

The meeting of the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President David Wright. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Maria Bohorquez, Renae Chesnut, Maria Clapham, Robyn Cooper, Bruce Gilbert, Karen Leroux, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Dorothy Pisarski, Eric Saylor, Bart Schmidt, Joseph Schneider, Miguel Schor, Bob Soltis, Keith Summerville, Jody Swilky, Timothy Urness, Maria Valdovinos, Craige Wrenn and David Wright.

Absent: Matt Esposito, Pat Heaston, LouAnn Simpson

The October 2014 meeting minutes were accepted.

President Maxwell Report: No report given as President Maxwell was out of town on University business

Provost Jones Report No report given as Provost Jones was out of town on University business

President Wright Report:

Olivia O’Hea, Student Senate Liaison report was supplied by President Wright. Ms. O’Hea is currently out of the country representing Drake with the Model Arab League team. She expressed her thanks to all who attended the Annual Academic Affairs Dinner which experienced greater attendance than last year. From that event, several pages of feedback notes on topics ranging from student life to majors to curriculum have been compiled. The general trends included (a) many professors and students reiterated negative stances towards the current AOI Drake Curriculum model, which they viewed as a checklist of classes rather than an interdisciplinary program and (b) more optimistic results were received for the current advising model, and (c) many students responded positively to the potential of an online advising website (an idea generated in the advising TIG). Most faculty and students were excited by the new programs offered at Drake-particularly the ones approved in the most recent board meetings. Discussion of curriculum models created a lot of new feedback and opinions, which I will bring back to the curriculum ad hoc committee. She encouraged faculty to reach out to her with their questions or concerns.

Chrystal Stanley, Academic Achievement Coordinator and Co-Chair of the TIG Advising, distributed a handout titled: Establishment of a Blended Advising Model. Ms. Stanley began with background as to how the Advising TIG became organized. The slide presentation included a brief history of advising task forces and reports. She stated that since the 1980’s the topic of changing the way advising is done has been discussed at Drake. Recent student survey results and assessment data indicate student discontent.

From the Spring 2010 Advising Survey results, the indication is that faculty are interested in talking to and mentoring students concerning their work life after Drake, be that at a graduate school or not, rather than discussing portions of the general education program.

The Advising TIG spent some time reviewing what models or systems are used for advising and reviewing if that model could feasibly work at Drake. From that research and conversation, the TIG chose a Blended Model. This schema would assign a faculty and staff (or professional advisor) to each student with clear knowledge of who is responsible for handling which topics of advising. As the model is defined at this point, the staff or professional advisor assigned would remain with the student throughout their program irrespective of whether or not the student changed academic programs. The Advising TIG, which has student members, includes student responsibilities in their definition. Before opening the presentation to questions, Ms. Stanley indicated the model is not fully articulated. The purpose of meeting with Senators today is to have the idea presented to build awareness and gain feedback.

Senator Owens expressed positive interest in the Blended Advising Model. He asked if the FYS (First Year Seminar) experience could include advisors into some of the FYS activities. Senator Saylor indicated his first reaction was not as positive as Senator Owens based on two initial factors. He was (1) concerned about ensuring the right hand knows what the left hand is doing and (2) what resources would this need. He was not in favor of an additional layer for either the faculty or for the student to navigate to receive help. Ms. Stanley replied that these are concerns we have heard before and the group is aware of communication tools which would allow for notes to be kept by both advisors in one place.

Senator Pisarski stated her current stance was similar to Senator Saylor. She desired clear instructions and understanding of which parties would be responsible for maintaining any shared communication tool. Senator Chesnut noted the model would require the staff or professional advisor to be very informed of many programs if they are to be able to advise students in all colleges and schools. She asked if the group had determined how many advisors would be needed for Drake. Ms. Stanley replied that specificity has not been addressed at this time.

Senator Schneider stated his interest for this model was much like Senator Owens. He believed that much of this model is already happening in Arts & Sciences. He stated he sees inventing the professional advisor as a wise move.

Senator Gilbert asked if the TIG had a time frame when this might happen. Ms. Stanley indicated the TIG is researching how other institutions have transitioned advising models. That is, whether any advising format change should be done via entering cohorts or via a straight cut over method. She indicated this research will have some impact on any implementation timeline creation. Ms. Stanley stated the TIG is also looking at the creation of a robust web presence for advisors and students.

Senator Chesnut indicated she could be more supportive if the professional staff advisors staying with the student throughout a students' career was changed to having those positions be college/school specific. She continued that from her knowledge of other institutions and her participation at conferences, it may be hard for an individual to be truly knowledgeable of all Drake's programs to serve the student well. Senator Phillips indicated he would be concerned also if the professional staff advisors would be all centralized and out of contact with the colleges and schools.

