

The meeting of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Nancy Reincke. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Dan Alexander, Klaus Bartschat, Maria Clapham, David Courard-Hauri, Renee Cramer, Debra De Laet, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Bengu Erguner-Tekinalp, Royce Fichtner, Lourdes Gutierrez-Najera, Jerrid Kruse, Karen Leroux, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Dorothy Pisarski, Nancy Reincke, LouAnn Simpson, Darcie Vandegrift, Melissa Weresh, and Craige Wrenn

Absent: Jennifer Harvey, Adina Klipatrick, Grady McGrannahan, David Wright

The April 2017 minutes were accepted.

President Martin Report

President Martin gave an update from the recent Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting which included the ground breaking for the Boys & Girls Clubs building. The majority of their fundraising has been completed. Also, the Nelson Construction and Development signage is up which gives notice to the University Avenue changes which will begin in Fall 2017 with five houses being moved or demolished. Actual construction on the site is not expected until Spring 2018.

The undergraduate admission numbers will not meet the 850 goal. The Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) budget will be revised and presented to the BOT in June 2017. Last week, leadership showed the BOT the current contingency budget plan. Concerning the students who do not come to Drake, the responses from 2016 to 2017 are interesting, stated President Martin. There is a “flipped dynamic of who we lost students to”. In 2017, more students responded they would attend a public school rather than a private school which is different than in 2016. President Martin remains firm in his belief that when students and families see the value of Drake vs the initial cost of Drake, they will see the reasons to join us here.

President Martin stated there will continue to be process reviews, such as the printing and purchasing have already done, in an effort to reduce expenses. Every President Council member will be looking for ways to decrease the expense footprint within their division.

When asked, President Martin shared the expected entering first year class will be between 740 to 780 students. Additionally, he responded to a question concerning the location of the public institutions. Were these Iowa regent institutions or outside of Iowa. He stated in 2016, one Iowa public and then institutions from contiguous states. In 2017, two Iowa publics were named within the top five schools. The private school enrollment decline trend during the same years of public school enrollment increases is occurring in multiple states. Also questioned was the use of discounted tuition to gain enrollment. President Martin’s reply was he is in favor of stressing Drake’s value rather than increasing the discount rate as that is not a sustainable practice. He stated again his belief that Drake is a good value and we need to stand on it. One group of students which is being looked at are the community college student. Drake needs to be welcoming to those students.

Another question raised was directed towards “what fundraising prioritizations come after STEM”. President Martin shared that a new campaign and new master campus plan are being developed. Also, there are efforts to look for persons and organizations who want to fund scholarships.

Also raised was a question of “the culture of our community” and the effort and direct investment it will take for faculty to stay fresh with curriculum and pedagogical teaching updates. Is the Drake experience and value understood by the prospective student and family the same as we believe it ourselves? The 160/90 marketing firm should have their campaign ready next year to “tell the story”. This will help both students and families to know who Drake is and we have the data to back it up. During this conversation a question was raised as to whether or not the expectations regarding enrollment numbers are too high. The response was that the Fall 2018 number will be reviewed carefully at President’s Council. President Martin also stated that all Admission cycle activities and geographic outreach is being examined. Everything is “on the table”. Concerning graduate programs, Drake is in year number four of downward numbers.

Provost Mattison Report

The past year, Provost Mattison has had a student advisory board which met four times. Within those discussions, the topic of priority registration was raised as an issue. A problem for several student groups is getting together for activities

such as practice times for teams and ensembles. A way to ease the burden is to allow for priority registration. Based on her research of other campus, this is a method to ease the burden. Provost Mattison distributed to Senators a one-page set of notes outlining her research and request for input. She asked for Senator input regarding whether or not early registration would have negative effects. She is interest in knowing what time periods might make sense and what assessment should be done.

Provost Mattison acknowledged that Drake's Athletics department has made efforts to get their student athletes to register on time and the proactive advising outreach has increased this student population's participation in registration from 70 to 90 percent. Concerning this topic, she has met with CAAD, Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Dean's Council. Currently athletes and certain students with disabilities are being considered for priority registration status. Approximately 350 to 450 students would be in this pool. Some Senators expressed doubt that this solution would not help but actually add to the existing problem. Provost Mattison accepted the doubt, as she would have also been skeptical.

