

DRAKE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting
January 29, 2003

The regular meeting of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Art Sanders. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Cairns, Dougherty, Esposito, Gillespie, Goldford, Hunter, Lovell, McKnight, Parsa, Reed, Reincke, Sanders, A, Sanders, B, Schaefer, Shulman, Simpson, Soltis, Vitha, Wade, Wright. Absent: Klugman

December 2002 minutes were accepted as presented.

Report of President Maxwell

--As stated at the January Senate Meeting held in executive session, President Maxwell welcomed questions to be sent to him which he would then address at Senate. He received one questions concerning the progress of the search for a Vice President of Advancement and the progress of the Development Office. He reported that the Development office's work with the consultant on a good prospect tracking system has resulted in extensive constructive leads which were used well as Campaign Drake drew to a close. The Annual Fund program is of interest to non-alumni givers, such as foundations, as they perceive Drake's strength among its employees and alumni. President Maxwell indicated that the whole operation is looking better than one year ago, but more work needs to be done. There are two Vice President candidates being considered at this point. Each is a sitting Vice President at an educational institution.

-- The Diversity Audit Report is here and is being reviewed by the President and Provost. The report will be brought forward to the campus community in the near future and there will be a time for discussion on the various recommendations. Some of the actions suggested are creative and some expensive, but he hoped that there will be an engaged conversation on campus and with the local and alumni communities about the diversity issues.

Senator Lovell said he had read the memo about the salary compensation and yet he desired information to know if the entire package had been adopted by the Board of Trustees. The answer was that yes, the two step process was accepted and the Board desired reassurance that that the merit poll of money would be utilized in conjunction with a performance based appraisal system. Provost Troyer reminded the body that the evaluation process is quite uneven amongst non-faculty positions. He continued that the faculty minimums will be met at the unit level not guaranteed that every faculty will be at the 45% level. President Maxwell recognized that the least happy person with the two year plan will be the person who is currently at or above the minimum, but this plan is view as the fair and ethical way to distribute salary monies.

Report from Provost Troyer

- The Deans are working on the process to distribute the funds and announcements will be made as appropriate.
- The various Dean position searches progress with one candidate on campus today and more scheduled in the next two weeks.
- Provost Troyer indicated that a point of concern in higher education is the set of positions labeled graduate assistantships. These positions have declined around Drake over the years, but the issue of the assigned work load to appropriate compensation for the quantity and quality of work will need to be addressed in the next months.

--During the next weeks, faculty will receive messages from Provost Troyer concerning the new administrative software, Banner. The system will begin to be used for the Summer and Fall 2003 registration. Not all features will begin in March and April 2003. There will be an announcement of training times for faculty. He expects that students will adapt to this faster than the faculty and staff.
-- The First Year Experience Committee and other venues have mentioned advising in recent meetings and reports. This is a broad concept which will need to be talked about in the future.

Senator Goldford expressed a concern about advising and the accountability for program requirements when a student self registers, perhaps without faculty consultation. Provost Troyer indicated that now the message sent to the parents and student is two faced. On one side is the statement of student accountability in the catalog and on the other is the statement that the student must consult with a faculty advisor concerning their program.

Report from President Sanders

-- President Sanders added that at the Board of Trustees meeting this past weekend, he felt the Board is sensitive to the salary erosion over the years and there was support for taking action now. He agreed that there was concern among the Board about the merit money pool's usage without a good system of yearly evaluations of personnel, both faculty and staff.
-- President Sanders ask a question of the body about the issue of a plus/minus grading system. He desired to know if there would be interest in considering this topic for the undergraduate and graduate populations. Using a show of hands system, there was great interest in exploring the issue at Drake.

Senator Shulman asked where he should go to find his current merit standing. Provost Troyer indicated that all merit programs are college based and suggested he check with his dean.

Unfinished Business: None presented

New Business:

Senator Goldford moved and Simpson seconded motion **03.05**

change to Faculty Manual section 4.52

4.527 Split Sabbatical Option

After three years of full-time service at the University, members of the tenure-track faculty who have successfully completed a three-year, pre-tenure review may apply for a one (1) semester (one-half year) "split sabbatical" at 70 percent salary. After seven (7) years of full-time service and upon completion of a successful tenure review, faculty who have taken the first half of a split sabbatical become eligible (and are expected) to apply for the second half of the split sabbatical.

If adopted, the new policy will become effective with the 2003-2004 academic year.

Provost Troyer indicated that this sabbatical method had come to his attention when he was on an evaluation team. The institution's faculty spoke highly of this split sabbatical option and he mentioned it in his weekly announcements and received lots of positive feedback. The Deans are looking at this new possibility as a recruiting asset.

Senator Gillespie asked about the 70% and whether it is spread over a semester or over a year. Provost Troyer said that there are several misunderstandings of the sabbatical reimbursements. This turns out to be 85% over the full year. Senator Goldford asked if the sabbatical after tenure actually puts pressure on the tenured person to actually take the second sabbatical. Provost Troyer replied that by the third or fourth year of the tenure process, there is a sense of knowing whether a person

will make the goal and this short sabbatical can assist in pulling together the last pieces. Senator Schaefer expressed a concern that this seemed like robbing Peter to pay Paul. The person who uses the first part has less time to use the second time. Provost Troyer expressed that not too many would need to use this option. Its availability is what gives the qualified person a chance.

