



University of Denver FACULTY FORUM

VOL. XIX NO. 1

NOVEMBER 2004

Ritchie Chairs Board of Trustees; Search for New Chancellor Begins **Cathy Potter, Faculty Senate President**

Chancellor Dan Ritchie's announcement that he will step down as Chancellor of the University and become Chairman of the Board of Trustees marks an important milestone in the University's history. Chancellor Ritchie, who has served for 16 years, is the second longest serving leader. The changes that have occurred on his watch are noteworthy. Our campus has been rejuvenated through the proliferation of beautiful new buildings. The University's financial situation is significantly improved. Perhaps most importantly, the University is seen as an institution that is on the move in exciting ways. It is fair to say that Chancellor Ritchie has given the University its future.

This change in leadership comes at a time when discussion of that future is widespread. Many feel that DU is poised to make significant gains in academic reputation and in national visibility. There is an emerging shift from bricks-and-mortar to academic initiatives. University spending, both in the base budget and enabled by external gifts, has been targeted to new academic proposals. Discussions regarding fund raising are increasingly centered on the need to build endowment for scholarships and faculty chairs. There is increasing acknowledgment of the need to move beyond our regional student base to a stronger national presence. The future is open, and we have the opportunity to chart a course.

The Chancellor search will take place in this environment of broadened vision. Tensions exist between the need to maintain our focus and the opportunity to widen our sights. Worries exist about the transition from a strong charismatic leader, who is in many ways the DU brand, to new leadership in the context of a strengthened board. The excitement and richness of possibility that comes with change is among us as well. Times of change are always times of danger and opportunity. The Chancellor Search Committee is charged with navigating these deep waters.

In the wake of the creation of the Presidency at DU in the summer of 2003, a group of faculty members and board members met regularly to discuss University issues. That group designed a statement regarding the Chancellor search process, a statement that was ratified by the Board of Trustees in October 2003. That document specifies a committee of not more than 16, comprised of at least 25 percent faculty members and others representing diverse University constituencies. The Committee is charged with the search process, culminating in recommendations to the Board, and with designing mechanisms for assuring input from campus constituencies. The process set forth in that document is being followed for the Chancellor search.

The members of the Chancellor Search Committee have been announced by the Faculty Senate and by Joy Burns, Chair, Board of Trustees. They include the following people:

1. **Joy Burns**, Chair, University of Denver, Board of Trustees
Chair, Chancellor Search Committee
Burns Realty
2. **Arthur Best**, Chair, Faculty Senate Personnel Committee
Professor, Sturm College of Law
3. **Jim Griesemer**, Professor, Leadership and Organizational Performance
Daniels College of Business
4. **Peter Groff**, Executive Director, Center for African American Policy
State Senator and DU Alumnus
5. **Maria Guajardo-Lucero**, Member, Board of Trustees
Director, Mayor's Office for Education and Children, City of Denver and DU Alumna
6. **Melissa Kutcher-Rinehart**, Head Women's Gymnastics Coach
Athletics and Recreation
7. **Corinne Lengsfeld**, Assistant Professor, Department of Engineering,

- Senator at Large
8. **John Lowe**, Member, Board of Trustees
Law Firm of Sherman and Howard and DU
Alumnus
9. **Scott Lumpkin**, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of
University Advancement
DU Alumnus
10. **Trygve Myhren**, Member, Board of Trustees
President, Myhren Media
11. **Cathryn Potter**, President, Faculty Senate
Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social
Work
Executive Director, Institute for Families, and DU
Alumna
12. **Rob Roberts**, Chair, Department of Psychology
Associate Professor, Psychology
13. **Donald Sturm**, Member, Board of Trustees
Sturm Group, and DU Alumnus
14. **Tom Willoughby**, Vice Chancellor for Enrollment
15. **Craig Woody**, Vice Chancellor for Business and
Financial Affairs
DU Alumnus
16. **Bill Zaranka**, Professor, English
Executive Director, Intermodal Transportation
Institute and DU Alumnus

The committee will begin work in late November. First tasks include decisions regarding the use of a search firm and articulation of the job description and required/recommended qualifications.

Speaking for the faculty members of the committee, I encourage you to contact us with your thoughts and recommendations. We will take that input very seriously as we seek to represent the diverse views of the University community. We will report to you regularly on committee progress, recognizing that many details must be held confidential, but mindful of the University's need for information.

