

DRAKE UNIVERSITY  
Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting  
September 5, 2001

President Charles Phillips called the regular meeting of the 2001-2002 Faculty Senate to order at 3:30 p.m. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Allen, Cairns, Clapham, DeLaet, Gillespie, Hunter, Klugman, Lovell, McKnight, Parsa, Phillips, Pomeroy, Rankin, Reed, Sanders, Art, Sanders, Brian, Simpson, Symonds, Wright, David, Wright, Dean  
Absent: None

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

Remarks from President Maxwell

- The Interim Report of the Program Review will be forthcoming shortly. He reminded the assembly of the June announcement which outlined that there will not be a reduction of the six colleges & schools. He is hopeful that the process will continue to move forward.
- There is now a focus on the last stage of the planning process, which is the creation of the strategic plan. He believes there is a broad sense of the institutional goals, which will be made public and used as the basis for open campus meetings.
- The U.S. News college rankings are due out soon. Our overall ranking is the same, third in the overall category with a first ranking in academics. Drake moved up on the Best buy list. There have been some changes in the categories used by the magazine.
- Drake has taken out a full-page ad in a variety of news weekly magazines, regionally, to correspond with the U.S. News ranking debut. Persons that have previewed the ad have reacted favorably.

Remarks from Provost Troyer

- A University level Faculty Development Fund will be set up with \$99,000 monies.
- The Deans Council has been working on a summer school report which is due out soon. The report will contain items which will need to be addressed by Senate.
- There have been several candidates for the Associate Provost position. He hopes to have an announcement next week.
- The Fall 2001 official enrollment is scheduled to be released next week.

Remarks from President Phillips

- The fourteen standing committees of the Faculty Senate, some two hundred positions in all, have been almost filled. This includes student and staff positions.
- He expects to bring tabled Senate motions, from the previous academic year, back to Senate yet this semester. Such as portions of the Academic Charter, possible changes to the charge of the Benefits Committee and the Budget & Business Committee.
- The Drake Curriculum continues to be reworked under the direction and coordination of David Skidmore, the Drake Curriculum Director. By November or December of this year, the Senate may have proposals to consider.
- The Review and Priorities Advisory Committee (RPAC) has recommended two items for Senate review.
  - a) An All University Senate the Student Senate has started to discuss this issue.
  - b) The use of the Registrar's time to be the Secretary of the Senate
- There are issues coming up concerning Senate committees, such as whether the committees are adequately charged, too many or not enough.

Unfinished Business: None presented

New Business:

Senator Simpson moved and Rankin seconded motion **02-01**:

*change section 4.522 of the Faculty Manual*

d. Applications submitted to Deans or administrative supervisors will then be forwarded with recommendation to the ~~Council~~ ~~Deans which would~~ **Provost who will** recommend priorities to the President for the applications submitted up to the limit of available funds. Other things being equal, persons with the longest service since the granting of the last sabbatical leave will be given priority in making the selections for any given year subject to eligibility defined above.

The Provost and Council of Deans presented this amendment to articulate in the Faculty Manual what is current practice at Drake.

The motion carried on a voice vote unanimously

Senator Lovell moved and Parsa seconded motion **02-02**:

*to refer to EPI for examination and possible recommendation the following:*

- a) *current policy of athletic practices not starting before 3:00 p.m.*
- b) *2.0 Participation Rule. EPI is urged to collect and review similar policies from other institutions (MVC, Pioneer League, peer, etc) specifically identifying when the rule is applied*

The suggestion to review the 3:00 p.m. practice start time policy came from the Athletic Task Force. Senator A. Sanders, an Intercollegiate Athletic Council member and a Task Force member, indicated that the IAC view is to have this policy looked at due to the changes in course offerings and scheduling which have occurred in the past ten years. The policy has been in place for over twenty years. He continued to say that the IAC has not discussed the 2.0 Participation policy.

