

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER  
FACULTY SENATE**

**Minutes  
Friday, November 12, 2004  
Mary Reed Building, Renaissance Room, South**

**Senators (or their proxy) present:** Bill Anderson (Philosophy), Elizabeth Anderson (Daniels College of Business), Davor Bazar (Physics and Astronomy), Dennis Barrett (Biological Sciences), Arthur Best (College of Law), Drs. David Cristophel (Natural Sciences and Mathematics), Lisa Conant (Political Science), Jenny Cornish (Graduate School of Professional Psychology), David Cox (Daniels College of Business), Ron DeLyser (Engineering), Fran Dickson (Human Communication), Andy Divine (Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management), Margo Espenlaub (Women's College), Rafael Fajardo (for Shannen Hill, Art and Art History), James Gilroy (Languages and Literature), Deborah Grealy (College of Education), Beth Karlsgodt (University College), Ari Kelman (for Don Hughes, History), Cristina Kreps (Anthropology), Walter LaMendola (Graduate School of Social Work), Corrine Lengsfeld (Engineering), Michael Levine-Clark (Library), Drs. David Longbrake (Geography), Mario Lopez (for Joel Cohen, Computer Science), Don McCubbrey (Daniels College of Business), Scott Montgomery (for Shannen Hill, Art and Art History), Lynn Parker (Graduate School of Social Work), Cathryn Potter (Graduate School of Social Work), Catherine Sailer (Music), Nancy Sampson (Marketing), Paula Sperry (Theatre), Audrey Sprenger (Sociology), Joseph Szyliowicz (Graduate School of International Studies), Javier Torre (Languages and Literature), John Tripp (Accountancy), Gordon VonStroh (Daniel's College of Business), Diane Waldman (Mass Communications), Tim Weaver (Art and Art History), Todd Wells (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Margaret Whitt (English), and Yavuz Yasar (Economics)

**Guest:** Mrs. Joy S. Burns, Chair, University of Denver DU) Board of Trustees

**1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes**

Cathryn Potter, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order at 12:00 and welcomed everyone present. The minutes were unanimously approved, with the caveat that any changes should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Secretary, Jenny Cornish ([jbarnish@du.edu](mailto:jbarnish@du.edu))

**2. Provost's Conference (Linking Evaluation of Teaching to Faculty Development and Rewards): Report and Discussion**

Sen. Ron DeLyser gave a brief overview of the conference and reviewed the recommendations from the group discussion:

- Create an efficient evaluation system
- Monitor new projects that support an efficient evaluation system
- Emphasize the role of Deans in efficient evaluation system
- Place equal emphasis on development and evaluation
- Review research on best practices for evaluation, development, and rewards

Sen. DeLyser further stated that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee addressed using standard, validated forms for student ratings and recommended looking into peer evaluations. He then led a discussion related to these issues. Senators made many suggestions including possibly setting up a committee related to evaluation, pursuing alternative measures (e.g., self evaluation), developing processes that might apply across units, and considering different types of peer review. The importance of evaluation related to growth as a teacher (rather than just focused on tenure) was stressed, along with encouraging a diversity of learning options and methods of pedagogy. Several Senators argued that written comments from students have proved more useful than numerical ratings. It was also emphasized that rewards and incentives are vastly different across divisions.

Provost Robert Coombe pointed out that evaluations should include contributions to the mission of the university. Without systems focused on development and reward, evaluations will be viewed only as punitive. He is hoping for some leverage from the conference to create development and reward structures, since it has been difficult for the administration to approach this issue in the past. He stressed that the faculty needs to propose such structures.

Sen. Arthur Best, Chair of the Senate Personnel Committee, agreed that the Personnel Committee would take a leadership role for this issue, with representatives from other Senate Committees involved as well. Such a process would be similar to that created for the Professional Research Opportunities for Faculty (PROF) Fund. Pres. Potter promised that the Senate Executive Committee would help start this progress, and she asked Senators to strongly consider working on this issue. Several Senators spoke about including course release time, funds to purchase classroom items, and salary merit increases as important to consider when developing a reward structure.

Sen. DeLyser concluded by stating that information from the table talks at the conference will be put on the Provost's website as well as the Faculty Senate website.

