

D R A K E U N I V E R S I T Y  
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting  
April 17, 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: Cairns, Gillespie, Hunter, King, Klugman, Parsa, Phillips, Pomeroy, Rankin, Reed, A. Sanders, B. Sanders, Simpson, Spencer, David Wright, Dean Wright, Absent: Allen, Clapham, Lovell

The body moved into Executive Session to consider the nominees for Drake Medal and Honorary Degrees.

Once back in regular session, the minutes of the March 2002 meeting were accepted as presented.

Report of President Maxwell

- The University Strategic Plan will be presented to the Board of Trustees this weekend. The five major goals will be presented and are expected to be approved.
- During the Board of Trustees meeting the fiscal year 2003 budget will be discussed and presented for approval.
- Campaign Drake is down to the last months and President Maxwell hopes to announce a significant gift in the next weeks.
- The Vice President for Institutional Advancement search committee has been meeting.

Senator Spencer asked about the status of Helmick Commons. The reply was that sod has been ordered and is expected to be set yet this month.

Senator Hunter asked about the expected down time for the air conditioning tower problem which has affected various buildings on the east side of campus. The reply was that the broken part will need to be machined. There was a stated belief that the month long down time allowed for contingency repair efforts and the problem will in reality be fixed before the announced date.

Report from Provost Troyer

- The next Dean's search will commence later this semester to fill the recently vacated College of Business & Public Administration position.
- The faculty transitional leave document responses were sparse. The Provost is working with Human Resources Director, Vanessa Macro to insure the guidelines are in compliance with Internal Revenue Service standards.
- A template will be created for annual reports which will need to be submitted, as per Program Review. This reporting effort will begin during the next academic year.

Senator Rankin expressed a concern that the library serials budget has decreased. Provost Troyer indicated that he will take this comment into consideration but many tough issues have to be critically reviewed in the budgeting.

Report from President Phillips

-- The Institutional Planning & Review Committee is meeting and the election for new members begins today.

Unfinished Business – none presented

New Business

Senator A Sanders moved and Parsa seconded Motion **02-20**

To accept Guidelines for Awarding Academic Credit to the  
Center for Special and Professional Studies (CSPS) Offerings

In order to maintain the integrity of academic credit at Drake, courses offered by the CSPS that seek to award academic credit must provide the following for review by the appropriate Department/College Curriculum Committees:

1. A syllabus with course description, course objectives, course content outline, course requirements, and methods of assessment;
2. A description of how the combination of “seat time” and “assignment time” will match the 15 clock hour = 1 credit hour paradigm that is used for regularly scheduled courses;
3. A *curriculum vitae* (not a résumé) from each instructor which validates her/his credentials and qualifications to teach the course; and
4. An annotated course calendar that denotes deadlines for completion of assignments.

These materials must be provided to the Department/College Curriculum Committees and approved prior to solicitation of student interest in the course. A minimum of four weeks prior to the marketing of any course to the general public is offered as a guideline.

If the course to be approved is scheduled as a summer offering, the respective Curriculum Committees must receive the above materials no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> nor the Monday closest to April 15<sup>th</sup> should that date fall on a weekend day.

If an opportunity arises for a unique course to be offered by the CSPS during the summer months when the respective Departmental/College Curriculum Committees are not in session, then the Provost will convene a panel of faculty that have expertise in the content area to evaluate the materials and to make a recommendation for the awarding of academic credit.

With no discussion the motion carried on a voice vote.

The Senate then opened a general discussion on the draft motion on Committee Reorganization. The motion is an expected agenda item for the May 2002 meeting. President Phillips reminded the body that this draft came out of the January 2002 Senate meeting’s discussion of the entire committee structure. This draft was written by the Executive Council and sent to all Faculty Senators, Dean’s Council, Council of Assistant and Associate Deans, and the President’s Cabinet for comment.

President Phillips presented a summary of the set of comments that he had received electronically. These comments addressed concerns of the collapsing of the committees rather than expanding the role of some of the other groups and whether the role of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is going to have an undue role of control over the college/school’s individual curriculum bodies.

Senator A. Sanders indicated that he was originally in favor of the UCC taking over the role of Drake Curriculum (DC) Committee, but he is no longer sure that is appropriate. The work of the DC may be complex enough for a unit by itself. The Outcomes Committee (OC) could still be dissolved into the DC. Senator Sanders stated he was not clear yet what the University wanted the UCC to handle.

Senator Simpson offered that the DC could be a model for the UCC. She sees value in one committee addressing all of these issues as she has known of times when the Educational Policies & Issues (EPI) Committee struggled with the lack of a University wide group to address curricular questions.

President Phillips asked the body whether the draft motion should be kept for a motion in May 2002. Senator A. Sanders asked that persons who might vote against the motion at this time express what their basis for discontent, so that those concerns can be addressed.

Senator McKnight offered that the proposed UCC seemed to have a lot of power in their charge and he is concerned whenever he sees one group with many responsibilities. Senator Simpson offered that from her experience, that is not a concern. The UCC will be more of a consolidation and cooperation committee.