Senator Phillips indicated that the review of the 2.0 policy has come from the Executive Committee discussions last semester. There has not been a request for a change in the rule from any group on campus.

Senator Spencer indicated he had no problem with the policies being looked at but did hope that both policies remain as they are. He reminded the assembly that he was not on campus last January when the 2.0 rule was in the headlines, but he was very proud of Drake for holding their ground. He did indicate a concern that the list of schools presented in the motion are athletic not academic. President Maxwell offered that he is not advocating any rule changes, but there might be appropriateness for a review. The argument of student in transition, from high school or otherwise coming to Drake, having a need to adjust was an example he presented.

Senator Lovell expressed his interest in having the review include institutions such as Notre Dame, Stanford and Harvard. Senator Hunter indicated he was inclined to vote against the motion. Senator Allen expressed that she agreed there is not much to gain. What do we learn if we find out that Drake is the only institution with such a rule.

Senator Simpson expressed her concern that some students are being treated differently due to the application of the rule at the end of the semester. She indicated she was in favor of the motion, not fearful of what would be learned but to know exactly how others are handling these concerns. Senator Parsa indicated he was opposed to the motion. He referred to the examination in the news media last Spring and many reports indicated favorable comments for the institution.

Senator Klugman referred to the 3:00 p.m. practice rule as an historical artifact that was brought about for reasons that no longer apply. This portion of the motion is not a media issue. Senator Symonds expressed that she is not opposed to fine tuning the 2.0 policy, if we are treating some students unequally. But she liked the fact that we had a policy, which was followed. Senator Lovell expressed again his interest in knowing what other institutions have as their policies. Senator A. Sanders replied

the he believed the answer is already known, and we are the only institution, which has this tight of a policy. He did not think that the EPI should investigate. President Maxwell contributed that what data he has supports Senator A. Sanders comments.

Senator Simpson again indicated a concern that students involved in a sport, which does not span two semesters, are treated differently than students whose sport crosses a grading period. Senator Klugman said he did not remember this issue, of when the rule is applied and the implications, was not debated at the time the rule was created and passed. Senator Allen and Spencer both spoke in favor of the rule as is with similar comments regarding the academic nature of its purpose. Senator Hunter did not see a reason to send the 2.0 policy to any committee. He saw a factual difference in the sports themselves and thus equal treatment is not a reason for suggesting this review. Senator DeLaet indicated that the current motion is not persuasive enough for her as it stands.

A motion to divide portion a from portion b of the main motion was made and passed on a voice vote.

Senator Pomeroy indicated that he suspected any change to the 3:00 p.m. practice time would make it harder for athletes to participate in the fine arts. The schedule already accommodates the athletes, who need to have their set practice times. Senator Hunter expressed that he thinks that portion a is a Trojan horse for portion b. He was not aware of any problems with the current policy. Senator A. Sanders indicated that IAC has experienced requests for exceptions. From his standpoint, the practice review request is based on the age of the existing policy. He expressed support for portion A. He was not prejudging the need to change the rule. The examination should include why the rule exists and impacts and ramifications of any possible changes.

Senator Dean Wright indicated that when he advises student athletes, the scheduling process is becoming more difficult due to the increase in classes, which end after 3:00 p.m. Senator Symonds agreed with that experience and expressed that she was in favor of this portion of the motion. Senator A Sanders also was cautious to blame coaches as being inflexible to practice accommodations that may be requested by students.

Portion A of motion 02-02 passed on a voice vote with one abstention.

Portion B of motion 02-02 failed on a show of hand vote ( 5 in favor; 14 against; 1 abstention)

Senator David Wright moved and second by Parsa to bring from the table motion 01-28:  
*Institutional Planning & Review Committee (IPRC)*

Motion to bring from the table passed

Senator A. Sanders pointed out that the current language calls for two-year terms yet other portions of the motion call for three-year cycles. Senator Hunter indicated he would like to see other groups act rather than create another committee. Senator Symonds did not see this as more committee but rather putting an advisory group now functioning under the Faculty Senate umbrella.

