

**D R A K E U N I V E R S I T Y**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting**  
**March 13, 2002**

The regular meeting of the 2001-2002 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Charles Phillips. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Allen, Cairns, Gillespie, Hunter, King, Klugman, Lovell, Parsa, Phillips, Pomeroy, Rankin, Reed, A. Sanders, B. Sanders, Simpson, Spencer, Wright, David, Wright, Dean  
Absent: Clapham, McKnight, Symonds

**Report of President Maxwell**

- Campaign Drake is within \$10 million of the goal with only a couple of months remaining in the drive. The Annual Fund number of donors has increased but the average amount given is lower. He spoke of some of the various issues which he is experiencing as he personally works on bringing Campaign Drake to a successful close. The various issues include important philanthropic projects in the Des Moines area and across the country which are canvassing the same persons and the impact of the last several months of the stock market condition.
- The Fall 2002 undergraduate admissions picture, presented weekly by Tom Willoughby, is quite strong. Although there is a decrease in the number of applications from last year, the number is ahead of two years ago. Most of the decrease in applications can be identified from three specific zip codes. We are ahead in receipt of tuition deposits. This attribute is a better indicator of first year student yield from application to enrolled student. He thanked the faculty for their time and effort in their personal interactions with individuals who are considering Drake.
- The Vice President for Institutional Advancement search is about to proceed. A consulting firm has been hired to assist with this task. A consultant will be on campus next week to better understand Drake. Faculty Senators will be invited to meet with the consultant.
- The Instructional Priorities and Review Committee (IPRC) will have its first meeting this week. The agenda for the first meeting will be a session to get an understanding of the charge to the committee.
- The five year budget plan, which was built on conservative projections, is still in place and functioning. President Maxwell indicated a campus wide town meeting is planned for yet this semester after the Anderson compensation comparison study is complete.

**Report from Provost Troyer**

- The various Dean's position searches are still in progress. He cautioned the Senate to not expect any announcements until after Spring Break.
- Four faculty members have been approved the CIEE exchanges. These applications need to also be approved by the CIEE.
- Provost Troyer indicated that the peer institution list is too small for effective use in the salary study, especially when comparing faculty within departments. The U.S. News College survey was reviewed to select more schools to be added to the peer group list. The list has been given to the Deans and is available from the Provost, upon request. He cited the problem that when department level review began for each classification of professor (full, associate, assistant) the small groupings were noted

Senator Allen asked if there will be a yearly compensation and classification study done by gender. Provost Troyer responded that he did not know, but agreed that such a comparison study was needed.

### **Report from President Phillips**

- IPRC will meet this week and also the election process for three faculty positions. The election process needs to be completed by May 1, 2002.
- Institutional Advancement search consultant will be on campus early next week. Either on Monday, March 18 or Tuesday, March 19 a session for faculty will be created. President Phillips requested to know which Senators might be available.
- President Phillips noted that today's agenda, under new business, there are three Academic Charter changes which are holdover items from the February 2001 Faculty Senate meeting. The fourth change, adding 'advising' to the promotion and tenure language, was dropped by the task force pending discussion and formation of a University wide Promotion & Tenure committee

**Unfinished Business** – none presented

### **New Business**

Senator A. Sanders moved and seconded by Klugman motion 2-13

To allow students to fulfill the Areas of Inquiry portion of the Drake Curriculum by substituting the "Honors Program Track" for the Areas of Inquiry requirements

Senator A. Sanders stated the desire to have a meaningful general education which could include interdisciplinary coursework. The retention of the lab, quantitative and artistic requirements is based on the consistent lack of sufficient offerings in these areas within the Honors courses. The Paths to Knowledge addition focuses on different approaches to understanding a particular topic. Senator Sanders continued that this Track would be a great benefit to the Honors Program. The perception is that recruitment of students directly from high school will be more straight forward as this spells out exactly what will be needed to complete this portion of the Honors Program.

Senator David Wright asked a question of Stuart Klugman concerning how the work of how the current work of the Outcomes Committee would fit into this Track. Honors courses have been submitted to fill the AOI's. Senator A. Sanders offered that persons involved were not aware how student behavior will change with this new version of the Drake Curriculum. This is an alternative to the AOI's which is not expected to be an easier offering, even with the two course reduction from the total taken.

Senator David Wright noted that the campus is in a transition mode into the AOI track and there is the upcoming registration where the new AOI version will become first available. He wondered if there will be a difficulty for those students who wish to change into or out of this general education track. Senator Klugman noted that under the AOI version, the Honors courses do not have to be listed on pull down lists to apply to the general education.

