

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: Klaus Bartschat, Maria Clapham, David Courard-Hauri, Renee Cramer, Debra DeLaet, Bengu Erguner-Tekinalp, Royce Fichtner, Jennifer Harvey, Adina Klipatrick, Jerrid Kruse, Karen Leroux, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Dorothy Pisarski, Nancy Reincke, Craige Wrenn,

Absent: Dan Alexander, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Lourdes Gutierrez-Najera , David Wright

The October minutes were accepted.

President Martin Report: No report was presented as President Martin was not in town.

Provost Mattison Report:

Provost Mattison thanked the faculty for their work during the election season and especially addressing the challenges of the past week. She appreciated the openness which she felt among the students and she has heard from the students how faculty took time to really listen to them during this busy time. She felt this is a compliment to Drake University's culture.

President Reincke:

The Student Senate representative, Kenia Calderon shared that they are hoping to have a joint faculty senate and student senate discussion this fall. At this time, no specific date is known for that event.

Unfinished Business: no items presented

New Business:

A procedural motion was offered to amend the previously distributed Agenda so as to include motion **17:03**, as moved by Senator De Laet and seconded by Senator Vandegrift. The motion states:

“Support of declaring Drake University a sanctuary for undocumented members of the Drake Community”

“Faculty Senate urges Drake University to become a sanctuary for undocumented members of the Drake community, and to affirm its commitment to protect immigrants from unfair deportation, investigation, or other intimidation based on their immigration status.”

Secretary's note: the motion was electronically distributed prior to the meeting, but the after the agenda was originally distributed.

Senator Fichtner noted that this topic is of major concern for senate and indicated that there had not been enough time to prepare to discuss this topic. Senator Vandegrift replied that there is a sense of urgency. This topic comes directly from student concerns. She agreed the topic is outside of what Senate does and yet it is a chance to make Drake a prompt voice within this important national issue. She indicated in these past couple of days as the motion and its rationale were developed there have been 12 co-sponsoring faculty and additionally approximately 200 alumni and approximately 200 students who have signed their names in support of this action.

After a vote, more than two-thirds of the Senate approved the motion to amend the Agenda.

The Senate then began the discussion of motion 17:03 by noting a change to the first paragraph of the rationale, as requested for clarification purposes. The second sentence would have the word “million” inserted after 2.1. Thus, “...there are 2.1 million undocumented students ...”.

Even though a couple of Senators voiced concerns about the timing of today's discussions, The Senate approved moving forward with this agenda item.

Concerning preparation materials concerning 'sanctuary', Senator De Laet appreciated the quickly put together informative email conversation (which included all Senators) concerning basic legal and Higher Learning Commission (HLC) particulars on the topic. Senator Cramer noted the topic is not only legal, it is political. She did not want the Senate or the University to overlook the risks which come with the motion. Her opinion is that Drake would be offering their voice to the existing and growing national debate. She felt it was the right time to "use our voice". Senator Kruse asked if the word 'urge' was strong enough. Senator Owens wanted to know what force comes with this motion. He asked who would be the person to act, if action were ever directly needed. Senator Bartschat believed the authority to be within executive administration with Board of Trustee endorsement. Senator De Laet shared her opinion was that this effort would be similar to when staff, faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees acted together towards the Sudanese investment divestiture effort.

Senator Harvey thanked the persons who put the motion and rationale together. Senator Lourdes Gutierrez-Najera, while not present for the meeting, was credited with putting the document together. Senator Harvey continued speaking in favor of the motion stating it would be symbolic and symbols can be helpful. She said she was very proud that this topic has been brought forward today.

Senator Wrenn asked about how broad the motion's intent is. He requested clarification and understanding of "Drake community" as stated in the motion. Senator De Laet indicated it was her understanding that it would include Drake employees and students. Other Senators questioned if the motion should be constrained especially during a time when sincere effort exists to broaden the number and role of community partners.

Senator Erguner-Tekinalp offered that this topic is fresh and real for her. She knows what it is like to want to feel safe, documented or not. Whenever the climate gets negative, it is nice to feel safe. Senator Phillips voiced he felt favorable to the motion's intent, yet wanted to know what the word "sanctuary" would mean and what actions would be expected or included.

Senator Kruse asked if words such as "within the scope of the law" should be added. Senator Owens reminded the group the University Bylaws and Academic Charter will govern, in general, how deep and broad the institution can act. His feeling would be to make the gesture as broad as possible and then leave the rest to the administration to fulfill.

Provost Mattison spoke in favor of the motion. She noted she will not usually speak for President Martin, yet knew him to be positive regarding the sense of the motion. She also had some questions concerning what "sanctuary" would mean even if purely symbolic. Provost Mattison offered she would be interested to learn what the DACA students believe the word "sanctuary" would mean for them.

Senator Simpson stated she liked the sense of the motion and that sanctuary is providing a safe place. Senator Harvey offered the word could mean the University would not cooperate with random unfounded federal inquiries and that is an important symbol. She continued stating the motion would be proactively proclaiming a positive symbol while not overpromising any specific action.

Student Senator Kenia Calderon was recognized to speak. Ms. Calderon stated she is an undocumented student who can attest to what the word 'sanctuary' means to those who are undocumented. They know it as a welcoming place where we will be protected and yet appropriate legal actions will be followed. Provost Mattison asked about the expectation of protection yet realizing the University would follow appropriate legal actions. Provost Mattison's example was that she would expect the institution to protect her information yet she cannot expect the University to be in charge of protecting her off campus. She did not want to suggest a false hope or guarantees which the University would or would not do, nor disappoint a student or family due to a misunderstanding. Situations will be complicated by each being distinct and Provost Mattison wanted to be clear of the possible legal realities which the institution will follow.

