

Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting

January 19, 2005

The regular meeting of the 2004-2005 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Klaus Bartschat. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting. *Alexander*, Bartschat, Clapham, Courard-Hauri, Dore, Esposito, Frank, Freeman-Miller, Gilbert, Gillespie, Lyons, Morrow, Pandit, Petersen, Reincke, Rozycki, Sanders, Simpson, Tice, Wade.

Absent: Allen,

The January 2005 minutes were accepted with corrections.

Report from President Maxwell

- President Maxwell responded to a questions received previous to the meeting.

- a) The upcoming Board of Trustee meeting includes the presentation of general budget assumptions for the next year. From the approved assumptions, the tuition and fees for 05-06 will be established.
- b) In regards to the Admission Vice President search, there is ongoing work with the outside consultant. President Maxwell will have initial off site visits with a new pool of candidates. There has been an expansion of what the position requirements so as to include persons who are not currently employed at the Vice Presidential level. The Admission Office continues to work with the Noel Levitt company for another six month period. They are helping Drake with operational strategies which will convert the undergraduate applicant pool to admitted students for Fall 2005.

Report from Provost Troyer

Provost Troyer report opened with comments concerning Admissions. He indicated that this is the beginning of the critical time of converting the admitted student to an enrolled student. The Provost noted that there is an increase in applications; which included an explosion in the applications to Pharmacy unit. If that unit is taken out of the calculation, then Drake has a 2.2% decrease in applications. The interesting portion of the current situation is that the number of tuition deposits is up from last year. The tuition deposit is a non-refundable fee. The Provost indicated that he believes that each year is different, and we can not merely look to the past in Admissions data to predict the future.

Each Dean is developing their own plan address the Admit-to-Enrolled issue. It was noted, by a senator, that submission of the tuition deposit early does not yield the student any specific benefits. One assumption for the 05-06 Budget is the enrollment of 775 first year students.

The Provost continued by pointing out that transfer applications remain down from last year and less than in previous years. The Admission consultant commented that Drake has articulation agreements with only seven of the Iowa community colleges. The development and maintenance of these agreements has been in the Admission Office. Based on advice from consultant, this task will move to the Office of the Provost. This task includes going back to the basics of building relationships with these two year schools by the Admission Office and Academic division.

Senator Alexander asked what the approval process is for these articulation agreements. The Provost indicated that each college/school would review the courses within their subject content areas.

Senator Esposito wondered if consideration had been given to establishing agreements with out of state institutions. The Provost indicated that is indeed a possibility. Senator Reincke noted that expanding our agreements to community colleges with diverse populations could help with increasing an overall diverse enrollment. Senator Gillespie related that she had been involved with the Admission Office in the past reviewing and articulating (establishing equivalents) courses.

Provost Troyer indicated that the consultant also suggested establishing a joint admission agreement with DMACC. He was not sure if that would work but it too, may be explored.

Report from President Bartschat

The Sabbatical Task Force, in connection with Executive Committee, will be sending out a survey to tenured and tenure track faculty. The survey instrument has been cleared by the Institutional Review Board. Individual information will be available to Nancy Geiger, but no one else. If you choose to ignore the survey, then your voice will not be heard on this subject. The survey will be open through January 31, 2005.

The Retiree Benefit Task Force lead discussion of the Humana proposal is not on the agenda as planned due to the weather related meeting postponements earlier in January. The topic will come to Senate later in the Spring semester.

President Bartschat indicated that based on Senate Budget Committee discussions concerning the upcoming Board of Trustee meeting which is being described as a retreat, the Board Chair David Miles offered to address the full Senate.

Mr. Miles indicated that he appreciated the chance to speak to the Faculty Senate. He commented that this will be the second year that a Board of Trustee retreat has happened during the January meeting. The purpose is to have the members step back and look at big picture issues as well as conduct regular Board business. Last year, the meeting was in Chicago and the topic of the retreat was Board governance. This year, the retreat topic is the future of higher education. The group will be addressed by a nationally recognized speaker.

Mr. Miles indicated that 25 of the 39 board members are from outside the Des Moines area. For the 14 persons who are in the Des Moines area, there is a concern that it is hard to remove themselves from their daily issues while attending any Board meeting, especially a retreat. He noted that he and the Board are sensitive to the costs of their meetings and perception of incurring associated costs for the University. He stated specifically that all 39 members pay their own travel expenses, no matter where they meet.

The Denver, Colorado location was chosen in part because of a joint decision with the Alumni division. There will be a long overdue alumni event that weekend in Denver. Over 100 persons are expected to attend besides the Board and Drake personnel. There will be a perspective student recruiting component to the weekend also. Mr. Miles indicated that the location and timing were leveraged to meet multiple Drake needs.

Senators expressed their concerns about the timing of this retreat meeting when the January and April meetings are prime Board business decision sessions. There was concern as to the shortened length of time which would be scheduled for each committee due the retreat agenda. There was mention of possibly using the June meeting for the retreat. Mr. Miles indicated he would take that suggestion to the Board for consideration. It was noted that any June meeting on campus would not offer to the Board a full range of real campus experiences since fewer students, student leaders and faculty are available. Mr. Miles did agree that the June session's timing had its own challenges as it so quickly follows the April meeting (which is aligned with the Drake Relays) and the May Commencement ceremonies.

