

**University of Denver  
Faculty Senate  
Minutes  
May 7, 2010  
Renaissance Room South**

**Senators (or proxies) present:** Bill Anderson, Jennifer Campbell, Frederique Chevillot, Paul Colomy, Ralph DiFranco, Jeff Engelstad, Judith Fox, Stacey Freedenthal, Chris GauthierDickey, Michele Hanna, John Hill (Secretary), Allison Horsley, Tim Hurley(also proxy for Scott Johns), Ruth Ann Jebe, Peggy Keeran, Frank Laird, James LaVita, Rick Leaman, Michael Levine-Clark (President), Tiffani Lennon, Scott Leutenegger, Mario Lopez, Jeff Ludwig, Sandra Macke, Chris Malloy, Mohammad Matin, Don McCubbrey, Paul Michalec, Mia Mulvey, Ved Nanda, Paul Novak, Linda Olson, George Potts, Charles Reichardt, Paula Rhodes, Polina Rikoun, Nicholas Rockwell, Christy Ann Rowe, Nancy Sampson, Sheila Schroeder, Robert Stencil (also proxy for Jennifer Hoffman), Gordon von Stroh, Nancy Wadsworth, Wilfried Wilms, and Yavuz Yasar (proxy for Katherine Freeman).

**Call to Order**

Michael Levine-Clark, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order at noon.

A motion to approve the minutes from April 16, 2010 was seconded and approved.

**Provost's Report and Questions (Gregg Kvistad)**

I will provide an update on a few important items; everything is good news.

Deposits for fall undergraduates have never been higher: we have 1256 deposits for 1200 slots; we expect some ebb and flow over the summer.

The academic profile for the fall entering class has improved: SAT scores average 1200, up about 40 points from last year; ACT scores are up; GPA is up slightly, but this is a less reliable indicator. Domestic minority students comprise 17.9 percent of the class versus 14 percent last year.

Financial aid seems plentiful thus far; we have \$7 million more than last year for need-based aid. The discount rate is about 38 percent versus 40 percent last year. We were less systematic last year because of severe concern about the prevailing economic conditions. We are below the target discount rate. We currently project our discount rate to increase to 40 percent by 2013 and then level off; some private institutions are greater than 50 percent.

The graduate picture is also very positive. There is some slight softness in law school deposits, possibly due to concerns about jobs for attorneys. Daniels applications are up, other units are about the same as last year.

The budget process was protracted this year. We started in October with discussions with each of the 47 budget units. Normally the process would have been completed in January, but it took until March. The 2.9 percent tuition increase meant that there was less revenue and therefore less funds to work with. The Trustees insisted upon a significant operating margin because of the uncertain economy. We recently settled on a \$17 million operating reserve, but in October the reserve was only \$4-5 million; hence, the lengthy budget process. The budget was approved by the Board's Finance and Budget Committee, and we expect it to be approved by the full Board in June. The budget transmittal document is 50 pages.

The general budget parameters are: 2.91 percent tuition increase, 36 percent discount rate, and \$7 million increase in financial aid. 42 percent receive merit aid only.

42.7 percent of students have financial need. 84 percent receive need-based aid, merit aid, or both.

The need gap is \$5700; it was \$9000 three years ago. This gap is filled with private loans; university aid, and federal or state subsidized loans are not used to fill this gap.

We have 4898 undergraduate students, 4987 graduate students, and 12,101 total students including non-traditional students.

The preliminary placeholder FY 2012 budget parameters are a 4 percent tuition increase, a 3 percent merit pool, and a \$42 million expense budget (3.4 percent increase).

There are several planned investments: Daniels will add 13 faculty positions and Sturm will add 10 faculty positions over the next three years; a total of 15.62 faculty FTEs will be added next year. Morgridge will add staff. A total of 21 staff will be added campus-wide. Five years ago we were staff-heavy relative to our peers. Now we have 1.76 staff per faculty versus 2.16 for our peer institutions.

Proceeds from the sale of the Phipps mansion will go to financial aid.

I will send a more complete message about the budget after the Board of Trustees approval. Last year I thought the annual report would provide adequate budget information, but it did not.

### **Senate Constitution, Bylaws (NCR)**

Frederique Chevillot briefly described the proposed changes to the Senate Constitution and Bylaws distributed prior to this Senate meeting.

Chip Reichardt moved to change "on leave" on page 3 of the proposed changes to the Constitution to "out of residence."