Senator Weresh offered she supported in theory the motion and yet believed an appropriate action would be for the language, such as guarantee used in the rationale, to be reviewed by an immigration lawyer. Senator Wrenn desired the language to be tightened up and made more pervasive and suggested the body should focus on what we can do for Drake employees and

students. Ms. Caldron reiterated that the words such as sanctuary and guarantee within this motion would be understood by the undocumented community. The Senate was reminded the rationale, in the last two paragraphs, contains the outline for actions which the institutions would be asked to agree.

Senator Simpson suggested she believed the Senate and institution would be better served if a group spent some effort on what has been accomplished so far today and craft language which will meet the expressed needs.

Senators Simpson and Fichtner moved and seconded an amendment:

Insert the phrase: “*to the extent of applicable law*” in front of the phrase “*from unfair deportation*”.

Senator Harvey indicated she was opposed to the additional language and to waiting on passage of the motion. Senator Erguner-Tekinalp supported the desire to accept the motion as it is and let the persons on the inside define how it will work.

With a show of hands vote, the amendment failed. (8 yes, 10 no)

A procedural motion to move to a vote on the motion failed.

Senators Owens and Kruse moved and seconded an amendment which deletes words presented in ~~strike through~~ and insert the language in *italics*:

“Faculty Senate urges *the executive administration of Drake University* to ~~become~~ *declare the University* a sanctuary for undocumented members of the Drake community, and to affirm ~~its~~ *our* commitment to protect immigrants from unfair deportation, investigation, or other intimidation based on their immigration status.”

The body agreed the issue of the executive administration being the appropriate office to enact this motion did not need to be stated. Shortly after some more discussion of the proposed wording changes, the amendment was withdrawn.

President Reincke restated for the assembled what the overall theme is which is being presented. It is solidarity and she would like the group to leave the meeting being in solidarity on the issue. She did not want the assembled to lose the essence of today’s action. Senator Wrenn spoke that he wanted the spirit and the letter of the intent to match. He wanted to support the students and “not let a federal agency like ICE run over their rights nor the institution”. Several other Senators agreed with the desire to act positively on the motion.

With a show of hands vote, the motion passed. (13 yes, 1 no, 5 abstentions)

Senator Simpson and Pisarski moved and seconded motion **17.04**:

Add the Academic Affairs (Student) Senator to the Ad Hoc Drake Curriculum Revision Committee

Senators Simpson and Pisarski indicated the inclusion of the phrase: “*as a non-voting member of the committee*” should be added to the end of the published motion. This was acceptable to the Senate. Senator Wrenn, ad hoc committee chair, indicated the committee members did not have an issue with this addition.

With a voice vote, the motion with the additional language passed.

The Senate then began discussion on the Ad Hoc General Education Task Force’s outcomes statements motion **17.05**.

Senator Harvey moved an amendment to the outcome F which was seconded by several Senate voices.

An amendment to outcome F, in regard to the specific language about diversity:

Analyze and understand how diversity and systems of exclusion shape society, with emphasis on *race, ethnicity, gender, and class* in the context of the United States.

Senator Harvey acknowledged the selection of only four issues may be problematic, yet it is important to articulate that race issues are prevalent issues within the general education. Senator Pisarski stated the ad hoc committee tried to draft the language as broad as possible. Senator Harvey realized there is a struggle with the tension of being too broad and desires to have the upmost issues addressed. Senator Vandegrift wanted everyone to look at what we want students to learn to identify the gaps. In her mind it does not mean that all exclusion categories will be stated in the seven outcomes, yet there is evidence these four need to have the most help within our current general education.

Senator Clapham liked the outcomes and suggested the first bullet within Outcome F does express examples of excluded groups and issues. Senator Harvey agreed the first bullet's list was a great set of examples, yet she proposed the amendment to put emphasis on the four named issues. Senator De Laet stated that she as a member of the committee offered the task was to define outcomes while not saying one outcome or one issue would equal one course. The committee needs yet to work on the curriculum. She stated it is a resolvable tension. Senator Kruse asked if placing the proposed words as an e.g. clause within the outcome statement. Senator Harvey preferred the language as presented.

With proper motion and vote, the Senate moved to extend the meeting past 5:00 p.m.

Senator Erguner-Tekinalp felt that if the outcome is to be explicit, then the list needs to be large and inclusive. Senator Owens believed the test of good outcomes will be the curriculum. It needs to be based on today's good conversation. The outcomes phase is a step towards the build of the model we can get behind to strengthen Drake's general education.

Senator Clapham did not have a problem with the main areas being mentioned and yet it is limiting if not including disability. Senator Wrenn stated the ad hoc committee tried to leave the outcomes broad in an inclusive way. Faculty need freedom to design their courses. Senator Harvey expressed her concern that she would not want to have a student leave Drake without having taking a course which concerns race/class/gender or ethnicity issues. When asked about the use of the words "United States" in the outcome description, Senator Harvey said she liked the usage. It is saying the reality as it is and where many of our students are from and will remain. Senator Clapham voiced that for her the "systems of exclusion" is an important critical point.

With a voice vote, the amendment passed.

Senators Kruse and De Laet moved an amendment to add "*and social*" to Outcome C after the word "*natural*"

Following short discussion and voice vote, the amendment failed

Senator Leroux asked to add within the second bullet point of Outcome A, the words "*multilingual*" following "*multiplatform*". Senator Courard-Hauri suggested the second bullet point of Outcome C, should include the word "environmental" following "political," Senator Wrenn was willing to accept input within the rationale as it does not change the outcomes. Both of these suggestions were not amendments.

With an unanimous voice vote, the motion to accept the outcomes passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m. Secretary, Nancy Geiger