

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
May 28, 2004**

President Giles called the meeting to order at 12:09

AGENDA

1. Approval of senate minutes for May 7, 2004
2. Provost Report
3. Proposed changes in Honor Code administration
4. Elections of Senators at Large
5. Academic Administrator Evaluations
6. Faculty Load Reports
7. Policy concerning Classroom Conduct (Student Relations)
8. Study on status of faculty salaries (Financial Planning)
9. Election of new officers
10. Branding initiative focus groups: Tuesday, June 1st, DuPont Room
 - a. 9:00-10:00 a.m.
 - b. 2:00-3:00 p.m.
11. Introduction of new senators
12. Change of officers
13. Committee reports
14. Other business
15. Reminders and announcements
16. Adjourn

Approval of senate minutes for May 7, 2004

The minutes were approved pending necessary changes.

Provost Report—Robert Coombe

Highlights: Principally, Provost Coombe wanted to thank the senate for having a productive year. He noted that the University is going into the end of the year in good financial shape. Spring quarter was a good quarter for us. He also acknowledged the success of the G-6 (G-9) conversations, the PROF fund process, and the work of the financially planning committee. He said the senate has been helpful to him.

Discussion

Rick Leaman asked whether or not DU will have enough space and teachers for incoming students. Coombe responded that the “melt” will allow DU to accommodate the expected 1050 students. He does not expect a “crisis” in housing.

Joe Szyliowicz asked what the situation is with regard to international students. Coombe responded that GRE takers world-wide are down by 31%, and we expect to see a slight reduction in international students, likely in the business school and GSIS graduate

programs. Provost Coombe projected that the trend will not have a negative impact on DU, however.

Margaret Whitt asked whether the provost's office has a final count on the number of participants and the cost of the Cherrington Global Scholars program. Coombe said that the total number of students going abroad in Fall 2004 is 420, and the majority are Cherrington Global Scholars. New money to be invested next year is \$2 million. Last year, \$230 million was budgeted. Szyliowicz asked if there is consideration for study abroad for graduate students. Coombe said there has been consideration, but he is not sure how that could be done financially.

Proposed changes in Honor Code Administration—Patti Helton and Dan Kast

Highlights: President Giles reported that the proposed changes were introduced at the FEAC meeting held Wednesday of this week. He raised questions concerning the fact that the faculty, particularly the senate, had not reviewed the policy and should have an opportunity to do so. The Board of Trustees referred the issue to the senate and approved changes pending senate support. Normally, the suggested changes would be referred to a senate committee. Coombe noted that the issue of streamlining procedures has been under consideration for sometime. He asked that the proposal go to the students and that it go to FEAC as an FYI. With regard to the senate, he is interested in our comments. The proposed changes really are an open matter, and if the senate has serious concerns, he will not worry about the time issue too much.

Patti Helton and Dan Kast were present to address any concerns the senate might have. Helton summarized the need for streamlining procedures. Suie Buell asked if work has been done to consider that there are different codes for the Law School and other units. Helton said that the code recognizes the right of different units to follow their established code and processes. Jenny Cornish asked Helton or Kast to explain the differences between the ACRB and CRB. Kast explained that CRB evaluates all cases of conduct violations while the ACRB is constituted solely to address issues of academic misconduct. His concern regarding the process of the ACRB is that a faculty member chairs the board but has no voting rights. Secondly, it is difficult to ensure confidentiality when the board is made up of members of the unit of the accused. Sandy Dixon asked if faculty can still fail students without taking the honor code violation to the board. Kast said that it is possible. It might be possible for the board to clear a student after a faculty member has failed him/her, but that has not happened yet. Dixon followed up asking whether any DU staff sits on the board. Kast said staff can sit on the board; however, in practice, there generally is one faculty member and two students. When asked whether the training includes how to recognize plagiarism, Kast said it does not but will in the future. He added that his office defers to the faculty member as the expert on plagiarism. Szyliowicz noted that there are only two sanctions. Are there other sanctions that can be invoked in other circumstances? Kast said those are not exhaustive.

