

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**May 5, 2006**  
**Mary Reed Building, Renaissance Room South**  
**Minutes**

**Senators (or their Proxy) present:** Bill Anderson, Elizabeth Anderson, Davor Balzar, Dennis Barrett, Arthur Best, David Christophel, Bonnie Clark, Joel Cohen, Jenny Cornish, Nick Cutforth, Ron DeLyser, Sandy Dixon, Margo Espenlaub, Ronald Farina, Jim Gilroy, Deb Grealy, Michele Hanna, John Hill, Shannen Hill, Mike Keables, Brian Kiteley, Maciej Kumosa, Walter LaMendola, Michael Levine-Clark (represented by Steve Fisher), Ved Nanda, Cathryn Potter, Catherine Reed, Charles Reichardt, Dean Saitta, Jack Sheinbaum, Joe Szyliowicz, John Tripp, Gordon Von Stroh, Tim Weaver, and Margaret Whitt

**Call to order**

President Potter called the meeting to order at noon and welcomed all present. She reminded everyone that the next meeting, scheduled for May 26, will be the final Senate meeting of this academic year, and requested that senators bring new members for introductions. Some final elections will be held at that meeting. Cox moved to approve the minutes from April 7, 2006, with the usual caveat that senators contact Cornish with necessary edits ([jjcornish@du.edu](mailto:jjcornish@du.edu) or x14737). This motion was seconded by Whitt and **passed unanimously.**

**Second Reading: Provost Emeritus Motion**

Grealy, Co-Chair of the Senate Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee (NCR) again presented their findings related to this motion:

1. “Although there is a DU precedent for awarding administrators emeritus status before they retire from the University, there is no precedent for the title Provost Emeritus.”
2. “If Provost Emeritus is to be conferred, it is appropriate that the Senate, acting for the faculty, be the body to recommend to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.”
3. “While in some state colleges and universities, especially those unionized, emeritus status comes automatically by request upon retirement, at our peer and aspirational institutions requirements are more stringent (averaging 15 years of ‘superior’ or ‘distinguished’ service) and is given by the governing body upon recommendation of the unit served.”
4. “Where administrators are accorded emeritus status, it is generally on retirement from the university, not from the administrative position.”

In summary, Grealy reminded senators that granting emeritus status at present to former Provost Zaranka would not be in keeping with the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or with peer or aspirational institutions. She also reiterated the high esteem in which she and all the other members of NCR hold

Zaranka. A discussion ensued in which several senators questioned how long Zaranka has been at the University (over 15 years) and how long he served as Provost (less than 15 years). Grealy then distributed paper ballots with the following choices:

1. “The Faculty Senate requests the Chancellor to carry to the Board of Trustees our recommendation to grant former provost William F. Zaranka the title Provost Emeritus, effective now.”
2. “The Faculty Senate requests the Chancellor to carry to the Board of Trustees our recommendation to grant former provost William F. Zaranka the title Provost Emeritus, effective upon his retirement from the University.”
3. “The Faculty Senate does not wish to initiate usage of the title Provost Emeritus.”

A motion to amend the motion from the previous Senate meeting, in order to provide the above three choices in paper ballot form, was made by DeLyser and seconded by Christophel. DeLyser and Christophel explained that the Senate’s Executive Committee Members discussed this issue at their meeting last week, and agreed that, given NCR’s findings, it would be most appropriate to offer three options instead of just one. Following a discussion about how to count the votes, it was agreed that a plurality vote would prevail. Barrett then called the question on the amendment. With 18 votes in favor, and 8 opposed, the **amendment passed**. NCR members then collected completed ballots. Barrett later announced that there were 12 votes for option #1, 15 votes for option #2, and 4 votes for option #3; therefore, the motion to recommend the title Provost Emeritus be granted to former provost Zaranka upon his retirement from the University **passed**.

### **Second Reading: Teaching Tasks Force (TTF) Motion**

Christophel reported on behalf of the Senate Academic Planning Committee and proposed 6 motions as rewritten since the last Senate meeting:

1. “The Senate affirms that the primary goal of the University in seeking greatness should be the pursuit of academic excellence and rigor.” [Later rewritten: see below]
2. “The Senate endorses the Deans’ position that teaching development activities remain distinct from teaching evaluation activities and reaffirms that the primary agency for teaching development is the CTL.” [Later rewritten: see below]
3. “The Senate recommends that the primary responsibility for evaluation of teaching remain with the academic units, aided by resources and consultation provided by the duly constituted Office of Assessment (recently renamed the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment).” [Later rewritten: see below]
4. “The Senate asserted that any evaluation mechanisms developed by units and which include evaluation by clients (students) should be designed without potential penalty for the use of either rigor or innovation by faculty members.”
5. “The Senate endorses the founding of unit-level teaching task forces, with the expectation that they will revisit the report of the Teaching Task Force in search of measures that found no shared support among the deans but may well benefit individual units.”

6. “The Senate recommends that the operations of the CTL be subject to evaluation, including evaluation by clients, just as all other teaching and learning activities at the University are subject to evaluation.”

DeLyser suggested that item #3 above be rewritten again as follows: “The Senate recommends that the primary responsibility for evaluation of teaching remain with the academic units.” This was seconded by Cox and was **accepted as a friendly amendment** by Christophel.

Szyliowicz then proposed that item #1 be rewritten as follows: “The Senate affirms that the primary goal of the University must be the pursuit of academic excellence.” This was also seconded by Cox and was **accepted as a friendly amendment** by Christophel.