Senator Spencer like the proposal and questioned whether there was a guarantee of some sort of breadth of courses taken. Could a student complete the Honors Track and only have exposure to a couple of faculty members or academic departments? Senator A Sanders replied that he believed one practical check against this occurrence is the type of student that takes the honors courses/program. Secondly he believed that there was and would continue to be informal advising against such limited exposure. Additionally, he believed that the number of faculty who teach within the Honors Program in a given four year time

span should promote the emphasis of student exploration.

Senator A Sanders believed that of the 70-90 students which enter the Honors Program each fall, 18-25 of them finish with the Honors program designation. He predicted that 30-35 students a year would use this Drake Curriculum version. Senator Cairns asked if there was a clustering in any one major of the students who graduated with the Honors Program designation. The reply was no. From two years of data, a frequency of two occurred within one major. There was a discussion of the flexibility or constraint the individual student would have to exit the program. The belief was that no hardship would exist for a student desiring to exit the program and complete the AOI version, since Honors courses are acceptable within the Drake Curriculum, certainly no greater hardship that a student late in their program who switches majors.

Drake Curriculum Director David Skidmore spoke to the group indicating that the Drake Curriculum Committee voted eight in favor and two against the proposal. He believes that the Honors Track will strengthen the Honors Program, the Drake Curriculum and enhance the impact on Drake Curriculum the interdisciplinary nature of the AOI's. Drake has been unusual in not having separate Honors program general education requirements.

The motion passed with two abstentions.

Senator Simpson moved and Parsa seconded motion 02-14  
To change the Academic Charter Section VIII C.6.and D. 7  
Adding the word 'Educational' twice to each paragraph (see bold)

Educational benefits held by a dismissed faculty member under the Faculty Manual shall continue for the living dependents of a dismissed faculty member unless comparable benefits are acquired as incidents of a subsequent position. Educational benefits shall be acquired in accordance of the Faculty Manual.

Senator Simpson refreshed the Senate's memory concerning this addition to the Academic Charter. This section was first requested (February 2001) to be deleted. This motion will clarify what benefits are supported by this paragraph. The educational benefits are the intended benefits addressed in this section of the Academic Charter. The paragraph only speaks to dependents of the dismissed faculty not the person directly.

The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Simpson moved and A Sanders second motion 02-15:  
To change the Academic Charter Section XV. B.2.  
by striking the words "and evaluation" (see overstricke)

The Dean of each college or school shall be the chief academic and administrative officer thereof. The Dean's appointment and evaluation shall be made with faculty and other participation as provided in section XVI of the Academic Charter. The Dean shall be responsible to the President through the Office of the Provost.

Senator Simpson noted that this section of the Charter addresses structure of the academic units and the language concerning evaluation is out of place. The sections concerning Vice Presidents or the President do not have evaluation language. She spoke in favor of the concept of evaluation of administrators as possibly a separate section of the Charter.

Senator Hunter noted that in the AAUP Red Book has a section which calls for such

evaluation. He believed that this language is appropriate where it is placed. He was opposed to the motion. Senator Simpson agreed that faculty should be involved but that this location is not appropriate. Senator Parsa spoke against the motion. He wanted a mechanism to evaluate the Deans. Senator Dean Wright agreed that the language is needed and although this may not be the section of a document to house the evaluation concept, he wanted the language to stay until there is a known location for such faculty involvement in the Deans' evaluation. Provost Troyer reminded the body that last year he began a three year rotation of Dean's evaluation. President Maxwell indicated that the Board of Trustees Affairs Committee has received a draft document for examination of upper administration. He indicated that the Senate Executive Committee will be kept apprised of this process.

Senator Allen was sensitive to having the Academic Charter language updated, but agreed that this wording should not be touched until there is replacement language.

Question was called.

Motion failed on a voice vote.

Senator Simpson moved and Spencer seconded motion 02-16:  
To change the Academic Charter Section VI by inserting new language

Delete:

G. With the exception of special appointments clearly limited to a brief association with the University, and reappointments of retired faculty members on special conditions, all full-time appointments to the rank of instructor or higher are of two kinds: (1) probationary appointments; (2) appointments with continuous tenure. During the probationary period the appointment document will contain a statement of the year in which the faculty member will be eligible for tenure.

