

Drake University Faculty Senate December 6, 2017

President David Courard-Hauri called a regular meeting of the 2017-2018 Faculty Senate to order at 3:30 p.m. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Dan Alexander, Robyn Cooper, David Courard-Hauri, Renee Cramer, Debra De Laet, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Bengu Erguner-Tekinalp, Lourdes Gutierrez Najera, Jerry Honts, Teri Koch, Jerrid Kruse, Sarah McCoy, Chip Miller, Craig Owens, Chuck Phillips, Dorothy Pisarski, Nancy Reincke, Elizabeth Robertson, Heidi Sleister, Mark Vitha, Melissa Weresh

Absent: Klaus Bartschat, Jennifer McCrickerd, David Wright

The November 2017 minutes were approved.

President Martin Report:

The recent death and remembrance of Paul F. Morrison was quite an event which honored an individual who was “Mr. Drake” to many, stated President Martin.

He reported the undergraduate applications are currently at a multiple year high. There is still a long way to go to yield the budgeted class yet the changes which Admisison team have made are showing promise.

President Martin responded to a question which he received concerning the University Avenue Development and how this may affect pedestrian safely. His reply included a description of how the City of Des Moines, DART, the developers and Drake are involved in improving not only the business and housing spaces but University Avenue’s overall usage. There is streetscape planning which includes consideration of esthetics, multi-modal transportation and every one’s safety. There may be stacked parking somewhere, yet nothing specific has been planned yet.

Senator Owens asked about a Des Moines Register article concerning sexual harassment allegations. The reply was general in nature as the matter is ongoing.

Provost Mattison Report:

Provost Mattison indicated the two dean searches are both wrapping up. She expects to name the Academic Fellow for Graduate Programs in the next two weeks. Her work on next year’s budget has included some cost savings suggestions. She has appreciated receiving these ideas.

Concerning this fall’s Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visit report, Craig Owens and Kevin Saunders have written a response which is being reviewed on campus at this time. Drake’s response will be submitted by early January. When asked if a particular item in the visit report caused a need for a response, the Provost indicated that out of the 5 criteria and the over two dozen subcomponents, the visit report listed all were met with two met with concerns. One issue in the visit report was the centralization of proof of degrees and faculty qualifications. Noting technology enhancements in approx. 2011, there are different methods of retaining documentation. Drake did produce evidence yet the documents were not in one place. The visit committee recommended follow up in four years, which is the regular follow up cycle.

Concerning the Drake On Line programs, a question was raised concerning the intellectual property issue of courses designed by Drake faculty. Senator Owens asked is there is an explicit statement concerning this issue. Christina Trombley, Executive Director, Online Programming, indicated there is not a faculty contract yet nor handbook. Both of these are being developed. Senator Owens suggested the owner of intellectual property be allowed to restrict or pull their course materials if they are not the persons teaching the course. He had interest in clear language on this matter being developed. Other senators agreed that clear ownership language is important for faculty and adjunct faculty participation. Senator Alexander noted that when web courses were created, the absence of a contract allows for ownership to fall to the instructor.

President Courard-Hauri Report:

One issue for Senate to consider in the future, stated President Courard-Hauri will be the consideration of allowing students who transfer to Drake with a completed Associate of Arts (AA) or Associated of Science (AS) degree to be allowed blanket articulation of the Areas of Inquiries (AOI). Currently the A.A. or A.S. coursework is articulated course by course and there is potential for not all of the AOI's to be satisfied.

Old Business: None Presented

New Business:

President Courard-Hauri opened the discussion of Faculty Senate representation with a recap of "how we got here". A major issue is the perception of overrepresentation of At-Large senator positions being held by Arts & Sciences faculty. Senate Executive Committee decided to not bring forward a specific motion for today's meeting. He emphasized the Executive Committee has had more than one discussion on the matter and wanted to gain more conversation. The goal for today's meeting is for Senate to have an open discussion of how to proceed. He reminded the body that any change to the Senate Rules & Regulations requires a 2/3 vote.

President Courard-Hauri outlined four basic options while recognizing more options certainly exist. His four stated options:

- a) Limit the at large senators per election by unit (college/school or Cowles Library). This would be an output restriction.
- b) Limit the number of votes per voter. This would be an input restriction.
- c) Eliminate at large senators and double the number of positions per unit.
- d) Develop clear guidelines describing a senator's role and responsibility. This would not change the senate composition. This would be culture and communications issues concerning campus.

Regarding the option to limit the number of at large members from any one unit. A review of four of the last five senate elections was distributed which addressed the question of "what would have been" the unit distribution if a per unit limit existed. One senator noted an issue with this basic review as it does not display data within division.

President Martin asked what the charge to at large senators is. The reply was that the rules are silent on that issue. Senator Cramer stated being a unit senator or an at large senator is a description "of how we get here". She was in favor of having a set of roles and responsibilities or such created as well as reviewing the representation concerns. Senator Pisarski stated an interest in getting the current concerns handled well. She also noted the Senate Rules & Regulations called for a review of the rules which should happen next year (2018-2019). Also noted by Senate DeLaet was the Academic Charter does not contain the Senate voting rules.

Senator Owens offered that one role of an at large senator is "to act that way". When he asked for an example of when one group's voice was not represented. The reply was that the closest example may have been the establishment of J-Term and the consistent College of Pharmacy & Health Sciences concerns. Senator Phillips offered that each members comes to Senate with their own discipline and personal perspectives. He does not see option 4 as a new distribution. He does see it as important. Senator Cramer stated a senator role is to inform and learn from other units as well as share differing perspectives.

Senator Alexander shared that as he reviewed alternate voting systems, he was not sure "what the right number would be" for Drake's Faculty Senate needs. Other senators agreed there will be need to determine faculty distribution and unit divisions. President Courard-Hauri reminded the body that from last fall's conversations, there is a group of faculty who do not consider Faculty Senate to acting in their best interest, whether or not current senators believe this distrust. Senator Pisarski believes this gets back to clarity of a senator's role.

Senator Kruse stated concern about the unintended consequences of moving to option three as he believes it would perpetuate the territorial impression of Senate. Senator Alexander thought number 4 would be a great place to start. He indicated he had been in favor of the Revised Drake Curriculum and yet with the faculty survey, he could not vote for it. Senator Dunham-LaGree offered that one issue is Senate is a small minority of the whole faculty.

Mr. Royce Fichtner noted the units and their divisions for Faculty Senate were set up a long time ago (1987-1988). While he did not have a suggested change for today's discussion, he noted his unit (College of Business & Public Administration) has its own divisions which should be considered. He liked the idea of making Senate a larger body and he saw value in at large membership. Senator Miller noted that when any unit has only one representative, that individual gets double duty by being automatically on Senate Executive Committee.

A question was raised if the Senate election voting history includes knowing what percentage of each unit participates. The reply was no, that breakdown is not available.

Based on several suggestions and alternatives, it was determined the faculty, via town halls held in early spring 2018, would be asked to consider their governance. Several voices were interested in a faculty survey also. There was interest to simply not “kick the can down the road” concerning senate representation and faculty perceptions of senate. Senators were asked to have their units talk about the option, issues and points made at today’s meeting. Depending on town hall turnout and participation level, the format for moving forward will be determined.

The meeting ended at 4:59 p.m.