Jack Donnelly asked about the appeals process. It seems odd to him that the faculty are being removed from the process of appeals. Replacing faculty with a staff person as the ultimate point of appeal when the issue deals with academic dishonest seems to him

inappropriate. Discussion ensued in an attempt to define who sits on the appeals board. Kast said he does not see it as replacing faculty but as removing faculty in an appellate role. What he is trying to do is move faculty to the hearing role. If it would make faculty comfortable to include faculty representation in the appellate role, he is open to that. Donnelly, suggested the inclusion of two faculty representatives. Cathy Potter noted the categories of academic dishonesty. She asked if assisting in an act of academic dishonesty is no longer punishable. Kast noted that the section regarding that violation has been moved but not removed, so assisting in academic dishonest is punishable. [Several questions were raised by senators who failed to identify themselves or to move to the microphone so they were inaudible and could not be included in the minutes.] Whitt noted the absence of the word “suspension” and suggested the use of that specific punishment for persons with multiple violations. Dave Cox recalled that the Chancellor suggested expulsion, even possibly for first offense. Donnelly asked to be shown where reference to other unit honor codes is made in the policy. Helton referred him to the student handbook. Donnelly said the document indicates that it sets out an all-university procedure, but it clearly does not address the Law School. He suggested that the document state clearly that it does not refer to the Law School and other units that have a radically different process. Dixon said that given the number of questions that things are not as clear as it might seem, a great deal of communication still needs to take place. Kast said that there needs to be education and promotion regarding the code for all university constituencies. Potter said many of the graduate schools, have specific codes and this conversation needs to take place in deans council. Dixon added that it is a serious concern that changes were moving forward, and the senate would not have known about it if Leon Giles had not been at the FEAC meeting. Helton said the proposed changes went through the proper channels. David Christophel asked what Helton’s new timeline for implementation was now, given the comments and concerns raised in the senate meeting. Helton said that the way she reads the process, it goes to the provost and does not have to be approved by the faculty senate. That is how she will proceed. Whitt said she thinks it unconscionable that a faculty member does not know there is an honor code. It should appear on every syllabus.

Szyliowicz said that the senate executive committee will meet during the summer and suggested that once Helton has incorporated appropriate changes that it be submitted to that body for consideration and approval. Coombe and Helton agreed. Coombe said one of the reasons for the need to streamline the process is that there are so many cases. We are looking at 400 violations per year. A small number involve academic honesty; most deal with alcohol. Most cases are first and second year students. One of the questions on the table is whether or not this indicates a serious cultural issue.

Elections of Senators at Large—Dennis Barrett

Giles called for Dennis Barrett to begin elections.

Senator at Large:

Nominees: Rick Leaman, Roger Salters, Vernon Swarth, Timothy Weaver

Elected: Roger Salters and Timothy Weaver

Academic Administrator Evaluations—Leon Giles

Highlights: Giles reported that the results, including comments, were distributed to those administrators who were evaluated. The official publication of the results will be released on Wednesday. They also will be posted to the senate website and published in the *Faculty Forum*. The response rate was 23.5 this year, down from last year. However, we received more comments than in the past. The senate needs to consider how to get the response rate up.

Faculty Load Reports—Leon Giles

Highlights: Giles referred to the report distributed to the body. The report is offered as an information item.

Policy Concerning Classroom Conduct (Student Relations)—Ron DeLyser

Highlights: DeLyser explained that discussion regarding classroom conduct started with Jo Calhoun who drafted a policy and took the proposal to the appropriate council. Student affairs and academic planning has had the opportunity to review it. He thinks it a good policy. Christophel asked when academic planning reviewed. DeLyser said he was aware of attempts to ensure the committee saw it but isn't certain of how successful that has been.

