

Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting

April 14, 2004

The regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Nancy Reincke. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Alexander, Allen, Bartschat, Clapham, Courard-Hauri, Dougherty Esposito, Gillespie, Lovell, Lyons, Morrow, Petersen, Rankin Reed, Reincke, Rozycki, Schaefer, Soltis, Vitha, Wade  
Absent: Bartschat, Clapham, Lyons, Shulman

The March 2004 minutes were accepted.

Report from President Maxwell –

- The Fiscal Year 2005 budget goes to board with the provision of 1.8 million new monies marked for salaries. This will be a balanced budget while using a 6% payout from endowment. This represents a lot of hard work coming together.
- The stadium project continues to go well. A recent large commitment has been received and will be announced soon. It will move Drake towards having raised 6 million of the total 10 million dollars.
- The Board of Trustees will meet this month. There are three major agenda items: approving the Fiscal Year 2005 budget; holding a discussion of the joint venture between SJMC and CBPA proposal (no vote is expected or planned) and discussion of issues surrounding the enrollment capacity report. That report is an interim effort and President Maxwell reminded the body bigger is not automatically better. Currently the Fall 2004 entering first year class is projected at 850 students and that may be the capacity which Drake can handle.

Report from Provost Troyer

- The Spring term is in the season of awards events. The Provost shared that there was a change made a couple of years ago to move the recognition of staff service longevity to a breakfast and a luncheon to honor the faculty promoted or receiving tenure. These have been pleasantly received.
- There are three commencements coming up, the Law event on Saturday evening and two on Sunday, May 9<sup>th</sup>. He encouraged strong attendance from the faculty. He indicated that there will be a new procedures handled through the Dean's Office for faculty attendance sign-up.
- The salary allocation procedures are proceeding. He indicated it has been a delightful exercise to give salary increases.
- There will be a summer retreat which will focus on the upcoming accreditation. It is no longer just an administrative function and faculty will be invited to join in on June 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, a Monday and Tuesday.

Senator Lovell asked what the student/faculty ratio would be with the enrollment capacity report. Provost Troyer indicated that the goal is 15 to 1 and currently Drake sits at 14.5 to 1.

Report from President Reincke

- There will be one more senate faculty meeting on April 28<sup>th</sup>. She reminded the group that there are multiple committees to be staffed for the upcoming year.
- A group has been organized to plan for the Faculty/Staff Center: Karl Schaefer, Susan Smith, Brand Toussaint, Suzanne Brown, Charlene Skidmore, and Gary Johnson.

Unfinished Business: None presented

New Business:

Senator Petersen moved and Gillespie seconded motion **04-07**:  
*Motion to approve Spring Break March 21-25, 2005*

Senator Lovell indicated that he supports the coordination of the Spring Break with the Des Moines school but noted that year's break was late in the semester.

Senator Reincke asked what the ideal time would be for the break. Senator Schaefer noted his concern was that this discussion is a part of the whole calendar issue. He believed that the break should be in the middle of the term. Senator Lovell was comfortable with the break being in the tenth week.

Motion passed on a voice vote

Senator Schaefer moved and Wade seconded motion **04-08**:

*approve the Academic Calendar of 2005-2006 and 2008-2009*

Senator Petersen said she was OK with 05-06 dates but desires in 07-08 for a longer break in January. Senator Allen agreed. Senator Doughty noted that the short turn around between the grading deadline and the start of the semester causes a couple of hard days for administrative tasks which must be done after grading, such as probation and suspension actions. He did not want the entire calendar to run by those who do poor academically.

There was a short review of the calendar creation guidelines which do give Faculty Senate the ability to change the start date within a set range of dates. Senator Morrow stated that there will always be some good times and there will never be a perfect fit. Senator Courard-Hauri stated that for programs that have field trips, the later start was better.

There was a comment and discussion as to why the semester was as long as it is, the 73 class days, and collective memory stated that this was reviewed not too long ago and Drake's semester is within the range of peer institutions.

An amendment was made and seconded to change the Spring 2009 semester start date to January 20 from January 12. The motion passed on a voice vote with one vote against.

The motion as amended passed on a voice vote.

Senator Gillespie moved and Alexander seconded motion **04-09**:

*Amendment to Article VI of the Academic Charter by adding sections for:  
Stopping the Tenure Clock or Tenure Clock Extensions*

At the request of Provost Troyer, a group convened consisting of Maura Strassberg, Catherine Gillespie, LouAnn Simpson and David Courardi-Hauri to draft a university wide policy. Ms LouAnn Simpson was invited to speak to the Senate. She stated that the reality had been that various faculty had been dealt with on a case by case basis differently and there was desire to have a

uniform manner to follow when a faculty person desired or needed a chance to adjust the timeline of gaining tenure. There is AAUP language available for this and the group reviewed other institutions policies. The summary of that review is that there are some institutions which have no policy at all and others range in how they allow for adjustments to the tenure timeline. The motion states some automatic reasons for a first extension and does allow for a second extension. The group did want to provide for special circumstances but did not create an exhaustive list.

Senator Rozoycki expressed that he wanted to handle all cases even though they all are not expressly stated in the policy. He wondered if the life event needed to be directly associated with the person, that is a concern when a junior faculty steps in to cover in a departmental crisis, would that be considered. Both Ms Simpson and Senator Gillespie replied that they thought the policy language was broad enough to cover such an event. Senator Reincke was concerned that she did not want this to be a way for junior faculty to be taken advantage of in a department.

