

Drake University Faculty Senate Minutes

November 17, 2021

President Matthew Zwier called the regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 3:30 pm, Wednesday, November 17, 2021. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Rachel Allen-McHugh, Eric Barnum, Klaus Bartschat, Hope Bibens, Michelle Bottenberg, Megan Brown, Debra DeLaet, Matthew Doré, Catherine Gillespie, Anisa Hansen, Matthew Hayden, Sandy Henry, Paul Judd, Chris Kliethermes, Kevin Lam, Natalie Lynner, Erik Maki, Joan McAlister, Lynn McCool, Thomas Rosburg, Jimmy Senteza, Priya Shenoy, Jill Van Wyke, Neil Ward, Greg Wolf, and Shelley Fairbairn.

The October 13, 2021, minutes were approved on a voice vote, motion by Debra DeLaet, seconded by Neil Ward.

Contents

Report from President Zwier	1
President Martin's report	2
Provost Mattison's report	2
Unfinished business: None known	3
New business	3

Report from President Zwier

- Reminder from University Book Store: The textbook adoption deadline for spring has passed. There are concerns about supply-chain issues. Although faculty may be unsure of spring semester, it's more important to make a choice and amend it, rather than not make a choice. Faculty are urged to make textbook adoption decisions as soon as possible and correct later if need be.
- Federal vaccine mandate vs state law: If you are vaccinated, [please submit proof via the online form](#). Whichever way the competing federal and state directives shake out, it will help us manage Drake's next steps.
- ITS will be rolling out multi-factor authentication for most of the items within myDrake. This is a necessary precaution, and there are options if you don't have a cell phone. Watch for updates. If you have questions or concerns, please contact ITS.
- Good news report from Megan Brown, inaugural faculty at John Dee Bright College: The Bright College students are incredible. They are energetic and inquisitive. A few are adult learned who grew up in the Drake neighborhood, but never thought they'd be part of the campus community. They feel warmly welcomed.
- Student Senate report from President Morgan Coleman
 - Student Senate just passed a bylaw change to add community service hours as a requirement for all senators. The new requirement is four hours per semester, and will go into effect spring semester.
 - Support for International Students: Urging all to make sure we are intentional about making our international students feel included as an integral part of the Drake community.

- BLM@Drake event: Received a lot of positive feedback. The next event will be Dec. 3, and faculty are encouraged to attend.

President Martin's report

- College and University Sustainability Project (CUSP): Searching for a permanent CEO, but currently looking at an interim arrangement. Next board meeting will be Dec. 3.
- Missouri Valley Conference: Loyola is leaving – going to Atlantic 10. The MVC is accepting [Belmont University](#) of Nashville. MVC will continue to work on expansion.
- [The Ones Campaign](#)
 - Launched Oct. 28.
 - Encouraged everyone to watch the video.
 - Started campaign at \$107 million, and now at \$110 million.
 - The Ones Campaign and Operating Budget – Questions regarding how the campaign might help with the overall operating budget.
 - The campaign will help in admissions. It will include 4 scholarships as endowed gifts. The more success we have in that space, we can substitute funded scholarships for internal discounts.
 - The campaign will help in retention. It provides for new programs, an attractive feature for coming and staying at Drake. Cohorts in these programs will help build community and sense of belonging, so important to improve retention.
 - Admitted student questionnaire found that prospective students who are admitted, but don't choose to attend Drake, do not have a sense that Drake is a “fun” place to go to college. A significant remodel of Olmsted will help with this.
 - Funded, endowed professorships are built into the campaign. These will be available to any faculty member who meets the criteria, allowing us to use funded dollars for those positions and freeing up operating dollars.

Provost Mattison's report

- Faculty salary adjustments
 - Kevin Saunders looked at gender or race bias, and found no significant differences.
 - CIP code designations have raised a lot of questions. CIP codes have been in place for many years to determine market value, but we are now making the overall process more transparent. This comes with a few bumps.
 - Each faculty will get their CIP code, but not the salary associated with that CIP code.
 - Blinding of associated salary is key to ensuring there is no bias. Those who determine the CIP code for each position do not know the associated salary. This is to ensure there is no biases/favoritism in the process.
 - UCC does not have a formal process in place to appeal the CIP code. If there is an egregious error, take it to the dean for review.
 - We believe the deans have accurately determined the CIP code associated with each position. The CIP code is not associated with the person in the position, but with the qualification needed to replace this position.
 - We are continuing to work on salary increase plans for both faculty and staff.

- Curricular Review
 - Appreciate the hard work by each department on this exercise.
 - Academic Chairs met on Friday to discuss and shared challenges and solutions, as well as some new great ideas.
- A faculty committee will be empaneled to create a vision for Online at Drake. This will include a deep look at the student experience, flexibility for faculty, and financial analysis.
- Denise Goldford raised an issue regarding Academic Freedom and video recording of classes, either virtual or in person.
 - Discussed in Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
 - With controversial subject matter, snippets can be recorded and taken out of context.
 - This is the individual faculty member's decision to either allow or no allow recording. Faculty members can make a policy for their own classes and may put it in their syllabus if they have concerns.