Senator Hunter was in favor of a broad based group to review cross-unit matters but not to dictate to the individual college/schools curriculum offerings. He continued by reminding the body that the more divided up into smaller groups a body is; the less power any one group has. Senator Parsa stated his view was that generally the faculty will not like the motion. There is the continued concern that some group outside the college/school will have some say in the college/school's curriculum.

Senator Gillespie reminded the Senate that there are committees now without power and that is not working. She was in favor of a set of fewer committees that really did proceed and get some actions accomplished.

Senator Hunter believed that his school's curriculum committee did need to continue to decide what was taught in the school but he did not see language in this motion which would take control from his school, rather added possibilities of collaboration. Senator David Wright offered that the UCC would act as a clearinghouse of communication which is why he believed the DC has worked so well this year. He stated that he considers this motion the single best piece of legislation to come before Senate this year.

President Maxwell reminded the body that from Review & Planning Advisory Council (RPAC) discussions there was never a look at control or power; but a desire for a level of discourse and questioning that was not happening at this University currently.

Senator Reed offered that as the Senators share their various reactions to the motion, perhaps it is the title of the UCC which causes undue concern. She offered that perhaps the motion should list more detail duties which the consolidated committee is expected to do.

David Skidmore, Director of the Drake Curriculum, was invited to comment. He stated that he was unclear on how the structure and access would be for the DC Director to this group. He now has direct access to a hard working group. He hopes to begin work on an assessment of the DC and the senior capstone courses. These are just two issues which he would be worried about since the DC would become simply one of several items which the UCC would be addressing. The Outcomes Committee or some group will need to continue with on going review of AOI course proposals. His main issue was the relationship of the DC Director to the UCC. He would prefer to keep the DC committee distinct. If this does not happen, he requested to have clearer wording as to the role of the DC Director. Senator Klugman reminded the group that there is flexibility to have task oriented committees which would complete a task and dissolve. He noted that a small Advisory DC Board might be of use to the program and its director.

President Phillips reviewed what he believed to be the concerns about this motion as

- 1) clarify the charge,
  - 2) what certain activities would fall to UCC from former committee charges
  - 3) what about the DC being a part of the UCC or leave as a separate body
- and 4) if the DC is left as a part of the UCC, then spell out the DC Director's role

Senator Simpson stated that communication and coordination are worthy reasons to take this bold step. Senator Spencer noted that the Drake Curriculum Director has had the flexibility for bouncing ideas and pulling the group together as was needed. He wondered if that access would be maintained. Senator Cairns noted that the Honors Program is not mentioned and should it be addressed. Senator Spencer offered that this motion does have some appeal to him as the motion eliminates five committees. This is a significant first step even though there are some questions.

President Phillips plans to send the next draft to all faculty & staff.

Senator Cairns reminded the body that the Faculty Senate should be considered for review, also.

Vice President Vicky Payseur was present and made a University budget presentation. She distributed two handouts which would be presented to the Board of Trustees this weekend titled Fiscal Year 02 Budget Status at Feb 28, 2002 and Finances at a glance for the Board of Trustees. She noted that there is the effort to get the budget and audited financial statements in line with the new GAAP format. The key items to note are the in the FY02 budget & 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter columns. She offered caution concerning the surplus at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter as most of the revenue has been collected for this year but there are three months of expenses yet to be paid.

Senator Spencer asked what the target draw down from the endowment would be for use for operation expenses. Ms Payseur replied that the FY98 percentage was 11% and the movement is towards a 5% usage in FY06.

Ms. Payseur referenced the five year budget model emphasizing that a very conservative set of numbers were used in the model. That is, very conservative rates of increase for the discount, tuition, enrollments and salaries. There is

accommodation of the Noel Levitt plan which manages the discount rate and income yield from tuition.

With proper motion and second the assembly voted to suspend the rules and continue the meeting past five o'clock.

Many of the original projections made during the Spring 2001 semester have been adjusted due to September 11, 2001 considerations. Both, Ms Payseur and President Maxwell noted the salary increase projections were used at 2%, but stressed that these are very conservative and expected to be higher. The effect of Campaign Drake has also been placed on the five year budget very conservatively.

Senator Spencer indicated he appreciated Vice President Payseur's efforts in preparing and presenting today's discussion item. Provost Troyer repeated the earlier statement that the five year budget has been built on quite conservative assumptions and projections. President Maxwell repeated an earlier stated position that he and all of central administration are concerned with the salary percentages which exist in this budget and have been presented to faculty and staff in recent years

Senator Simpson moved and Gillespie seconded motion **02-21**

*Move to Strike: "and university-wide planning and budgeting."  
from Article XIV of the Academic Charter.*

Senator Simpson noted the Charter language was not representative of the Provost's budget responsibilities. The Vice President of Business and Finance is charged with University wide budgeting. Procedurally, the motion will be addressed in May 2002.

The agenda item from EPI concerning athletic practice times will be held over to May 2002 meeting

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