Insert:

G. Fulltime appointments at the rank of instructor or higher are normally of two kinds: (1) probationary appointments leading to continuous tenure; or (2) appointments with continuous tenure. Exceptions to this are:

1. special appointments clearly limited to a brief association with the University;
2. Reappointments of retired faculty members on special conditions;
- 3.a Extended term appointments of faculty to non-tenure track positions where specific program needs have been identified and the appointment are approved by the dean, provost and president. Non-tenure-track appointments do not lead to tenure. However, the presumption with extended term, non-tenure track appointments is that they will be continued if the faculty member is not duly notified to the contrary.
- 3.b Continuous appointments of faculty to non-tenure track positions where specific program needs have been identified and the appointment are approved by the dean, provost and president. Non-tenure-track appointments do not lead to tenure. However, the presumption with continuous term, non-tenure track appointments is that they will be continued if the faculty member is not duly notified to the contrary.

Senator Hunter presented information that the existing Academic Charter language comes directly from 1982 AAUP Red Book. He asserted that tenure is what a university is all about and this substitution would change the direction that Drake would take as an institution. He was opposed to the motion. President Maxwell noted that he is aware of long time appointments at various Ivy League schools. Senator Simpson stated that this motion would not eliminate tenure. It allows for other kinds of appointments, several of which Drake has been employing for many years. Senator Allen indicated that she could over time see how these kinds of non-tenure faculty positions could eliminate tenured positions. She was

nervous at the extended and continuous language. Provost Troyer indicated that the nature of positions available in the past ten years has changed, especially in the Health Sciences and Computer Science areas. He has known of non-tenure able persons becoming employed with the stipulation that Drake would assist them person to move into a tenure track position. This kind of employment arrangement has happened, but this is not supported in our current policy documents.

President Maxwell offered from his perspective that he too could see this change as an assault on tenure but as during the program review process, there is an understanding of institutional committed to this basic structure. He continued that the parallel track is common, a three or five year rolling contract, not as an avoidance to tenure but as a way to employ persons of quality. Senator Spencer asked if adding Faculty Senate review would give faculty input without simply adding bureau tic step. He stated his comment as a review of the job or positions in this category, not the individuals.

Senator Hunter went back to the AAUP Red Book language and indicated that a University does have the opportunity to enter into contracts for a brief specific time period. If the relationship is to be long term, then it should be a tenure track consideration. Senator Allen asked if President Maxwell was aware of how other institutions handle this matter in their Academic Charters. He replied that he did not know but was personally aware of long term appointments that are not tenure track. Senator Allen was concerned about clinical faculty's consideration in other Charters... She remained uncomfortable with this proposed change and how it may be interrupted in the future. Drake needs some employment flexibility but not with this language.

Senator A. Sanders asked for an example of continuous and extended. Stephen Hoag replied that in the health education profession the tenure option has not been desirable. He continued by citing some AAUP Red Book language which called for the 'welfare of the faculty' to be preserved. The College of Pharmacy & Health Sciences already has such appointments and these positions are helping the institution and promoting the College. The welfare of the faculty is a concern and priority of the unit. Mr. Hoag continued that the concern has been that their personnel practices have been ignoring the Academic Charter provisions and they would not like that to continue. Senator Phillips shared with the assembly that a current faculty person has spoken to him of their exclusion from serving on committees because of their employment status.

Upon proper motion and vote; Senate agreed to continue the meeting past five p.m.

Senator Pomeroy noted the Artist in Residence position is an example of someone who is outside the current Charter language. Senator Hunter asserted that the Academic Charter language should not be adjusted to accommodate the occasional hire. He acknowledged that Universities have the freedom to enter into individual contract and he did not see motion as an appropriate place to change the way a University is run.

The motion failed. (one yes, one abstention and eleven no)

Senator Reed moved and David Wright seconded motion 02-17:  
Approve March 17-21, 2003 as Spring Break and  
the Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 Semester calendars

The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Reed moved and David Wright seconded motion 02-18:  
Approve General Catalog wording change to page 34 (1999-2001) regarding  
Credits required to earn a second bachelors degree

Undergraduates earning two or more bachelors degrees concurrently need to successfully complete the requirements for each degree and major. The total credit minimum is 124 (excluding Doctor of Pharmacy degree).

Furthermore, the Drake graduate who returns for a second undergraduate degree must complete requirements for the second major/degree; this student does not need to complete Drake Curriculum general education requirements and has no minimum number of credits required. A minimum of 30 credits is required for the non-Drake graduate who applies for a second undergraduate degree. The student must meet the Drake Curriculum requirements and requirements for the new degree/major.

Senator Dean Wright indicated he was glad to see this action and was in favor of the motion. Senator Spencer asked for a clarification of an example. Could a person earn two degrees with 124 credits? The answer was yes, it would be possible especially because of the Drake Curriculum.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Senator Dean Wright wondered why there is the 124 credits rule required for the bachelor's degree.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10pm  
Submitted by Secretary, Nancy Geiger