Potter asked senators to vote on each item in order. **Items 1 – 6 (with items 1 – 3 as rewritten) all passed** with 29 votes in favor and 1 vote abstaining (from a senator acting in a proxy role for this meeting).

Whitt requested to reconsider item #2 and to rewrite it as follows: “The Senate endorses the Deans’ position that teaching development activities remain distinct from teaching evaluation activities and reaffirms that a primary agency for teaching development is the CTL” (replacing “the primary agency” with “a primary agency”). This reconsideration was seconded by DeLyser and **accepted as a friendly amendment** by Christophel. Barrett called the question; the revised item #2 **passed unanimously**.

### **NCR: Spring Elections**

Barrett asked for nominations for Senators-at-Large (2 positions) and reported Sandra Smith Eaton and David Christophel had previously been nominated. With no further nominations coming from the floor, Nanda moved to close nominations for these positions; this was seconded by DeLyser and **passed unanimously**. Cox moved for a hand ballot rather than a paper ballot on these nominations; this was seconded by DeLyser and **passed unanimously**. The senators then voted on the two candidates and both **were elected unanimously**.

Barrett then announced that election for officer positions will be conducted at the next meeting and asked for nominations for the following positions: Executive Secretary (for a 2-year term ending in 2008), Editor of the *Faculty Forum* (1 year term), Member-At-Large on the Senate Executive Committee, Senate Representative to the Board of Trustees Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC), and Senate Representatives to Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (2 year terms).

- Saitta nominated Espenlaub for Executive Secretary; seconded by Cornish.
- Cornish nominated Whitt for Editor of the *Faculty Forum*; seconded by Christophel.

- Cox nominated DeLyser for Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee; seconded by Nanda. Whitt nominated Dixon for Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee; seconded by Barrett, but Dixon declined.
- Potter nominated Sandra Eaton for FEAC representative; seconded by Cornish.
- Cox nominated DeLyser as representative to Graduate Council; seconded by Nanda.
- Potter nominated Whitt to continue as representative to Undergraduate Council; seconded by Cornish
- Grealy reported that nominations for representatives to the Faculty Athletic Committee had previously been made to NCR: Potter self-nominated, and Amy Phillips was nominated by Nancy Sampson.

Barrett reminded senators that committee chairs should be elected at the final meeting of the committee. More nominations for the positions above can be considered at the next Senate meeting, but it is important to be sure that those nominated have agreed to serve.

### **Research, Scholarship and Creative Work Task Force Update**

Potter reported that, following the TTF, the Provost asked for an assessment of the state of research, scholarship, and creative work at DU. Data collection methods have included presentations by each dean, discussions with faculty in each division, an on-line survey of chairs, and an additional survey is planned for junior faculty. A small work group has begun meeting every other week to analyze the data and plans to write a final report by June, 2006.

### **Committee Reports**

- **Academic Planning**  
Christophel reported that Michael Levine-Clark was elected Academic Planning Chair for 2006-2007. Christophel moved that the amount of space allowed on the DU server for faculty electronic mails be increased from 50 megs to 1 gig per faculty member. This motion was seconded by Cox. Following a suggestion by Best, Arias and Christophel promised to contact University Technology Services (UTS) before the next Senate meeting to gather more information about this. Potter stated that this motion should be considered a first reading; thus **vote will be taken next meeting.**
- **Student Relations**  
Gilroy reported that Nancy Sampson was elected Student Relations Chair for 2006-2007. The Committee held many interesting informational meetings this year. A new residence hall is planned to be built next to Nelson. The popularity of the Johnson-McFarlane Residence Hall saved it from planned demolition. Some students have complained that they need more advising about finding employment or getting into graduate school. An initiative to promote communication between undergraduate and graduate programs has been proposed.

- **Finance**

Cox reported that the salary study is underway. The Finance Committee received the data set and noticed some omissions; thus they will proceed with caution. Cox asked senators to affirm Potter for her continuation on the salary study task force (along with Cox and Saitta). Barrett moved to have a straw vote on this request; the nomination was **approved unanimously**. The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees meets next week, and the Senate Finance Committee meets with the Provost on May 22 to review next year's budget. Cox promised to update senators at the next meeting with information from these two meetings.

- **Personnel**

Barrett reminded senators that benefits choices are due by next Friday to Human Resources.

### **Internationalization Grants**

Cox reported that Nanda (who had to leave the meeting early today) wished to express gratitude for all who applied for small grants. Nanda's office received 60 proposals and was able to fund \$19,000.00.

### **Administrator Evaluations**

Potter asked senators to strongly encourage their colleagues to complete these on-line evaluations. Saitta and she will meet with the Provost to discuss the results, but if the response rate is low, the results will not be considered definitive. She promised to again provide a chocolate cake for any unit that has a 100% turnout (the Information Technology Department won this reward last year).

### **Open Positions on Campus**

Whitt questioned the status on four important positions on campus (Provost, Dean of the College of Law, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, and Vice Chancellor for Intellectual Property and Events). Von Stroh stated that his division was informed by their dean today that the Chancellor hopes to announce all four positions at once, possibly next Monday.

### **Adjournment**

Barrett moved to adjourn; this was seconded by Cox, and **passed unanimously**, thus President Potter adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m., and thanked everyone for their helpful participation.

### **Respectfully submitted:**

Jenny Cornish, Senate Executive Secretary