Senator Reincke indicated that she had raised issues with the committee concerning the difference in this proposed policy and the AAUP suggested language makes two one year extensions automatic. She wanted to note that this proposed policy is less giving.

Senator Courard-Hauri stated that the group did talk about the varying length of time of any one life event. He did think it was reasonable to have a high bar to ask for a second extension. There was Senate discussion of possible reasons for one extension during the tenure timeline and a comment that many persons may not want to extend the time before they are eligible and achieve tenure. The policy not to give a poor performer more time to grow, it is to acknowledge that outside circumstances may affect good work.

Senator Vitha asked if the departmental impact of how they may have been able or must handle the absence of the person was taken into consideration when this was drafted. Ms Simpson stated that there was not discussion on university impact. The group was asked to draft a policy which could be used by all units and allow for case by case basis reviews. Some persons may continue to teach a regular load and yet desire assistance with their tenure timeline.

Senator Gillespie stated that the existence of this policy opens up a possibility for a person to request an extension rather than forces one on them. The mere knowledge that it is a university wide policy which is available to them may assist when recruiting faculty. Senator Morrow supported the motion. He saw a difference in adjusting the review process based on performance vs. acknowledging and granting an extension based on a 'life event'. Senator Rozycki stated that there are other ways for a faculty member to have more time such as a decreased course load. He supports this policy with the knowledge that it is not the only option available.

Motion passed on a voice vote

Senator Petersen moved and Vitha seconded motion **04-10**:

*approve new version of Nondiscrimination Statement and  
approve Statement on Diversity for use in Faculty Manual and other University documents*

Senator Reincke gave some background on the motion. The first intent was to add gender identity to the statement and then Human Resources Director Vanessa Macro assisted to further bring the

wording up-to-date. Senator Lovell liked the wording of the two statements especially the inclusion language and even the suggested addition from Ms Macro which was distributed as a handout.

Senator Lovell moved and Esposito seconded to amend the wording as offered in the handout.

#### Statement on Diversity

Drake University is committed to being an inclusive, multicultural community in which differences are welcomed, respected and valued. The University's goal is to ensure that Drake students, faculty and staff are able to function effectively as members of diverse local, national and global communities. Mindful of its ~~responsibility to serve as a leader in promoting social justice and equality~~ *commitment to the principles of diversity, equality of opportunity, and human dignity*, the University reserves the right to take affirmative action in pursuing the goal of creating a society in which all may thrive.

#### Nondiscrimination Statement

The principles of equal access and equal opportunity require that all interactions within the University be free from invidious discrimination. Drake University therefore prohibits all forms of discrimination, including discrimination based upon race, color, national origin, culture, creed, religion, age, physical ability, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or veteran status.

For additional information on nondiscrimination policies, including Title IX, contact the Director of Human Resources for Drake University.

The amendment passed.

There was discussion of whether or not socio-economic status should also be listed. The discussion included that it might actually hurt Drake's ability to offer financial assistance to worthy students. It was noted that this is included in the Arts & Sciences statement.

Motion passed on voice vote

President Maxwell stated that these two will go to the Board of Trustees for approval. President Reincke hoped that the All Staff Council would want to also review and endorse these statements.

Senator Alexander moved and Petersen seconded motion **04-11**:

#### *abolish Institutional Planning & Review Committee (IPRC)*

Senator Reincke stated that there was some dissatisfaction with the current operation of IPRC. It was started with good intentions and she acknowledged that President Maxwell had desired to have a continuing body after RPAC, but the conditions which made RPAC valued and productive do not exist. Senator Allen indicated that this made sense to her but she was very concerned that Senate had previously abolished the Budget and Business Affairs Committee when IPRC was established. She strongly felt that the faculty needed a group which dealt with the budget. She did not want to end up with no IPRC and no Budget committee. There were others present who shared Senator Allen's concern as to the absence of both groups.

President Maxwell offered two observations. One in terms the financial issues, there is now a feature which did not exist in the past in that the President of Faculty Senate sits on the Senior Advisory Council (SAC) and two the desire with IPRC was to maintain the discourse of RPAC, a group which is ongoing and is looking at the big picture and priorities. It is harder to do when the conversation is not as focused as it was with RPAC. He wants to have an ongoing forum for this discussion and wants to engage the faculty and staff in the long term health of Drake.

Upon proper motion, the Senate approved to continue past 5:00 p.m.

Senator Alexander offered that he found the discussion healthy but what was lacking was the act of doing something. He did not feel IPRC was getting things done in a consistent way. Senator Morrow offered that everything we do is in the context of the budget. Senator Allen saw the IPRC as the vision committee and the budget committee could get into the ability to consult on the budget and make recommendations. She saw them as separate.

Senator Lovell indicated that he had from the beginning saw IPRC as a strange committee. It is elected but yet does not meet on a regular basis and the minutes are not published. If the main purpose is to be advisory, then it does not need to be elected.

There was a discussion of what makes any committee function well especially a group whose topic is the budget. That group needs to have an understanding which does not automatically come to everyone. Senator Rozycki noted that he was the last chair of the Budget and Business Affairs Committee when they voted themselves out of existence. He felt there was a collective ignorance of the vast issues that drive the budget, that they were not effective and that gaining information was difficult.

There was a sense in the body to not act today but use this session as a discussion of the whole issue. President Maxwell stated that he appreciated today's discussion of faculty perception.

The motion was tabled until next session

At 5:15 p.m. the Senate moved into Executive Session to consider the Drake Medal and Honorary Degrees.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Submitted by Secretary, Nancy Geiger