduate faculty to participate in the vote. Several voices agreed with a wide faculty vote once a revision proposal is formed. One Senator encouraged that administrator should be equally interviewed and survey regarding a general education plan.

The plus/minus grading policy change was mentioned as a good model to follow which was an interest survey, faculty vote then faculty senate took up the motion. President Soltis would want to have the phrase “non-binding vote” attached to the all faculty vote language. Amendment language was crafted by Senator Owens to include that ‘non-binding’ language for the faculty voting process once a full revision proposal is created.

It was clarified that Senate would be taking up the amended motion distributed at the meeting. Additionally, the name of the College of Pharmacy would be corrected for the actual motion.

While the 2016-2017 year would involve an adhoc committee the UCC would be vetting, communication and collaboration between the UCC and the adhoc committee.

At 4:54 pm., the Senate moved back into the regular business session.

Senator DeLaet and Alexander seconded the motion **16:14**

Secretary's note: This motion was distributed at the meeting as a replacement to the previously submitted motion

In consultation with the 2016-2017 Senate Executive Committee, the Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate President will appoint an ad hoc General Education Working Group comprised of members of the 2016-2107 Faculty Senate, including divisional and/or at large senators from the College of Business and Public Administration, the College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, Cowles Library and the College of Arts and Sciences.

This Working Group will be charged with articulating, refining and proposing to Faculty Senate for its consideration no later than November 2016 student learning outcomes to be achieved by the General Education Curriculum. These outcomes must be consonant with the six general education objectives provisionally endorsed by Faculty Senate at its November 15, 2015 meeting and must directly support the Drake University mission. The Working Group will solicit input from the faculty of the University and its several academic divisions to ensure that its recommendations reflect the unique programmatic needs of diversity academic units.

Further, upon approval of these proposed outcomes, this Working Group will be charged with crafting and proposing a comprehensive general education curriculum for considerate by Faculty Senate by its April, 2017 meeting. To that end, the document titled “Revised General Education Curriculum” [RGEC] [dated April 26, 2016 and shared at the May 4, 2016 Senate meeting] and its source documents, along with the findings of UCC, DCAC, and the 2014 ad hoc committee on General Education model feasibility, will serve as resource documents. Once again, the Working Group will engage with campus-wide as well as divisional constituencies and bodies in crafting its recommendations. This recommendation brought forth by this Working Group will outline plans and a timeline for determining resource allocation, implementation, and assessment of its proposed curriculum, as appropriate to the nature of its recommendations. A non-binding faculty vote will be taken once a full revised proposal is created.

The Working Group will report regularly to Faculty Senate to receive input on its development recommendations.

This motion stipulates that at least two distinct Faculty Senate votes beyond the adoption of this motion must pass to effect a revised curriculum:

1. A vote in favor of the proposed student learning outcomes in Fall, 2016.
2. A vote in favor of the comprehensive curriculum revision and implementation plan/timeline in Spring 2017

Senator Gilbert supported the current version with the suggested changes. He added a cautionary item to the discussion. That all concerned remain sensitive to the reality of enrollment cycles at the time any of this takes place the institution will have different enrollment percentages.

The Senate moved, seconded and approved the amendment to add the language of “non-binding faculty vote”.

The Senate moved, seconded and approved the amended, amended motion with a voice vote.

Senators offered their Thanks to President Soltis, with applause.

With proper motions and vote, the Senate moved to extend the meeting past 5:00 p.m. and into closed session to consider the recommendations of the Honorary Degree & Drake Medal Committee.

Secretary, Nancy Geiger