

D R A K E U N I V E R S I T Y
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting
October 17, 2001

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, Clapham, DeLaet, Gillespie, Klugman, Lovell, McKnight, Parsa, Phillips, Pomeroy, Rankin, Reed, Sanders, A., Sanders, B., Symonds, Wright, David, Wright, Dean
Absent: Hunter, Simpson

Upon proper motion and vote the minutes of the September 2001 meeting were approved.

Remarks from President Maxwell

--President Maxwell reminded the body of a previous campus wide announcement concerning his assumption of direct oversight of Institutional Advancement. This began when Angela Voos resigned her position as Vice President of Institutional Advancement. A consultant is currently on campus and is auditing various processes and the overall status of the Campaign for Drake. President Maxwell is confident that the campaign goal will be met.
-- There will be a public forum on the Role of the University in Times of National Crisis. This will be a panel event moderated by Michael Gartner.
-- Tomorrow there will be a campus forum on the Strategic Plan. There is a desire to obtain feedback on the various goals and comments concerning their priorities. He was pleased at the attendance at the Convocation and the immediate feedback gathered at that session.

Remarks from Provost Troyer

-- On Tuesday, Oct 23rd will be a forum on campus which is co-sponsored by the National Conference for Community and Justice. The title of the session will be "Respecting Our Diversity in Times of Crisis: Can We Meet the Challenge?" Religious leaders from throughout the central Iowa area are expected to attend and participate.
-- The HEIR Survey is due out soon. The Provost requested the faculty's cooperation with the completion of this instrument.
-- The Web Policy Committee will be completely staffed soon. The Provost would like two faculty, especially persons interested in the legal issues of this medium, to join the committee. Please contact him if you are interested.
-- The Banner software implementation progress is beginning. He is pleased with the work of Susan Ladd, Project Manager and Paul Morris, CIO. The implementation should take 30 months.

Remarks from President Phillips

-- Among the four items tabled during last year Senate's action, was a proposed change to the Budget & Business Affairs Committee. That Committee has withdrawn that motion.
-- October 17, 2001 is the 60th anniversary of the Senate. President Harmon was inaugurated 60 years ago and immediately brought about faculty governance.

Unfinished Business:

Senator A. Sanders moved and David Wright seconded motion 01-28:
Create a standing committee of the Faculty Senate
Institutional Planning & Review Committee (IPRC)
President Phillips noted that Senate Executive Committee had altered some language from the previously distributed motion as requested during the September meeting. Previous

question was called but failed for a lack of a second.

President Maxwell expressed his concern that this is a large group. He reminded the group that this committee will be an advisory group with the Cabinet to the President. It was not proposed to be a representative body. He expressed a concern that the size will affect the effectiveness of the committee. Senator Allen shared the concern noting not only the scheduling issue of a large group but how a large group meeting can become difficult to run. Senator Spencer asked of the President what size her would recommend, such as eight to ten persons. The reply was yes.

President Maxwell suggested that several groups on the membership list already meet with the Provost and President on a regular basis. Perhaps these are various segments to delete as they will not lose contact with central administration. He also wondered if there should be a reduction of the Arts & Sciences representatives.

Senator Parsa said that he was opposed to the committee in the beginning and yet now liked the inclusion of the Deans. They should have the knowledge of what is going on. Senator Allen offered that a reduction in the total faculty, perhaps to three or four, voted from the whole faculty should be considered. President Maxwell offered the insight that the workings of RPAC have not been conducted as 'turf wars'. He noted that this is most likely contrary to what may be believed in the general University community. Senator Symonds was not in favor of including a Dean as a category.

Senator Spencer suggested the group be comprised of six faculty, two elected at large, two from the professional schools and two from Arts & Sciences. There were a series of comments in favor of a reduction in the total number of faculty and how the group might be structured. Senator Allen suggested that perhaps the Assistant and Associate Deans should be invited to sit on the Administrative Council, thus adding them to the groups which have direct access to the President.

Senator Klugman wanted a sense of what the Senate wanted the membership to be before continuing working on the membership as a committee of the whole or sending the issue back to the Executive Committee.