President Reincke Report

Tonia Land, 2016-2017 Chair of the Drake Curriculum Analysis Committee was introduced. She shared they used a new process which included inviting faculty involvement (Global AOI) from the beginning. Effort was made to develop faculty understanding of addressing the outcomes and learn from the faculty. She cited, if a person does not know the outcomes, then then participation in addressing the concepts are not strong. There is a full report which will be distributed.

Old Business: None presented

New Business:

Motion was moved and seconded to change the order of the agenda.

Senators Courard-Hauri & Cramer moved and seconded motion **17:16**

Add language to the General Catalog Academic Regulations sections titled: Grade Point Average and Withdrawal and Add language to the Faculty Manual 2.183 Drop, Add, Withdrawal Policies

Explanation of Drop and Drop-with-W Periods

Drops and withdrawals affect a student's transcript differently depending on the point of time within a semester. The following definitions explain the beginning and end of each period of a semester.

Drop Period – For fall and spring semesters, the drop period is the first through the 10th day of the semester. For summer, it is the first meeting date of the class through the following business day. For January terms, it is the first and second day of the term.

Drop-with-W Period – For fall and spring semester, the drop-with-W period is the day following the drop period through the fifth day following the semester midpoint. For summer, it is the day following the drop period of the class to the midpoint of the class. For January terms, it is the day following the drop period through the midpoint of the term.

Complete Withdrawal

A student may withdraw from the University at any time during a semester, up to the completion or submission of the final work of the course(s), by submitting a request in writing to the dean (or the dean's designee) of the college or school in which the student is enrolled.

A. Complete withdrawals that occur within the **drop period** of the semester will result in no coursework appearing on the student's transcript for the respective semester.

B. Complete withdrawals that occur within the **drop-with-W period** will result in the mark of “W” (Withdrawal) on the student’s transcript for the respective semester’s coursework. The “W” is not used in the calculation of the grade point average.

C. Complete withdrawal requests submitted after the **drop-with-W period** will be considered late withdrawal requests and must document the extenuating circumstances that form the basis for the request, such as a serious illness or a family emergency.

1. Authorized late complete withdrawals will have the same result as item B above.
2. Unauthorized late withdrawals may lead to a mark of “WU”, which is counted as an “F” in the grade point average calculation. In the case of an unauthorized withdrawal:
 - a. If the last date of academic activity is determined to be within the drop period, the result will be the same as in item A above.
 - b. If the last date of academic activity is determined to be within the **drop-with-W period**, the result will be the same as item B above. The “W” cannot be removed from a student’s transcript upon subsequently repeating the course.
 - c. If the last date of academic activity is determined to be after the **drop-with-W period**, the instructors of record will determine if a mark of “WU” (Unauthorized Withdrawal) or letter grade will be assigned. The “WU” is calculated as an “F” in the grade point average. The “WU” cannot be removed from a student’s transcript upon subsequently repeating the course *and receiving an actual letter grade*; however, its calculation as an “F” may be removed from the student’s grade point average.

Financial implications are not in the purview of the academic colleges and schools.

Associate Provost Melissa Sturm-Smith and Arts & Sciences Assistant Dean Jenny Tran-Johnson were recognized and asked to speak to Senate. Ms. Sturm-Smith indicated this proposed expansion of the withdrawal language and new end of term administrative mark is the product of about four months of work. There were members of CAAD who reviewed the complete withdrawal policy. The is broad and vague, in particular the language concerning withdrawing from Drake late in the semester. Various aspects and cases were reviewed including the case of a student who earns all F’s in a semester. The new administrative mark could be used when a student departs and earns all F’s and the faculty does not want to give a “F”. These marks would be used with faculty consultation. The goal is to support students in what they need to do and be able to more accurately track their late semester withdrawals.

With approvals, language was added to the portion C.2.c: (in *italics* below)

The “WU” cannot be removed from a student’s transcript upon subsequently repeating the course *and receiving an actual letter grade*; however, its calculation as an “F” may be removed from the student’s grade point average

The motion with the added language passed on a voice vote.

Senators Pisarski & Phillips moved and seconded motion **17:17**

Approve the General Education (RDC) next steps timeline

Revised Drake Curriculum (RDC) Timeline Moving Forward
Faculty Senate meeting

Presented: May 3, 2017

May 2017:

Preliminary action: request that the RDC ad hoc committee members continue in their positions and facilitate the communication and feedback steps in the process. Begin gathering data as to the feasibility of the proposal (i.e., budgetary implications; RDC “fit” with college and major requirements; capacity for faculty to develop and offer required courses, etc.)

