

The meeting of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President De Laet. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Alexander, Dao, Fejes, Leroux, McCarthy, Pisarski, Reed, Schmidt, Sidon, Simpson, Soltis, Summerville, Swilky, Vitha and Wright.

Absent: Courard-Hauri, Esposito, McCrickerd, Reel Schmidt, Sleister, Urness, Vandegrift

The April 2014 meeting minutes were accepted.

President Maxwell Report:

Fall 2014 enrollment numbers look strong for entering first year (EFR) students. At the April Board of Trustee (BOT) meetings during the STEM construction funds discussion, the concept was pressed that the EFR yield is lower in the science areas and that is due to the facilities. With that urgency, there was a plan B included which is a modular approach to the construction. The money will become a mix of funding options. The reaction of the BOT was to move forward and that enthusiasm was very encouraging. Two physics labs are targeted for this summer. And planning will progress for a larger scale to be planned for summer 2015.

Senator Vitha asked what will be the number of EFR which will allow for salary increases to proceed. President Maxwell replied there is not enough clarity at this time compared to five years ago to have that developed. The big question about what can be done in the fall is not only the numbers but what can be sustainable over the long haul. The Budget Advisory Cmte will be involved in any of those discussions. Senator Vitha expressed concern of the unsustainability without the scenarios and salary increases. Senator Swilky asked if any scenario has been compared to the revenue for 805 to 900 and cost to have the additional students. President Maxwell indicated that we have looked at it and lived it in recent years. It is a concern on the perception and the reality. Senator Swilky finished with noting that only doing a token is just as insulting. President Maxwell stated the budget is built on conservative assumptions and for 870 EFR.

Provost Jones Report:

Provost Jones offered a College of Business and Public Administration update. In consultation with Interim Dean Teri Vaughan, a consultant will be contacted concerning the accreditation. Additionally, there will be an advisory group working with Dean Vaughan.

She also reminded those present to register for August learning symposium. The second half of the day will be devoted to preparation for the Higher Learning Commission. Provost Jones indicated she is becoming a reviewer and receiving HLC training.

Senator Summerville asked about the status of year one of the Quality Initiative (QI) and as part of the 'run up' to the HLC visit what are the reporting requirements. Provost Jones said the QI consultant has completed their first visit and reporting is done electronically by Kevin Saunders and Craig Owens.

President De Laet:

President De Laet thanked everyone for their work on Senate and the committees this year! She expressed appreciation to all. She continued by announcing that additional meeting materials have been placed on the website which is not on the agenda: (a) information about the Campus One Card Project and (b) JTerm 2015 registration summary. President De Laet wanted to make sure everyone knew these items were made available to Senate.

Olivia OHea gave a brief Student Senate report indicating that the group is right now in the process of transitioning to their new elected leadership. She thanked the many faculty who have been helpful and indicated she will be back in this role next year.

Professor Matt Dore and Venessa Macro gave an oral University Benefits Committee (UBC) report which summarized portions of the end of year report. That report is posted on the UBC webpage within the Faculty Senate website.

Three issues were asked of the UBC for special attention.

a) How often does Drake review its benefits policies? When Human Resources proposes changes to a benefit program, those changes are reviewed by the UBC.

b) The early retirement program and what options might be added? There is a Senior Status Program for faculty which has existed. It involves an application process and perhaps it needs to be more broadly advertised. In respect to targeting persons for this program or early retirement, that would be a discrimination issue. President De Laet offered a basis for the question. It was whether the Age/Service combination could be reviewed and updated if appropriate. Senator Fejes asked what precipitated the last change in the early 1990's. Ms. Macro indicated it was a change in accounting liability rules. Mr. Dore indicated another portion of the issue is the health insurance subsidiary premium liability. Senator Fejes asked if a third category could be added to the list such as employed 25 years and regardless of age and if there would be any savings based on new hires being at a lower cost. Ms. Macro stated that could be assessed and shared but there would be an impact on the liability budget for the 25 year model.

c) Should Drake add more investment fund options to the retirement plan? This portion of the benefit package was evaluated and then published in 2013. The thrust of those changes were to move to no manager funds and thus no fees. These are believed to be better funds in the long run. The question is not if there should be more. A consultant (non-commission) talked to the committee and advice was to not add more index type options at this point. Ms. Macro indicated the consultant is a former TIAA employee. Mr. Dore indicated he may have a personal opinion to add more options but the sense of the committee was that there was no reason to change at this time. He noted there is a separate committee which runs the plans. When asked, it was stated that committee is Ms. Macro, Nancy Crittenden, Gary Johnson and Marlene Heuertz. Via the ensuing discussion, Senators expressed interest in learning about the goals of that committee and if it had plans to change any funds. Ms. Macro indicated the committee does have a set of goals and was watching the number of investors in the new options and usage over time.

Mr. Dore expressed his opinion that more review and comparison work needs to be done regarding the health and dental benefits. He also stated he was not sure if the committee is a University committee or merely advisory to Human Resources. President De Laet noted this was worthy of becoming clarified.