Senator Spencer moved and Parsa seconded an amendment:

Reduce the Faculty to six with at least one from Arts & Sciences and no more than two from any one college or the libraries.

Senator David Wright noted that these are proposed substantial changes and he did not wish to proceed with these without serious consideration. He moved to table the motion. Senator Dean Wright seconded the motion.

Senator Klugman hoped that those who wanted to table the motion are doing solely on the numbers issue and when the motion returns, there will not be another issue which arises to block progress on this committee's creation. Senator DeLaet was comfortable with a lower number of faculty and yet she would want to see how the representation is going to be decided before committing to being in favor of the membership. She supported the tabling motion.

Senator Art Sanders suggested that students serve a one year term. He continued that certainly the individual student might serve more than one term.

The procedural motion to table passed on a voice vote with one vote against.

New Business:

Senator Klugman moved and David Wright seconded motion 02-05:

To create the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Task Force

President Phillips highlighted the keys points of the committee's charge and composition.

Senator Dean Wright asked Carol Miller, Director of Corporate, Sponsored Grant Support Programs, if she was comfortable with this motion. She replied yes.

The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

Senator David Wright moved and Symonds seconded motion 02-06:

Change the Rules & Regulations of the Faculty Senate, section 1.01

Senator Spencer requested clarity on line 17 and 18 concerning the timing of the election and beginning service of the Vice President. There was a friendly amendment was accepted which inserted the phrase "subsequent to the term of the President" after Senate President in line 18. Language offered by President Maxwell was accepted as preferred language "will serve as President in the year subsequent to his/her term as vice president.

Another change was offered and accepted as a friendly amendment in the second paragraph.

Beginning on line 28:

If the Vice-President completes the term of a standing President, for one semester or less that person will continue for one additional academic year Vice President is not precluded from running for Vice-President at the next Spring organizational meeting. If the newly elected Vice-President is in his or her last year of eligible service in the Senate, he or she will be granted one additional year of Senate eligibility service to complete his or her year as President, which would change the established election cycle.

There was a discussion of and examples given of the impact of an additional year of service for either an at-large or unit elected Senator. The body did not oppose the possibility that one member could have three years of Senate service for one term. The amendments were reread.

The motion passed on unanimous voice vote.

President Phillips announced that there would most likely be a Vice President election at the November meeting. Senator Spencer moved and Rankin seconded motion 02-07:

With respect to the continuing allegations and instances of academic corruption in college athletics, and with the reemphasis in Program Review to the centrality of academic integrity in all we do,

1. Drake University shall provide accountability for academic integrity in college athletics by disclosure of institutional conduct balanced with the students' right to privacy. The president shall develop a format that may include but not be limited to the following:

--Public disclosure of the courses including course GPA and instructor completed for all students. No student's grades will be disclosed, or,

-- For each intercollegiate athletic team, public disclosure of the courses enrolled in by team members, the average of the grades given in the course, and instructor of the course, at the end of the semester.

2. Academic counseling and support services for athletes shall be located and controlled by academic counseling and support available for all students.

3. Drake University official shall work toward scheduling athletic contests so as not to

conflict with class attendance.

Wanda Everage, Associate Provost for Academic Services, was invited to join the Senate body for this discussion and comment. Senator Spencer began the discussion with a reference to the 1999 meeting on Drake's campus of a national group which has become known as the Drake Group. Several persons in attendance, Judith Allen, Robert Hariman, Wanda Everage and Dan Spencer, attended that conference. The Knight Commission Report on Athletics was the foundation for their report. Mr Spencer quoted some passages from the report on the bringing the role of athletics back into the perspective of the academic institution. A basic concern is that athletics is big business and must not overshadow academics. This motion is an effort to put the faculty on record as being accountable for the integrity of the institution.

Senator DeLaet commented that she is supportive of academic integrity but has concerns about an individual's privacy. She has reservations of revealing actual student grades if this motion were implemented. She liked the second item in the motion. Senator Allen stressed that the public disclosure would be the course the student is enrolled in, not the individual's grade. She indicated that the intention is not to embarrass the student but to shine the light on the faculty. We want to look at our own practices.

