

The regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Bartschat. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Bartschat, Courard-Hauri, Cramer, Dore, Fairbairn, Koch, Lyons, Nelson, Reed, Saylor, Simpson, Wrenn,

Absent: Esposito, Evans, Freeman-Miller, Klipec, Reincke, Vandegrift, Younger, Wright

Upon proper motion and vote, April 2011 minutes were accepted.

#### President Maxwell Report:

President Maxwell complimented the Senate for its work throughout the academic year and noted that issues will continue to require the faculty's attention.

#### Provost Renner Report

Provost Renner encouraged faculty to attend commencements as this is important event for students and their families. He thanked the Senate for their efforts this year concerning the very important curriculum discussion.

#### Report from President Bartschat

President Bartschat referred to his previously distributed report. He also thanked the Senate for their work this year concerning the Drake Curriculum and related matters.

#### New Business:

Senator Dore moved and Saylor seconded **Motion 11-24:**

Create DCAC (Drake Curriculum Analysis Committee) as a Faculty Senate committee

Charge: The Drake Curriculum Analysis Committee (DCAC; formerly the Drake Curriculum Analysis and Planning **Committee**) is responsible for assessing achievement of the student learning outcomes drawn from the Drake Mission, and evaluating the effectiveness of the Drake Curriculum and related experiential and co-curricular programs in contributing to the achievement of those outcomes. DCAC will provide regular summaries of the student learning data to the Faculty Senate, University Curriculum Committee, and the Provost, and make recommendations as appropriate for ongoing improvement of the general education curriculum and related programs.

Specific responsibilities of the committee include:

- Work with the Director of Assessment and the Director of Institutional Research to
- develop a rolling plan for assessment of learning outcomes drawn from the mission explication and the Drake Curriculum
- evaluate the data for evidence of student learning and make recommendations for program improvement to the University Curriculum Committee and other bodies as appropriate
- evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment instruments and procedures and revise the assessment plan accordingly.

- Encourage participation by faculty, staff, and students in assessment procedures.
- Report assessment results on a regular basis to the Faculty Senate, the University Curriculum Committee, the Provost, and to other groups on campus as needed.
- Consult with the Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment regarding faculty and staff development programs on teaching and assessing the essential skills and knowledge needed to achieve Drake Curriculum outcomes.
- Liaise with the colleges and schools to share general education and program assessment data that is useful to each.

Membership:

- Six faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to three year terms. The faculty representatives will include one each from the Colleges of Business, Journalism, Education, Arts and Sciences (including the School of Fine Arts), and Pharmacy, and one representing Cowles Library.
- 1 representative drawn from the University Curriculum Committee – normally the vice chair – one year term
- Director of Assessment (ex officio)
- Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment (ex officio)
- Assistant Dean of Students (ex officio)
- Manager of Instructional Technology (ex officio)

The committee will be chaired by a faculty member holding the rank of associate or full professor, the term to last for one year; after the first year of DCAC's existence, any faculty member appointed to the chair's position must previously have served on the committee for a minimum of one year..

In appointing faculty, the Senate Executive Committee should give consideration to the level of involvement of individual faculty members with the Drake Curriculum (such as past participation in teaching FYS or AOIs) or with college, school, or program assessment.

Initial terms will be staggered so that committee openings occur on a three-year rotating basis. Two representatives will be appointed for each term of service, paired as follows: Business and Education, Pharmacy and Cowles Library, and Arts and Sciences and Journalism.

Note: historically, the Student Senate has appointed a representative to DCAP, often the chair of the Student Senate's Academic Affairs Committee. We suggest that this student might be better placed on the University Curriculum Committee than on the newly constituted DCAC, as the UCC's mandate to review Drake Curriculum courses and cross-college programs aligns more closely with academic affairs decisions directly affecting students.

The motion passed without dissent or discussion.

Senator Dore moved and Saylor seconded **Motion 11-25:**

*Approve changes to the Sabbatical Leave Policy (section 4.342 and 4.341 of the Faculty Manual)*

Dean of Students Sentwali Bakari was introduced and asked to present proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct (Code) as distributed for the April 2011 meeting. Mr. Bakari opened by asking if there were questions. Senator Dore inquired why a student was prohibited from being represented by an attorney. She stated it seemed to strip them of a right. Mr. Bakari responded that it was not meant to stop them from having someone but rather to not have their attorney facilitate the hearing process.