The senate approved Chip's motion, the Constitution and Bylaw changes by the following vote:

Yes—41  
No—0  
Abstain—0

## **Senate Elections (NCR)**

Frederique Chevillot reminded everyone Senate elections will be held at the next meeting. The email announcement regarding the elections will serve as the first reading.

## **Honor Code Revision**

Professor Michael Kerwin presented on behalf of the 13-member Honor Code Task Force.

Ten years ago a committee established DU's first honor code. The current committee was mindful of the effort and thought that went into the initial honor code, which was understood to be a living document that would change over time and could be altered at the discretion of the Provost. In late 2009 the Provost asked Kristin Olsen and I to form an Honor Code Task Force made up of faculty, staff, administrators, and students to evaluate the effectiveness of the Honor Code and recommend changes to strengthen the code. Our current focus is only on the students and academic misconduct only, i.e., we have not considered changes to the code of conduct for faculty, staff, or administrators, nor have we examined non-academic misconduct. We will examine such additional matters in the near future. We intend our initial suggestions to establish technology to aid in identifying plagiarized papers, standardize and simplify ways to report student Honor Code violations, and establish a higher profile of the honor code so that students understand the expectations.

The Honor Code Task Force's recommendations are:

1. Distill the existing statement into clear language, and provide specific examples—Our survey showed that most students, faculty, and staff did not know what the Honor Code is, or how it is adjudicated.
2. All members of the community should be “EXPECTED” to report student violations—This is based on the Daniel's College Business “constructive action” concept. Faculty would choose how to deal with violations in their own classes.
3. New technology—Provide training and encourage the use of Safe Assign on Blackboard.
4. Establish a website and publications, with clear language, and specific examples of violations; the schools with the best Honor Codes also have excellent websites dedicated to the topic.
5. Market the changes and get the students involved—Students must promote reasons not to cheat for this to work. A recent report suggests that as many as 70% of college students cheat. We know that ultimately it is a choice not to cheat. Thus, students must convince other students that there is an advantage to acting with integrity and honor.

6. Provide training and explanations on the Honor Code to all new students—Currently students get some training at Pioneer Passage and perhaps in their first year seminar. A senior honor student stated she heard about the honor code in Sept 2006, but not again until May 2010.
7. Train faculty and staff on the Honor Code and proper procedures for reporting violations.
8. All violations should be reported to the Office of Citizenship and Community Standards—As a faculty member I welcome this action. In the past I have had violations and not known what to do or whom to contact. The Honor Code Task Force seeks fair and consistent adjudication.

The Honor Code Task Force welcomes comments and suggestions.

### **Discussion:**

George Potts complimented the document and remarked that incidents are often not black and white. Kristin Olson noted her office is available to help.

Almost all syllabi mention the honor code.

There are many subtle ways to cheat, e.g., purchasing papers. Kristin replied that our goal is to change the culture and that we will not catch everyone. We want to establish a high integrity climate.

We should also focus on structuring assignments that make cheating more difficult, e.g., require draft reports.

Will the increased quality of students help with this?—Michael Kerwin suggested it may be more about the fabric of the community than the quality of the students.

Kristin Olson stated that cheating is not consistently handled across the graduate units.

### **Pre-Tenure Review Discussion (continued)**

Question: Would it be possible to craft something short of this to address exceptional cases rather than implement a full-scale change?

Michael Levine-Clark responded: Perhaps, but how would we implement it in a fair and systematic way?

Question: What is the extent of the problem? How many of the six-year reviewees should have gone out at three years? Michel Levine-Clark said he would try to gather data about this.

Comments:

Give direct explicit feedback at three years.

Do more to help Associates advance to Full. Michael Levine-Clark stated we can look at this too.

This could impact our ability to recruit faculty.

Some departments already encourage some to leave after three years.

Some institutions provide one quarter off from teaching for research.

Regarding current practices: The Provost reminded everyone that legally we use one-year contracts; with annual reappointments; there are no three year contracts. New faculty typically have six years, but it depends on their prior experience. In any case, there is a mid-term review. Few are let go prior to tenure review. The seriousness of pre tenure review varies widely across the campus.

Michael Levine-Clark asked the Senate members to ponder what might be the best way to develop a proposal, and stated the Personnel Committee is looking at it.

## **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

## **Prepared and submitted by**

John Hill  
Faculty Senate Secretary