Study on status of faculty salaries (Financial Planning)—David Cox

Highlights: Cox explained that data collected went back to 1990. The committee found that the raise pool was about 6/10% higher than the inflation rate during the period examined. That is at the provost office level. The merit increase is not characterized as a cost-of-living increase. The committee compared salary to groups identified as competitive, aspiration group, and super aspiration group. The DU average salary is 1.6% below the average competitive group (1995-2003). Compared to the aspiration group, the DU average was 17% below in 1995, a \$9,000 gap, and about 16% below in 2003, an \$11,000) gap. The budgetary impact to move us toward the aspiration group is \$11,000 per faculty member. The gap between DU salaries and those of the super aspiration group was about \$20,000 gap in 2003 and is \$30,000 now. In the competitive group, DU ranks 8th out of 11. Chip Reichardt noted that the average salary is different depending on the composition of the school. He asked if we have a sense of how DU is affected by this issue. Cox suspects that UPAC took some of that information into consideration in defining the competition. He went on to talk about gaps by rank. From his perspective, the most problematic area regards assistant professors because this addresses new hires and the need for competitive salaries for attracting them. Giles closed discussion for time considerations.

Election of new officers—Dennis Barrett

Barrett reminded the body of the election last year of Cathy Potter as president-elect.

Results of the election follow:

Executive secretary

Nominees: Jenny Cornish. Elected: Jenny Cornish

Members at Large of the Executive Committee

Nominees: Dean Saitta. Elected: Dean Saitta

Editor of the Faculty Forum

Nominees: Margaret Whitt. Elected: Margaret Whitt

Representative to the FEAC

Nominees: David Christophel and Jack Donnelly. Elected: David Christophel

Senate Representative to Graduate Council

Nominees: Gordon Von Stroh Elected. Gordon Von Stroh

Senate Representative to Undergraduate Council

Nominees: Ron DeLyser. Elected: Ron DeLyser

Branding initiative focus groups: Tuesday, June 1st, DuPont Room

9:00-10:00 a.m.

2:00-3:00 p.m.

Highlights: Giles encouraged faculty participation in this process because we need to be absolutely certain that the strategic planning of the university drives this process rather than public relations initiatives. Dean Saitta asked if Giles could briefly describe the three branding choices. Coombe said he is thinking about it in a little different way than Giles is. This initiative is coming out of the Chancellor's office and is being handled by a firm that was hired. He does not see DU as being close to any decision regarding branding. This is the "first stab" at what the message might be. The three branding platforms represent three degrees of progressive strategy. If the university settles on a message at some point, real dollars will need to go toward the effort. It is early in the process, and he agreed that the faculty needs to be as involved as possible.

Discussion: Szyliowicz asked what the process will be for settling on a platform. Coombe said he can't say, as there has not been a conversation about it. The research part of this ended recently. It is good that this information is being bounced around the university. Donnelly expressed appreciation that something is coming out for faculty consideration fairly early in the process. Saitta said that an hour isn't a lot of time, especially if there is a "slick preamble." There will be. Potter has attended one of the sessions and finds the research is based on unacceptable data collection standards. Christophel asked what the platforms are. Coombe said they are a series of statements about what the university does and what we want to do. He can't remember them all but recalls that the most aggressive one says we will change education as the world knows it; the least aggressive one says that DU has experienced a renaissance. Andy Divine asked how faculty input has been incorporated to date. Faculty will be able to offer input through the focus groups.

Introduction of new senators—Dennis Barrett

Barrett announced continuing and new senators.

Committee reports

None were offered.

Other business:

- ***Parting remarks from the President:*** Giles expressed his appreciation for the support this year. He received a prolonged standing ovation for his work.
- ***Giles appreciation:*** Cathy Potter took the microphone to invite comments. Coombe counted himself “blessed” to have had Giles as president. Other kind comments followed regarding his courage, leadership, kindness, and slow-to-anger temperament. Cathy Potter presented Giles with a gift certificate to the Briarwood, travel books, and from Potter personally a bottle of Presidente Brandy and a plaque from the Senate. Giles responded that he enjoyed the work. It has been hard, but the senate supported him when he needed.
- ***Retirements:*** Giles noted the retirement from the university of a few long-term senators: John Kuark, Alton Barbour, and Helga Watt.
- ***Wilcots appreciation:*** Margaret Whitt acknowledged Barbara Wilcots for her work as senate secretary.

Reminders and announcements

Adjournment: President Leon Giles adjourned the meeting at 1:50.