Senator Lovell desired a broader discussion of the sabbatical policy which restricts the person to 70% salary, especially considering the overall low salaries here at Drake. He asked if the sabbatical program is a money maker for the institution. Provost Troyer replied that the 30% salary does not cover the costs of the sabbatical program throughout the institution. The number of persons taking sabbatical has remained stable over the years at Drake but the whole concept is hard to explain outside the institution.

Senator Schaefer asked when does the 70% start and stop, considering the summers. He understands that there is a cost to the program which enables the intangible of a refreshed faculty and that is a strong case for the program. Provost Troyer agreed that with the refreshed faculty and indicated he provides a one page summary of what the sabbatical activities to the Academic Affairs committee of the Board and this helps them to see the value of sabbaticals.

Senator Hunter expressed a concern with the writing of the paragraph. He indicated that some will say "when I am on tenure track; I need to take the sabbatical; and then when I am tenured I can not afford to take the second half". He desired the parenthetical statement in the last sentence (*and are expected*) to be deleted.

An amendment was made, seconded and passed to delete the phrase.

Senator Goldford asked if someone is awarded this sabbatical; then is it seems as merit recognition. Senator B Sanders asked if someone coming in with credit towards tenure be eligible. Provost Troyer replied that he thought that would be reviewed on a case by case basis. Senator Esposito asked if the current Humanities Center grant with the two course release would be affected. Provost Troyer did not see this program affecting that program.

President Sanders thanked the group for the good discussion of the whole sabbatical issue; and the Provost has related that the percentage was established long ago. President Sanders will ask the Executive Committee to open up a general discussion at the faculty level on this issue.

The motion passed.

Senator B Sanders moved and Simpson seconded motion **03-06**:

To establish a task force to examine, report on, and, if necessary, make recommendations concerning procedures AND STANDARDS for tenure and promotion across the University.

Responsibilities:

The All University Task Force on Tenure and Promotion will review tenure and promotion procedures AND STANDARDS in each college. After such review, the Committee will recommend to the Faculty Senate and the colleges/schools and library any changes in those procedures deemed appropriate to bring such procedures AND STANDARDS in line with the University Charter and By-Laws and AAUP standards. This review should be completed and submitted by the end of the Fall 2003 semester.

Rationale:

Such a task force will encourage consistency in standards across disciplines and across colleges/schools.

Another major task will be to ensure that faculty with joint appointments (between disciplines and/or colleges and schools) or who actively participate in interdisciplinary programs beyond their department of appointment will be evaluated in a fair and consistent manner. There is some question regarding current procedures for promotion and tenure of a faculty member with a joint appointment.

The task force will not be another level of review of individual tenure and promotion decisions. We have the Faculty Senate Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee as well as University and AAUP procedures and guidelines available for protection if college and schools procedures and guidelines are not followed.

Task Force Membership:

The task force will consist of one member each from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business and Public Administration, the School of Education, the School of Journalism and Mass Communications, the College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, the Law School, and the Library.

Selection Process:

The faculty of each College/School/Library, by methods of their own choosing, will select their representative by February 28, 2003. The chair of the task force will be chosen from those selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Senator Simpson asked if there had not been previous mention of adding the words 'guidelines' to the motion? President Sanders agreed and suggested that should be accepted as friendly amendment.

Senator Dougherty noted that the Fine Arts area has procedures and requirements which are based on the discipline which would not easily be replicated in other colleges. President Sanders noted that this Task Force would not be creating the procedures but would review if indeed scholarship was being considered in all disciplines. He continued that this group would not be deciding if someone should have tenure, rather review the procedures which are to be followed to achieve tenure. Senator Dougherty noted that in our department; we use the college level requirements and then at the department level add some needs for the candidates and he remained consistent with his concern about the phrase: 'consistent across disciplines'.

Senator Gillespie shared the concern for the committee's review to decide if each unit has a broad enough definition to encompass what is appropriate in every discipline noting the great technology changes and several of mediums used to effectively teach. She hoped that the Arts & Sciences committee member would bring examples of department specific documents to the Task Force for review. Senator Schaefer indicated that the document from the Library does not require scholarship per se, but is based on service. He offered this as an example of a discipline specific difference that would be encounter by the Task Force.

Senator Hunter indicated that some committees have the function of a committee and others have the function to take actions, such as Academic Freedom & Tenure (AFT). This Task Force has the charge to recommend only; there is not specific action authority. Senator Lovell noted that the language under responsibility does indicate a narrower set of procedures. Senator B Sanders indicated that he was confused about the intent of this Task Force and was in favor of consistency but remained concerned that there is too much tinkering at the local level. President A Sanders expressed his concern that is scope is too narrow; the review will not get off the ground.

Senator Vitha asked what happens to the report when it arrives at the Faculty Senate. He indicated that any inconsistencies found sounded like a Dean's issue to him. He did not want to waste six people's time. President Sanders indicated that reports which involve the faculty are very appropriate to come to the Faculty Senate and depending on the recommendations, and then the report may be sent to a variety of places and committees.

Provost Troyer said that if the motion passed, he would ask that the national AAUP person involved with promotion and tenure issues to review the various college/school/library existing documents. This outside review would be given to the Task Force as a starting point. Provost Troyer would pay for this outside work.

Senator Lovell again desired a consistency in the procedures and standards language. He desired change in the rationale language.

An amendment was made and seconded to add AND STANDARDS to the motion and the rationale language instead of the guideline language. The amendment passed. The motion as amended passed, after proper motion and vote.

President Sanders will notify in the next day or two the Deans of the membership selection needs for Task Force.

The proposed guidelines for mass emails will be presented as unfinished business at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Submitted by Secretary, Nancy Geiger