Senator Schmidt shared a parent perspective that currently at Drake there is a great variance in advising experiences. The range is from enjoyment to total frustration. He indicated interest in the student having someone who is consistently assigned during their time at Drake. Senator Saylor spoke of his concern about whether the model would be the introduction of a new layer or an incorporation of what is used now in some units. He noted that without a carrot being available to faculty to perform well with their advising assignments; it will remain hard to have consistently good faculty participation. Senator Pisarski asked how the student with multiple majors would be addressed within the model. Ms. Stanley indicated there would be one faculty per major assigned but only one staff advisor.

President Wright thanked Ms. Stanley for her presentation and welcomed the Advising TIG back to Senate in the future.

Sandy Henry, Associate Professor in Journalism and Mass Communication and Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Curricular Reform began her remarks by acknowledging committee members in attendance, Senator Gilbert, Laura Linn, and Carrie Dunham-LaGree. The committee is tasked, she stated, with doing a viability study of the two models presented last Spring by the University Curriculum Committee. The presenters briefly outlined the two models and the committee notes to date in their process. With either model the First Year Seminars (FYS) and Senior Capstone experience would stay, she believed. The committee is currently collecting from the academic units various data about the Drake Curriculum and the two models. Ms. Henry indicated the early

results from these conversations are positive yet with some basic concerns. These concerns have four main themes: 1) funding for persons and the technological support, 2) classroom availability for increased interdisciplinary offerings, 3) what are the outcomes of the Drake Curriculum which are really desired and 4) what would be the Drake identity within any of the models. At Senate Executive Committee meeting last week, new considerations were given to the ad hoc committee. They will look at (a) creating operational precepts for a general education curriculum, (b) develop a basic understanding of what outcomes are desired in a general education, (c) outline the history of the AOI's at Drake to help identify what caused issues within the AOI system and (d) consider crafting a new model as the ad hoc committee continues to investigate the other two models.

President Wright thanked Ms. Henry and the committee for their work. Senator Owens asked to what degree any change could be made while keeping the program distinct and making it something which can 'go-on-the-road'. Ms. Henry replied that her group thinks about this often in their discussions. Senator Owens also asked if there has been a discussion of pedagogy practices. Ms. Henry indicated their conversations include these concerns and came into play extensively while discussing the two semester FYS experience within the integrated core model. Senator Swilky indicated he liked the models presented and wondered if the whole idea of not front loading general education is a good idea. That is, to spread out the general education over the full length of the student's time at Drake. He also asked to learn which portion of the present model is considered to be working. Also, he asked if the committee is aware of the great number of two major or two degree students studying at Drake. Both Senator Gilbert and Ms. Henry replied the body is aware of the great number of students pursuing multi-curricular programs.

Senator Schneider indicated he is both interested and worried about the level of interdisciplinary as these courses are very hard to do well.

Old Business:

Senator Gilbert moved and Senator Summerville seconded **Motion 15-01** (revised) taken from table

Amend Section I.A., Section I.B.2, and Section II.A. of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations

For all Sections, proposed additional language is in italics. Proposed deleted language is overstruck.

Proposed Changes to Section I.A.

I. Senate Officers.

A. Designated Officers. The designated officers of the Faculty Senate are the President, the President-Elect, and the Secretary. *The President of the University, the Provost, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and the President of the Senate are designated as non-voting members of the Senate. (This status applies to the President of the Senate even though the President of the Senate may vote in the case of a tie (see I.B.3))*

Proposed Changes to Section I.B.2

B. Senate President

~~2. Ex Officio Senator. The President shall serve as an ex officio Senator. If the President's term as Senator has expired in the year in which he or she begins the Presidency, the President shall serve as an ex officio Senator. If the Senator who serves as President has not completed his or her term as Senator, the President shall withdraw as an active Senator and serve as an ex officio Senator. The President's position as Senator shall be filled under the appropriate section provisions of (II)(E)~~

2. President's Replacement as Voting Senator. If the President-Elect has not completed his or her term as a voting Senator before beginning his or her term as President of the Senate, a

replacement shall be named to fulfill the remainder of his or her term as a voting Senator under the appropriate provisions of Section II.E.

Proposed Changes to Section II.A.

II. Senators.

A. Constitution of the Senate. *The voting members of the* Faculty Senate will be made up of ten Unit Senators and twelve At-Large Senators.

There was no discussion of the revised motion and the motion passed on a voice vote.

New Business: None presented

The meeting moved into Executive Session at 4:30 p.m. The Executive Session closed at 4:55 p.m.