Please give the committee your support and encouragement. We live in interesting times, and we hope to serve the University well.

PROF is Back!
Cathryn Potter, Faculty Senate President

The **Professional Research Opportunities for Faculty (PROF)** fund was established by the Provost in FY 04 in response to ongoing discussions among UPAC, the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, and the Board of Trustees Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC) regarding effective ways to support scholarship at the University. This new fund (\$200,000 in FY 05) is a collaborative enterprise between the Senate and the Provost's Office, and money is located in the base budget of the University. The program is

grounded in a commitment to peer review as the strongest mechanism for assessing the merit of proposals across diverse divisions of the University. The goals of the fund are the following:

- To expand funding for meritorious proposals
- To support an increase in scholarly activity by the faculty
- To enhance the reputation of the University.

In AY 03-04, seventeen (17) of sixty (60) proposals were funded following a two-stage review process that took place at Division and University levels. Awards were made in seven (7) of the ten (10) Divisions from which proposals were received. PROF awards ranged from \$6,250 to \$15,000, and included diverse areas such as Art History and Computer Science, Mathematics and International Studies, Psychology and Business, Judaic Studies and Chemistry.

This round of applications will be for funding that begins in July of 2005. Requests for amounts between \$5,000 and \$15,000 will be accepted. Proposals are due by January 21, 2005, with reviews taking place during winter quarter. Awards will be announced in April.

As we move into the relative calm of the interterm, please take the time to examine the RFP and consider whether your scholarship might be supported by these funds. Check your email for the RFP or visit www.du.edu/facsen.

Last month the Undergraduate Council and the faculty in the Arts and Sciences approved a proposal put forward by the Marsico Steering Committee to revise the first year experience and the writing program at DU. The proposal was developed with the intent of engaging students in small-group academic interactions with our faculty as soon as they arrive at DU and establishing programs that enable students to develop their skills in academic discourse and argumentation. The proposal includes a revision of the first-year writing program, an extension of writing instruction beyond the first year, the establishment of a dedicated writing center, and the hiring of a writing director to oversee writing instruction at DU. Details of the proposal can be viewed on the Marsico Steering Committee Portfolio site. To access this site, click on *Portfolio Community* on the DU homepage, log in to Portfolio, then enter www.portfolio.du.edu/marsico into your browser.

Now that this proposal has been approved, we need to proceed to implement it. The first step is to hire a Writing Director who will oversee the details of the rest of the implementation of the proposal. This person will be a tenured professor of Rhetoric who will be housed in the English Department and will report directly to the Provost.

A faculty committee is being established to coordinate this search. The intent is to begin recruiting for this position immediately and to have the Writing director in place by fall of 2005.

We expect to recruit tenure-track faculty during the 2005-2006 academic year with the intent of having them in place by the fall of 2006. The addition of these faculty will enable us to staff the small enrollment First-year seminars and the Writing-intensive Core classes with regular tenure-track faculty teaching on load. The Deans will be making decisions this academic year regarding which departments will be hiring these new tenure track faculty. During the 2006-2007 academic year we will also be hiring the full-time lecturers in Rhetoric who will be teaching the second and third terms of the First-year writing sequence.

We will not be able to implement the new programs until these hires are made, so we do not anticipate any changes in programming during the 2005-2006 academic year. However, if the anticipated hiring is successful, we hope to have the program fully implemented by the fall of 2006.

2004 Provost's Conference Linking Evaluation of Teaching to Faculty Development and Rewards

Ron DeLyser, School of Engineering and Computer Science

Raoul Arreola, from the University of Tennessee Health Sciences, was the featured speaker at this year's Provost's Conference on Friday, October 29. After opening remarks in the morning, Dr. Arreola wrapped up the conference in the afternoon with an address that included an extended example of how a comprehensive system of evaluation of teaching might work. His full remarks will be made available to the faculty on the Senate website.

The morning activities included three sessions: Don Bacon and Cathy Green led one on the effectiveness of student evaluations. Dr. Arreola's session was on the pitfalls of peer evaluation, and Julanna Gilbert and Ron DeLyser led the third session on the creation and uses of teaching portfolios.

The afternoon activities started with round table discussions at 10 tables. Nine of the tables consisted of faculty members excluding deans and associate deans. The remaining table consisted of faculty members who were also deans and associate deans and the provost.