Professor John Rozycki gave an oral Senate Budget Committee (SBC) report which summarized portions of the end of year report. That report is posted on the SBC webpage within the Faculty Senate website.

He opened his remarks stating it has been an active committee this year. While he was remiss in mentioning persons on the committee, the report presented to Senate contains his opinions.

1) Mr. Rozycki stated with noting portions of the committee charge which are hard to perform. The charge includes monitoring the budget and includes a section about advising university leadership and yet this is no process for that advice. He asserted that this should not be ad hoc.

2) Noting there are at least three budget committees, he believed there could be a great deal of information available about the budget. He noted that the most recently created unit, the strategic Budget Working Group has not met. Mr. Rozycki offered an editorial comment that a five year cash budgeting plan which is working and based on effective planning will enhance Drake in many ways. He did not believe that having three committees is an effective use of time.

3) Mr. Rozycki endorsed having a long term budget with clear assumptions and forecasted revenues and expenditures which would lead to deriving a net cash flow projection. He offered that new initiatives need to be monitored and reallocations made as appropriate.

Finally, he outlined various areas of focus including: enrollment, retention, establishment of long term goals not just year to year numbers, incorporating graduate and professional strategies into the plan rather than maintaining them as separate. He stated that the SBC having the data available to prepare advice is important. The SBC should be looking at trends of five or ten years. He knows the Board of Trustee subcommittee looks at the endowment and they will do what they will do, in his opinion to help the University.

Mr. Rozycki thanked the Senators for their time. Drake does face challenges as any institution does but we do not have to do this in the dark. Senator McCarthy asked if the SBC had a chance to review if JTerm or Summer had an effect on tuition reduction. Mr. Rozycki indicated they had not. Associate Provost Art Sanders stated there is enough money in the JTerm budget to pay for the individuals who get paid with some slight expansion available. He stated the JTerm budget is set as if all instructors are paid.

Senator Alexander thanked Mr. Rozycki for his opinions and asked for a quick simple cash budget definition. The reply was that it is like a household budget. To keep the lights on we must pay the bills. Senator Summerville stated that Mr. Rozycki's viewpoints align with his and he sees the need for a greater degree of collaboration of data and if it does not exist, then various conversations are not a worthy exercise.

When asked about which committee Mr. Rozycki sees value in staying he replied that the Strategic Working Group should stay and look at the five year plan. Persons working on this or any budget group should be available for a three-year period of time so they can give valuable service and make it work the time. Drake has to do a better job with long term planning, prioritizing and being in sync, that is singing-from-the-same-song-sheet.

President Maxwell asked two questions (1) what can he do to fix this and (2) in terms of the data, what are the obstacles to getting this data. Mr. Rozycki offered there has not been the understanding of data being articulated in the committee charge. He believes the SBC can do their job if data is available to look for trends. President Maxwell stated he will meet with the Provost and Vice Presidents on this matter. President De Laet thanked Mr. Rozycki for his report.

Old Business – none presented

New Business –

Senators Simpson and Soltis moved and seconded **Motion 14-10**:

*The Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Curricular Reform consider the role of experiential learning in whatever proposal they move forward and that implementation of the current experiential learning requirement be delayed until that process provides a recommendation concerning this requirement.*

Senators were reminded that in March 2013 the senate discussion about the experiential learning requirement included a concern about resources. At that time a decision was made to delay and now with the Drake Curriculum being reviewed and an Ad Hoc Committee beginning their work, this motion is being made to delay the implementation of the requirement.

The motion passed via a voice vote.

Senators Schmidt and Summerville moved and seconded **Motion 14-11:**

*Endorse University record retention as an official function of the new University Archives within Cowles Library*

Senator Schmidt indicated this does not create any new staff positions. Kathy Lincoln was recognized, distributed a handout and spoke to Senate. Ms. Lincoln offered a quick summary of what should be sent to the University Records office including items which are 1) inactive, 2) paper, 3) have possible historic value and 4) are propriety of Drake. This is a new endeavor for everyone and she is available to come and help the investigation in your departments and offices. Secretary Nancy Geiger indicated the University Senate records for the time period of the mid-1940's through the mid-1980's were sent to Mr. Lincoln.

The motion passed via a voice vote.

Senators Wright and Pisarski moved and seconded **Motion 14-12:**

*Replace the text for the President's List and Dean's Lists heading found in the Catalog General Information section; Academic Regulations subsection. To become effective with the 2014-2015 academic year*

Clarification was given that this motion does not affect the Law School. The motion updates the policy language from 1969 and cleans up the procedures and protocols for the two designations. Senator Alexander asked about the IP and how it might affect a student. Within a discussion, there was interest to clarify individuals who take courses pass/fail. Senator Wright noted this would not affect many students.

Senators Alexander and Soltis moved and seconded an amendment to:

*Within the second paragraph, first sentence change six to nine*

The amendment passed via a voice vote.

The motion as amended passed on a voice vote.

Upon proper motion and vote, the meeting was allowed to progress past 5:00 p.m.

The Senate then moved into Executive Session to consider the Honorary Degrees and Drake Medal recommendations after which the Senate adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

The meeting concluded with applause for President De Laet.