President Maxwell stressed that the present committee is close to completing its mandate and he does not see redundancy in this charge. There will be a need for campus input and perspective in many important decisions made in the next few years, including implementation issues. This will be a group submitting their advice not a direct decision making body. There is the possibility for one half of the faculty and staff on the committee to change each year, thus resulting in a very informed campus community.

Senator Allen believes that the basic idea of this committee is very sound. There is a need for persons to come together and talk about issues. She does not oppose the motion but perhaps more thought

should be given to this committee's creation and also strengthen existing committees that are meeting but not functioning. Senator Simpson reminded the body that in recent history we have experienced a form of central administration that did not want to share with the community and she also is sensitive to the question of too many committees. There are opportunities to re-examine our governance and maybe that time has come. She endorsed the motion. Senator Pomeroy agreed with the study of the existing governing structure. He pointed out that the present RPAC has set out several Centers and there is a call for those to be reviewed.

Senator Hunter indicated he would like to see the present RPAC continue and a University Senate should be created which would include a set of persons to advise the President. He continued that Drake has come through a time of conquer and divide and that this motion is premature. RPAC should advise the President. Senator Rankin did not believe that the motion was premature, rather twenty years too late. There have been purge and binge budget realities, she continued, that have brought us to this state. She supported the motion.

The assembly agreed to suspend the rules and continue past 5:00 p.m.

Senator Lovell moved and Hunter seconded to amend the charge  
*"to terminate the committee in two years"*.

The expressed reason was based partly that the productivity of the group was its ad hoc nature.

Senator Dean Wright wondered if the Executive Committee should come back soon with a plan on realigning the senate committees. There were several comments regarding the pros and cons of having any committee with a termination date and its reality of functioning well on such important matters with such a deadline. Senator A Sanders spoke against the amendment indicating that specifying a timelimit is too binding.

Previous question was called and passed.

The amendment failed on a voice vote.

Senator Simpson and Sanders again raised implementation issues with the present motion. The Senators then discussed their willingness to have the details of the committee's creation (staggered terms, voting timelines, etc) handled by the Executive committee. The group agreed that current RPAC members could be elected to this committee.

There was a concern raised by Provost Troyer that some proposed member groups are not constituted in the University's governing documents. Senator Parsa raised the concern that the Deans are not included and do not seem to be always included in University matters.

Senators Spencer moved and Dean Wright seconded motion **02-03**:  
*That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is authorized to  
fix the implementations issues of motion 01-28*

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Senator David Wright reminded the body of the need to consider the replacement of the Senate Vice President. Senator Allen reminded the body that this position was set up when she served as Senate President and she believes it is an important position, but the system is flawed. She suggested the Executive Committee bring a recommendation to the Senate.

Senator Allen moved and David Wright seconded motion **02-04**:  
*That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee bring a plan for elect a*

*Senate Vice President to the October 2001 meeting.*

The motion passed on a voice vote with one vote against.

Senator Phillips introduced Carol Miller, Director Sponsored Programs, to speak to the issue of compliance with emerging Federal regulation concerning higher education led research. There are expected federal policy guidelines forthcoming and Drake will have only a couple of years to comply with appropriate policies and reviews. Senator Simpson asked if this is something that could be addressed by the Human Subjects Research & Review Committee (HSRRC). Ms. Miller indicated that the people could be the same but that the need was for a group to create an institutional plan, which was inclusive of an ongoing educational plan. Senator Klugman indicated he has seen a draft of this task and sees it as a technical task for a small group. Senator Rankin hoped that persons who are current and past members of the HSRRC and the Institutional Animal Care Committee would be considered for this task.

The discussion ended with Senator Phillips agreeing to bring a motion to the October meeting regarding this task.

The assembly adjourned at 5:35 p.m.