The 9 faculty tables addressed subsets of the following questions:

1. What forms of evaluation of teaching exist in your unit?

2. What forms of evaluation of teaching would you like to see being used in your unit?
3. Do obstacles exist in your unit and/or University wide that inhibit the creation of an effective teaching evaluation process? If so, what are they?
4. What forms of faculty development (with regard to teaching) exist in your unit?
5. What forms of faculty development (with regard to teaching) would you like to see available in your unit or University-wide?
6. Do obstacles exist in your unit and/or University wide that inhibit the creation of an effective faculty development (with regard to teaching) program? If so, what are they?
7. What faculty reward structure (with regard to teaching) exists in your unit?
8. What faculty reward structure (with regard to teaching) would you like to see available in your unit?
9. Do obstacles exist in your unit or University wide that inhibit the creation of a comprehensive faculty reward structure (with regard to teaching)? If so, what are they?
10. What linkages exist in your unit between evaluation of teaching, faculty development, and faculty rewards?
11. What specific recommendations do you have for the Provost as we move forward with developing a comprehensive system for evaluating teaching and linking the results to faculty development and rewards?

Details of all of the discussions were recorded by facilitators and will soon be available.

After the discussion, Jim Davis led a "reporting out" of the nine faculty groups. The recommendations from the faculty that were made to the Provost included the following:

- 1. Create an efficient evaluation system**
- 2. Monitor new projects that support an efficient evaluation system**
- 3. Emphasize the role of Deans in efficient evaluation system**
- 4. Emphasize faculty development as much as faculty evaluation**
- 5. Review the research on best practices for evaluation, development and rewards**

The dean's table had a different set of questions to address. They chose to listen to the faculty during the reporting out session but did have responses to the questions posed to them that they wanted to share. We are taking this opportunity to share those questions and responses:

Does DU need a comprehensive system of teaching evaluation, teaching development and rewards?

- There are different systems in different units. Some aspects must be uniform across the university. We need more integration with rewards.
- There is a need to evaluate teaching with a variety of tools.
- Credibility is perceived to be missing from the current system of some units.
- Should consider addition of peer reviews and teaching portfolios.
- Set standards for a quality review system that could be used university wide. "Quality standards for an excellent faculty review system."

Deans: What would such a system bring to DU?

- Brings a discussion of values within and across units.
- Fosters a discussion about effective teaching – effective learning.
- A more positive perspective. Without a comprehensive evaluation system, development is not valued. Faculty need to see rewards for excellent teaching.
- Systematic way of merging T&P system and merit raise procedures. Expectations are clear from day of hiring through pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, etc.
- Standards of quality
- If more value is given to teaching, professors have more motivation to bring innovation to teaching.

Deans: What are the drawbacks of such a system?

- Takes a lot of work and a lot of time.
- Needs to be integrated into the other components – service and scholarship.
- Will DU become a "teaching institution" only? We need balance between teaching and scholarship.

How much will you, as Dean, invest? In staff support? In course relief? In merit raises?

- Without an evaluation system, how do you know your resources are used wisely.
- University pays for it.
- What is the cost/benefit?

News from Academic Planning

David Christophel, Department of Biological Sciences

To increase efficiency and ease of meeting scheduling, the 15 member Academic Planning Committee has been divided into three working groups chaired by Diane Waldman, Michael Levine-Clark and Audrey Sprenger/Andy Devine respectively. The Waldman work group has been/will be dealing with a consideration of the Hyde Interview Process. Following a concerted effort this year by Administration to involve more faculty in this process, the work group is charged with examining methodology, rewards and outcomes of the Hyde process with the aim of making suggestions to modify the system to gain greater faculty support for it.

The first task of the Levine-Clark work group has been to revise the FRF (Faculty Research Fund) which has become a "small grant" alternative to the PROFS initiative. Only small changes were made for the fall round of applications (time constraints), but larger revisions will be considered for the Spring round. The first task of the Sprenger/Devine group is the Branding Initiative. Its goal here is to endeavor to act as a liaison between the Branding Group (including DU administrators) and the Faculty to ensure that Faculty's opinions are heard and (hopefully) its support gained. Other matters to be considered this year include relationships between the faculty and the Marsico Program and participation (along with other committees) in developing a new model for academic assessment, including peer review.

All work groups report to the Academic Planning Committee, which meets regularly for one hour prior to Senate Meetings.