Unfinished business: None known

New business

- Motion 22-04: Amends the appendix of the Faculty Senate Rules & Regulations, to remove Law School representation from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Motion by Natalie Lynner, seconded by Jimmy Senteza, and approved on a voice vote.
 - Discussion: This brings the Rules and Regulations in line with current practice.
- Discussion of the proposed grade appeals standardization.
 - Suspend Roberts Rules of Order on a voice vote, motion by Debra DeLaet, seconded by Jill VanWyke.
 - **Background**
 - Part 1 – Updates catalog language to reflect current practice
 - Part 2 –
 - Clarifies that only the final grade is subject to appeal.
 - Adds specificity to the grounds for appeal
 - Clearly communicates student responsibility
 - Clearly communicates appeal pathways and timelines
 - CBPA was updating its process for accreditation and noticed that students with a major across units, had two different processes and timelines. Wanted to address problems in the process
 - #1 consistent time frame for students
 - #2 clear criteria
 - #3 students have to provide evidence
 - #4 alleviates the problem of students who stall process by not responding to communications
 - **Discussion**
 - The proposal is in 2 parts: Suggested updated language in the catalog and a set of recommendations for units to achieve consistency
 - CPHS process is more detailed and explicit. I think this is helpful.
 - Want to ensure due process and fairness for students. If they are appealing

their final grade, that grade was determined because of the grades for various assignments – so doesn't that mean they should be allowed to challenge individual assignments? If they had a concern with an assignment, they should address it then with the professor early on – at the time the assignment was submitted and assessed. It's helpful to think about the criteria – that gives context. The policy in each syllabus should give students a timeframe to appeal individual assignment grades.

- CPHS students have 3 days to appeal a final grade. This proposes 30 days. Where did 30 days come from? Timing is everything for CPHS – they have to appeal quickly to move on to their next step. The language for the CPHS 3-day exception is already in the proposal.
 - SOE have a much longer time - until end of semester after you got the grade. So 30 days is a compromise. In SOE some were concerned that 30-days would be too short, especially at the end of fall semester, which is quickly followed by the holidays and then J-term.
 - Seems like it would be helpful to have a norm – but may not need to be 30 days.
- How will Student Senate weigh in? Melissa Sturm-Smith will share with Academic Affairs senator and determine a pathway to get student input.

Criteria for Appeal

Students may appeal a final grade only for one or more of the following reasons and must include rationale/justification for the appeal.

1. procedural or clerical error by the instructor that had a negative impact on the student's grade
2. bias on the part of the instructor that had a negative impact on the student's grade
3. the grading being arbitrary, capricious or outside accepted norms with resultant negative impact on the student's grade.
4. The evaluation was of a different standard than that required of other students in the class, resulting in a negative impact on the student's grade.

- In regards to students' reasons/rationale for the appeal, it is not very clear how bias (#2) is distinct from (#3)?
 - Have seen 3 used with more subjective exams, where the bias of an instructor might be in play. The bias is more about an individual student saying the instructor has something against him/her/them as a group.
 - Arbitrary and capricious is more that the grading of all students isn't standardized.
- Why is #4 here? What problem is it trying to solve? It came from the CBPA policy.
 - #2 is too ambiguous. We could remove #4 if we had a definition on bias.
 - Or eliminate #2 and keep #4.
 - How do you provide evidence for "bias" – need to be more specific

around what that looks like.

- Be specific about biases or assume #4 captures what is being missed.
- Bias – laws on unlawful discrimination would supersede this. You wouldn't appeal your grade through this process.
- I think perhaps #4 is a worded better than #2
- A more specific definition of bias in evaluative standards is helpful, since evaluations show patterns of bias toward instructors. Bias in application of evaluative standards vs the instructor doesn't like me because I'm "XXX".
- Not all evaluations show bias. Some are well researched and don't show bias in the instructor/course evaluation.

President Zwier: Faculty Senate appears to be supportive in the abstract of this proposal. That being said, what are some pieces of information that might be helpful to you (Melissa and Sean)?

- Deadline on when appeal needs to be made, but with some flexibility. Feedback on the starting point for appeals being similar.
 - Fair – within 7 days of final grades being posted
 - The process on both parties (college/school and the student) should be fair. The school/college needs to have a final decision in a timely manner so that students know prior to the next term (especially if the grade in question is for a pre-req to a course in the next semester)
 - I am concerned about 7 days not being long enough for students over the winter holiday.
 - First step of the process is an appeal directly to the professor, it is the beginning of the appeal. The other steps are further down the road, so 7 days should be reasonable.
- Conversation with Department Chairs might be helpful – when does it land on their desk? Holidays being factored in? Has been taken back to faculty, but informally, not to chairs.
- Would also like student government input on the deadline.

Action items

- Check with departments/chairs – President Zwier will collect
- Check with Student Senate – Melissa Sturm-Smith will facilitate this

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 pm on a motion by Michelle Bottenberg, seconded by Jill Van Wyke.