### 3. Provost's Report

Provost Coombe gave a brief report and answered questions from the Senators:

- The Provost thanked the Senate for managing the vote on the Marsico Initiative.
- He stated that the G-9 group continues to make progress, meeting at least once per quarter. Recently, this group discussed the branding initiative. Provost Coombe suggested that the G-9 group give a report to the Faculty Senate in the near future.
- He reviewed budget development for the university and stated that DU is currently in quite good shape. He hopes to focus investing in academic programs (such as increasing the PROF fund, as well as continuing to raise Graduate Teaching Assistant stipends). For the future, the administration hopes to keep tuition costs down while ensuring academic stability via other revenue streams, principally by building the endowment. The university's endowment was previously at 190 million but moved to 135 million following the drop in markets after September 11. It has risen to 175 million at present. The goal would be for an endowment that is approximately three times the operating budget, or around 750 million. Since the university raised 370 million for buildings over the last 10 years, it is not unrealistic to aim for the proposed endowment within the next 10 years. Currently, the vast majority of the endowment is restricted to certain units; in the future it will be important to obtain less restricted endowment funds available to support faculty (e.g., through endowed chairs) and students (e.g., through academic scholarships).
- The Provost recently attended the final new faculty workshop. There are many different types of faculty at the university including tenure track, research professorial, clinical, lecturers, adjuncts, etc. The role of lecturers is particularly unclear, despite an increase in hiring such faculty members due to the Marsico Initiative. Approximately 20% of the faculty members at DU are not tenure track and a fair proportion of those are lecturers. He recommended that the Senate create guidelines for all faculty members.

### 4. Chancellor Search

Pres. Potter introduced Joy W. Burns, Chair of the DU Board of Trustees and also Chair of the Chancellor Search Committee. Mrs. Burns announced that the 16 member Search Committee is finalized and includes:

- Board of Trustees members: Joy Burns, María Guajardo Lucero, John Low, Trygve Myhren, and Donald L. Sturm (with William Dean Singleton serving as a consultant related to search firms should the Search Committee decide to use such a firm)
- Representatives from the Administration: James Griesmer (Daniels College of Business), Peter Groff (Center for African American Policy), Scott Lumpkin (University Advancement), Melissa Reinhardt (Athletics), Tom Willoughby (Admissions Office),

Craig Woody (Business and Financial Affairs), and William Zaranka (Department of English)

- Faculty members: Arthur Best (College of Law), Corrine Lengsfeld (Engineering), Cathryn Potter (Graduate School of Social Work), and Rob Roberts (Department of Psychology)

Mrs. Burns stated that she tried to select people to cover all areas of the university. She would have liked to include someone from facilities and maintenance, but feels confident that Mr. Woody will provide that expertise. Because it was impossible to choose one student from over 10,000 possible candidates, the Search Committee will be certain that final candidates meet with selected groups of students. The first goals of the committee will be to write a job description (with the help of current Chancellor Daniel Ritchie) and to decide whether or not to utilize a search firm. Mrs. Burns emphasized that due to her experience on previous search committees (including that for the Dean of the Daniels College of Business), and due to the high cost of search firms, her preference would be to not hire such a firm. She has consulted with the Association of Governing Boards and will also consult with the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, especially regarding salary information, since obviously it is not possible to find another chancellor willing to work for \$1.00 per year. She stated that in her opinion, the university needs a chancellor with a strong academic background, since “the next big push is the academic side of the university.” Several Board of Trustees members hoped that Condoleezza Rice might be a candidate, but she is apparently not interested. They expect to have a new chancellor hired by July 1, 2005. Mrs. Burns concluded by stating that she is excited about being on the Search Committee and looks forward to the process.

Following Mrs. Burn’s presentation, Pres. Potter reiterated that the faculty members on the committee are interested in faculty ideas regarding job qualifications and the process itself and encouraged everyone to contact any of the four faculty members on the committee. Although the search process will require some confidentiality, the faculty representatives will do their best to answer questions whenever they can. She stated that her personal opinion is that a search firm would be useful since it may otherwise be difficult to recruit high profile current Chancellors, Provosts, and Presidents.

#### **5. Professional Research Opportunities For Faculty (PROF) Fund: Review Committees**

Pres. Potter stated that the intent of the PROF committee this year is to have a more structured approach than was possible last year due to the newness of the fund at that time and the desire to disperse funds in a timely manner. The Senate Executive Committee members hope that units will review their models with broader faculty input into the process. Pres. Potter urged Senators to read the documents sent via email yesterday and to establish divisional review committees by January 21. Sen. Lisa Conant questioned the requirement to avoid potential conflicts of interest by recusing faculty members from participating in their divisional review committees if they are seeking PROF funds themselves. Sen. Andy Divine pointed out that small departments may lack representation in general. Pres. Potter suggested that PROF recipients from last year could be encouraged to join divisional review committees, since they shouldn’t apply this year for a second grant. She also charged Senators to revisit the process by which they elect or appoint review committees and then contact the PROF Committee with their final divisional review committee information. The Requests for Proposals will be distributed next week, with January 21 as the application due date, giving faculty members time to write proposals over the break.