Fall 2017

August 2017

1. Prepare a poster/materials to be available during the Learning Symposium, and gather a list of questions that we are asked, as a way to start curating insights from high-involvement faculty. Prior to the First Day of Classes:

2. Distribute the Revised Drake Curriculum proposal to all relevant units on campus, academic and non-academic (admissions, athletics, student records, etc.). Communicate the history and rationale for this proposal (e.g., poster-session style info experiences; Q&A sessions with RDC ad hoc committee members; written materials with FAQs). Report information on the feasibility of implementing the RDC [note: not likely to be complete at this point and additional questions to research will arise].

No later than the third week of classes:

3. Schedule focus-group discussions to elicit comments and concerns from each of the non-academic units. Encourage academic units to meet and discuss the proposal, recording comments and concerns (interdisciplinary discussions are highly encouraged). Conduct focus groups with students in conjunction with the Student Senate.

Sixth week of classes:

4. Hold town-hall style forums in which all parties may express their level of support or their concerns.

Approx. Fall Break:

5. Conduct an on-line faculty-wide survey and non-binding vote giving people the opportunity to respond to the proposal with written comments that will be tabulated and published to the campus.

The week of November 6:

6. Analyze all data collected. Reflect. Is it time for Faculty Senate to vote on the proposal?

Senator Pisarski gave background information concerning the ad hoc committee’s actions and the creation of the Revised Drake Curriculum proposal (RDC) and timeline. There was some conversation surrounding budget implementations of this proposal. These will be complicated and will require Provost Office assistance. Also, there was a question of a holding a binding faculty vote as compared to a non-binding vote. It was acknowledged it is important for Senate, the elected body, to make the final decision with overall faculty input. Several Senators liked the “up or down vote” late in the Fall 2017 semester as to whether or not to proceed. Concerns were raised about amendments to the timeline or to the RDC which might be proposed during the Senate’s work after the Faculty vote.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Senators Cramer & Courard-Hauri moved and seconded motion **17:18**:

Amend the terms of service and process of selection for the University Benefits Committee (UBC)

After review and approval by the Senate, the Committee is responsible for recommending employee benefits policies to the President. The Committee is concerned with but not necessarily confined to insurance and retirement provisions for employees of the University. The membership of the Committee shall consist of four members of the Faculty of Instruction (at least one of whom should be nine-month and one twelve

month contract) chosen by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and serving three-year, staggered terms; one exempt and one non-exempt staff member chosen by the All-Staff Council Executive Committee and serving three-year terms; a member of the bargaining unit; a representative of the Provost's Office; and a retiree. The Director and Assistant Director of Human Resources, the Chief Administration Officer, the Chief Financial Officer and the Wellness Director serve on the Committee in an ex-officio capacity. The Senate Executive Committee chooses the Chair of the Committee who shall be a member of the faculty.

~~the Vice Provost of Human Resources, the Drake University Treasurer, a representative of the Provost's Office, a representative of the clerical staff, and a representative of the professional/technical staff. The Director of the Drake Wellness Program sits on the Committee in an ex-officio capacity.~~

Without discussion, the motion passed on a voice vote.

Senators Owens & Cramer moved and seconded motion **17:19**

Create a Faculty Senate committee titled Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee is charged with monitoring and reviewing faculty compensation policies and proposing changes as necessary. The Committee membership and chair are chosen by the Senate Executive Committee. The terms of service will be for three years, staggered. Membership of the Committee includes seven faculty members and one staff member who also teaches. In choosing members, the Senate Executive Committee should consider such factors as expertise and representation by academic units and by different categories of faculty appointment.

Without discussion, the motion passed on a voice vote.

Senators Alexander & Gutierrez-Najera moved and seconded motion **17:20**

Create a Faculty Senate committee titled Information Technology Committee

The Committee provides coordination and advice to the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) on optimizing technology and the dissemination of information about IT plans and policies. The Committee also works with faculty to maximize input into decision making, including working with faculty in the colleges to ensure that college-specific educational needs and goals are met. Terms of membership on the Committee will be for two years, staggered. The Senate Executive Committee selects the Committee chair. Membership will consist of one faculty or staff representative from each academic unit, selected by that unit. The CITO and the Provost are also members of the Committee

Without discussion, the motion passed on a voice vote.

The meeting ended at 5:02 p.m.