Senator Lovell preferred the language of the Drake Group uses in their brochure, which was previously distributed to the Senators, for use in item one. He also did not think the opening sentence was needed. It is inflammatory.

Senator Dean Wright offered that he believed that the piece does not go far enough. The current language actually will end up blaming the victim. He expressed that what this signals is that the faculty needs to better govern ourselves. If we have easy courses, we should go after that. He did not want to blame the student athlete for taking courses offered in a given semester. Senator Symonds was concerned that faculty need to maintain the right to give grades as they choose. She offered that her sense of this was that it is an Admission issue. Perhaps some persons admitted can not work at the University academic level.

Senator Parsa shared the concerns of Mr. Wright. He did not want to simply blame athletes. He offered that coaches, administration and the faculty are to blame, but to simply publish more information about the students is not fair. Senator Allen was puzzled that this action would be seen as blaming the student. She offered that she is sensitive to that issue, rather she sees this as the faculty looking at ourselves. She continued that grade inflation and courses need to be the focus.

President Maxwell offered two points to the discussion. He wanted the body to realize that posting course gpas, as we do now, can be misunderstood. There is a need to have some interpretative ability to know about what type of student take a certain group of courses. Secondly, he offered his concern as to how the posting of a student's course schedule and its process will be viewed by the outside world, including perspective students. He continued that athletes are not a large group at Drake and with in that group there are those who are performing well academically. He wanted Drake to take a leadership role on the issue of academic integrity but we must be aware of the complete set of messages that are sent with each effort and how those messages, policies and procedures are received.

Upon proper motion and vote, the Senate rules were suspended and the meeting allowed to continue past five p.m.

Wanda Everage spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that the second point addresses

student responsibility. They have some responsibility to be involved in their academic life here at Drake. The 2.0 Rule is a minimum expectation. If Drake holds the students to a standard, then the faculty should be held to a standard as well.

Senator McKnight wondered how this would bring about faculty accountability. He was in favor of that but simply requested to know how this action would bring such a result.

Senator Spencer noted that Drake and other institutions do have shining stars, but there is a large cloud over the student athletes. They provide a good product and we should avoid the victimization of individuals. Mr. Spencer continued that President Maxwell is right that some courses have a high gpa and we must be able to put this into perspective for those outside the academy. He offered that his honors courses have a high overall gpa and that needs to be conveyed in a certain context.

Senator Lovell with some changes, I could support the motion. He thought that a greater question of concern should be that the courses are appropriate to degree completion and the Drake basic admissions standards. He continued that academic counseling should be offered the same for these students as for all students. Senator Klugman agreed with many of these points and yet if Drake has a problem with academics, then this is using the athletes to find bad professors.

Provost Troyer offered that he is sympathetic to the intent of the motion. He continued that he was not convinced that the 2.0 policy has fixed everything. He saw two issues:

1) Faculty in higher education who may ignore academic issues. The intent here is to expose that there are concerns. 2) We ought to know what is going on at Drake. There is a need to know the information and how we go about maintaining our integrity. Senator Allen offered that the body should not get caught up in the details of the motion as that is for the administration to handle. A vote in favor of the motion is a vote for academic integrity, not a vote for a certain set of details. Mr Hariman spoke in favor of the motion. He offered that the language is broad because there are other constraints about which the Provost and President must be concerned. This language gives them faculty support.

President Phillips disagreed with some aspects of the motion language, offering that points two and three are already being done at Drake

Senator Lovell moved and David Wright second motion 02-08:

To send the motion to the Executive Committee to work with the motion's proponents, President Maxwell and Provost Troyer and bring a re-worked motion back to Senate
There was some discussion of whether passing the motion as presented sent a strong and concise message or whether the committee referral would be seen as a weakening of the faculty resolve.

Previous question was called and passed.

With a show of hands vote, the motion to refer to committee passed (8 in favor; 6 against).

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.
Submitted by Secretary, Nancy Geiger