Some Senators acknowledged the importance of a retreat type atmosphere within any organizational body and others indicated that such atmosphere was not productive, in their opinion. Mr. Miles indicated that he and others saw value to the retreat concept for the Board which is overseeing an almost \$100 million dollar institution (*operating budget*). He sees this session as an investment in the Board of Trustees.

President Maxwell offered that the cost of this location over and above the cost of any board meeting will be approximately \$7,500. Comparable figures for last year's retreat were not known. Seven Drake personnel will be attending besides the Alumni personnel needed to handle the reception.

There was a discussion of the membership of the Board of Trustees. Not everyone on the Board is an alum of Drake. There were suggestions offered to perhaps broaden the base membership to younger persons who at this point in their career can not afford such a fiscal commitment but may be interested in giving their time and expertise to Drake. President Maxwell indicated there is a Board committee which handles the operational aspects of the Board. He will bring these suggestions to their attention.

New Business:

Gillespie moved and Simpson seconded **motion 05-06**:

a) Motion to change the catalog description of the 'Incomplete' and the 'In Progress' Grade

The changes are indicated in **bold**.

The mark "I" (Incomplete) indicates a student has not submitted all evidence required for a final grade, **due to extraordinary circumstances (e.g., a serious illness or a death in the immediate family)**. The student must make satisfactory arrangements with the instructor to complete the work **by the end of** the next semester of enrollment (**excluding enrollment in summer terms**). The instructor writes out the conditions that must be met to remove the incomplete. **As a component of these conditions, the instructor may demand an accelerated deadline (e.g., the midterm of the following semester) or may provide an extended deadline if special circumstances warrant (e.g., a semester abroad, student teaching, etc.). The instructor will indicate the final grade for the course in the event the work is not completed. The statement is filed** with the dean of the student's college or school. **A copy is also given to the student.** Marks of incomplete are changed to a final grade **either by the instructor (upon completion of the work) or by the Office of Student Records (if the work is not completed after one semester has passed)**. Marks of incomplete are not computed in the grade point average. The mark of "IP" (In Progress) may be given in certain courses **where** special conditions **make** the grade of Incomplete **unrepresentative of** the status of the students at the close of the semester. **The grade of "IP" is appropriate only when the coursework could not be finished during the semester for the entire class (e.g., internships, practicums, or courses that do not fit the standard academic calendar; fieldwork or research presentations that may take place after a semester has ended; theses or dissertations; or other special situations where coursework extends beyond one**

semester). A grade of “IP” must be changed to a final grade by the instructor by the end of the next semester. The instructor must indicate to the appropriate dean’s office in what courses students will be assigned an “IP.”

This new version would begin with grades issued for the Spring 2005 semester. That is, during January 2006, the first automatic grade changes would replace any remaining ‘I’s’ issued for the Spring 2005 semester.

Bill Dougherty was introduced and available for questions. He wrote the proposed change.

Senator Frank asked what would be the long term harm of an ‘I’ staying an ‘I’. Provost Troyer responded that from the perspective of some outside agency, this mark would be viewed as an ‘F’. Also, there are questions when students graduate with a Drake degree and an ‘I’ exist on their record.

There was a discussion of what was meant by the end of the next semester and whether or not summer terms were included in that calculation. Mr. Dougherty indicated the wording was taken from the grade appeal language which excludes the summer term.

Senator Tice indicated that there are cases in his unit where the ‘IP’ mark is give to an entire class due to the unique scheduling of that experience. These ‘IP’s’ are changed promptly.

Several senators spoke of their experiences with being pressured to give an ‘I’ due to medical or external hardship reasons. Some felt these instances created undue pressure for the individual faculty member to know under what circumstances an ‘I’ is appropriate. The motion does provide examples. With this motion, the ‘I’ does not automatically change to an ‘F’. The assignment of the grade is still with the instructor. The motion offers to clarify the timeframe in which the ‘I’ should stand on the student’s record.

Senator Frank offered that she would not give a passing grade if the work were incomplete. Her opinion continued that to have an ‘I’ shows the coursework can not yet be graded.

Several senators stated they would be concerned about an expected graduating senior who earns an ‘I’ and how that would affect the degree clearance. President Bartschat indicated that he would consider a change where a Drake degree could not be earned if an ‘I’ or ‘IP’ existed.

President Bartschat shared with the Senate a message from the Law School. The Law School is generally supportive of this motion, but requests more time to consider its impact.

Margie Davidson, Director of Student Records and Academic Information stated that there is a one year component of the current policy. The deadline does not include a requirement for a final grade from the instructor, merely notification that the year has passed. She is in favor of the motion. It was noted that there are approximately 700 marks of ‘I’ or ‘IP’ currently on file since Spring 2003.

The motion was made and passed to table the motion to February 2005.

The meeting adjourned. at 5:00 p.m. Secretary, Nancy Geiger