#### **6. New Business**

Pres. Potter asked for new business from the floor. Sen. Dennis Barrett announced that the Senate roster is now complete. He also pointed out that the schedule for Senate meetings is posted on the Senate website ([www.du.edu/facsen](http://www.du.edu/facsen)) Sen. Cornish reminded everyone to sign in when attending Senate meetings, and to let her know if she inadvertently omits anyone from the list of attendees in the minutes. Sen. DeLyser reminded Senators that if they need to miss a meeting, they can send a proxy. It was announced that Sen. Shannen Hill recently had a baby girl.

## 7. Subcommittee reports

### **Ammi Hyde Interviews: Sen. Diane Waldman**

Sen. Waldman raised a number of questions related to the Ammi Hyde Interviews. She wondered whether the purpose of the interviews is to select or recruit students. Are faculty members involved on a voluntary basis? Can junior faculty be involved? Should faculty be paid for their time? Why do some faculty members have to pay out of pocket for meals, etc.? Is the current team approach (utilizing faculty, staff, and alumni) the best use of time? Why are some faculty given a script from which they cannot deviate? Why are questions posted on the web ahead of time? Why were some candidates with low scores (4s and 5s) offered admission? Why can't faculty identify their divisions?

At a training session this morning, only 5-6 faculty members attended. Participants in the interviews last year included 1,000 alumni, 137 staff members, and 30 faculty members. The interviews this year will be in-person (except for international applicants, due to cost factors) and have been expanded to 31 cities including Honolulu. Per Diem costs vary depending on the city. Sample interviews were read in the training session today to establish inter-rater reliability. Only three areas will be assessed this year: motivation for learning, openness to new ideas, and honesty/integrity. Faculty members have been encouraged to keep the interviews (and especially potentially overly enthusiastic alumni) in control.

The Provost explained that these interviews began three years ago with goals related to fit and persistence, yet an unexpected gain in yield occurred. He reiterated that faculty members must be involved in order for the interviews to truly work. He suggested that the Senate contact the Admissions Office to implement faculty recommendations.

Pres. Potter asked the subcommittee to bring this issue back to the next Senate meeting.

### **Branding: Sen. Andy Divine**

Sen. Divine stated that the faculty was recently solicited directly by the current branding firm via the internet thus bypassing the Senate. He suggested that faculty respond to the solicitation by answering the brief survey, and then copy either Sen. Audrey Sprengle or himself. He further hypothesized that it is no coincidence that each time the faculty has been asked for input into the branding initiative, it has happened prior to a break in the academic schedule. Pres. Potter shared her impression that the firm hired to work on branding at DU is interested in faculty input, and reiterated that faculty should be involved. She suggested that the branding subcommittee reach out to the current firm on a proactive basis and offer to help interpret the information received from their internet request. The Provost argued that the key to branding success at the university is faculty participation. He stated his hope that the deans will stimulate a broad and deep conversation involving faculty across campus. The first firm was hired because they had expertise in external issues; the current firm was hired due to their expertise in internal issues; there is a general lack of branding firms with expertise in academic communities.

### **Faculty Research Fund (FRF): Sen. Michael Levine-Clark**

Sen. Levine-Clark reminded Senators that the latest FRF request was distributed a few weeks ago. The FRF Committee eliminated the requirement for a signature as well as for a letter of recommendation from a dean or chair. They also used electronic dissemination. Perhaps because of that electronic dissemination, along with the PROF fund and the newly created Art Fund, the committee received 12 rather than the usual 20-30 applications. Although the 12 applications appear to be evenly distributed across the campus, Sen. Levine-Clark asked that Senators remind their colleagues to apply for the FRF when it is sent out again this spring.

**Faculty Awards: Sen. Arthur Best**

Sen. Best reminded the Senators that the pool for faculty awards appears smaller than in previous years. Although the recipients are excellent, it would help reinforce the prestige of these awards if more nominations were put forward.

**Administrator Evaluations: Sen. Arthur Best**

Sen. Best asked that Senators write to the Personnel Committee members (listed on the Faculty Senate website: [www.du.edu/facsen](http://www.du.edu/facsen)) with suggestions for administrator evaluations. When these evaluations were collected via an electronic system last year, there was a significant and troubling decrease in participation.

**8. Adjournment**

Pres. Potter adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m. and thanked the Senators for their participation in this meeting.

**Respectfully submitted by:**

J. Cornish, Ph.D., Faculty Senate Secretary