Senator Simpson asked about something which she said could be seen as a formatting issue. She noted that the Title IX heading (referring to the law) was in the front section rather than in Section B. Mr. Bakari indicated he would look into it. She continued noting the new section on page 7 has a list and Appendix H & I are referenced. She asked if these were to be separate. He said yes.

Mr. Bakari was asked what definition would be used for “unreasonably disruptive” within the Interim Administrative Leave (I.J.15) section Procedure (III.B). Senator Simpson stated that unreasonable is a subjective term and was concerned with who would be the person to determine when disruptions were unreasonable. She noted that different language is used in other places in the document and she expressed a desire for consistency of language. Mr. Bakari indicated the reason for the language was to allow for individual assessments and determinations. Senator Schneider asked where the ‘unreasonable’ language had come from and the reply was from Drake’s legal counsel.

Provost Renner offered that there are two sets of rights in a conflict: the accused, who is not yet convicted, and the victim rights. He offered that an accused person’s very presence on campus may be of concern for many. He continued that the language is meant to allow for a threshold to exist for ‘disruptive’ behavior. President Maxwell indicated he sees two current issues: a consistency of language and a principle which was desired to be accomplished via the new language. It was determined that this matter should again be discussed with Drake’s legal counsel

Senator Dore noted that the addition of an Interim Administrative Leave. Mr. Bakari indicated this is the current practice yet the language is new to the document. Senator Dore stated this practice seems like an indefinite suspension for the student and suggested that ‘due cause’ language be considered for the Interim Administrative Leave.

Senator Simpson referenced page 9, subsection D and asked a question about the terminology of “resolution by agreement”. She noted that within that process in the past, it was a discussion rather than a formal hearing, yet on page 19, there is a reference to formal mediation and the “resolution by agreement” process. Mr. Bakari indicated there would not be mediation with certain kinds of assault. Senator Simpson suggested the language be made clearer as to when formal mediation is not an option but the resolution through agreement is the option. It was also noted that page 19, section 7, subsection B contains processes which are not clearly defined such as mediation when the resolution by agreement, an informal process, is used.

Senator Dore asked to have addressed the University’s actions when there are pending criminal charges. She stated that she sees a student being penalized who chooses to remain silent even though it is their right. She agreed that the institution needs the option to proceed with their hearings, yet the concern remains that a student’s silence during that hearing should not be taken

as guilt. Mr. Bakari indicated he would look forward to suggested wording. The desire is to not put the institution at risk nor the student.

Senator Dore continued with an objection to the issue of seemingly no right to appeal with less than expulsion or suspension. She noted that the process stops with the Dean of Students office. She felt that stripping a student of scholarship money can be a severe sanction. Mr. Bakari indicated these cases were minor violations which fell into this category. He offered that the intent is to not pull in a hearing officer for minor infractions and he would take this feedback and review the language.

President Bartschat asked if students had been involved in making these changes. The reply was no. President Bartschat and Provost Renner suggested that Senators Simpson, Dore and anyone else who has specific concerns should work with Dean of Student Bakari to reconcile the language concerns. It was noted that this version of the Code of Student Conduct is desired for implementation for Fall 2011. Faculty Senate action is desired before the document goes to the Board of Trustees for their approval. At this point, it was stated that the September Board of Trustees meeting will be the next opportunity for the changes to be on their agenda. Senator Cramer reminded the body that soon a new staff position will be filled with someone who may be able to help.

President Maxwell offered that a past event brought to light the absence, within the Code, of the authority to suspend a student who had criminal charges pending. He did not wish for the University to go without such authority for too long. A short discussion was held concerning the Senate taking a tentative vote. Several Senators indicated they did not feel they could support such action with the concerns they had heard. Additionally, suggestions to amend the Code language 'on the fly' during Senate were not endorsed.

Mr. Bakari noted he did not want to have the institution 'bogged' down and wanted the institution to have flexibility in handling individual cases.

President Maxwell urged the Senate to consider this matter at the September 2011 meeting, so the Board of Trustees can address the matter shortly thereafter.

The Senate went into Executive Session to consider the nominations for Honorary Degrees & Drake Medals.

The Executive Session ended at 5:00 p.m. Secretary, Nancy Geiger