

**University of Denver  
Faculty Senate  
Minutes  
January 14, 2011  
Renaissance Room South**

**Senators (or proxies) present:** Bill Anderson, Jennifer Campbell, Paul Colomy, Michael Daniels, Christof Demont-Heinrich, Ralph DiFranco, Rachel Epstein, Judith Fox, Katherine Freeman, Sylvia Hall-Ellis, Annabeth Headrick, Darin Hicks, John Hill (Secretary), Jennifer Hoffman, Ruth Ann Jebe, Scott Johns (also proxy for Tim Hurley), Arthur Jones, Peggy Keeran (proxy for Sandy Macke), Maciej Kumosa, Frank Laird, Rick Leaman, Tiffani Lennon, Scott Leutenegger, Mario Lopez, Sandra Macke, Mohammad Matin, Don McCubbrey (President), Erin Meyer, Paul Michalec, Keith Miller, Paul Novak, Maik Nwosu, Linda Olson, George Potts, Martin Quigley, Tom Quinn, Charles Reichardt, Paula Rhodes, Polina Rikoun, Karen Riley, Nicholas Rockwell, Nancy Sampson, Robert Stencel, Barb Stuart (proxy for Vi Narapareddy), Matthew Taylor, Bruce Uhrmacher, Gordon von Stroh, Nancy Wadsworth, Linda Wang and Wilfried Wilms.

**Call to Order, Approval of Minutes**

Don McCubbrey, Senate President, called the meeting to order at noon.

A motion to approve the minutes from November 12, 2010 was seconded and approved.

Don McCubbrey reminded the Senate of the following upcoming events:

- Faculty Senate Meeting: Friday, February 4, 11:30-1:30
- Wed. Feb. 17, 2011 Faculty Club 4:00-6:00
- Wed. Feb. 23, 2011 Faculty Meeting w/Provost 1:00-2:00

The Senate calendar and documents are available at <http://www.du.edu/facsen/>.

**Provost's Report and Questions**

The Provost reported the following:

**Budget**—We are about midway through preparation of the FY12 budget. The budget situation is still very fluid, but the approximate parameters are 1200 first year students, 200 transfer students, less than 5000 total undergraduates, about the same number of graduate students, 37 percent discount rate, and a \$13 million operating margin. I will provide more information on this later as it becomes available.

We are in good shape on the FY11 (current academic year) budget. A \$17 million operating margin was planned; it appears the actual operating margin will be about \$29 million. This occurs primarily because our actual financial discount was 33.7 percent versus a plan of 36 percent. Each one percent of discount equates to about \$1.7 million. Some universities have discount rates as high as 53 percent. Our goal is a maximum of 40 percent. The discount contributes to both need-based and merit-based financial aid. I intend to talk with the Board of Trustees about lowering the planned operating margin in future plans. Excess operating margin is invested well at the end of the year; it cannot be used for faculty or staff salaries.

**Searches**—Searches for the Vice Chancellor, Technology Services and the Vice Chancellor, Communications are underway. A very good search firm has been retained for these searches. We have also retained a search firm for the Associate Provost, Inclusive Excellence. The search for a staff director for the Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (CCESL) was unsuccessful, so we have switched to a faculty director model. The position has been posted and I hope to have it filled within two weeks.

**Summer Term**—This has been discussed previously with the Senate and with the Deans. We have an initiative to expand our summer course offerings. Student surveys indicate increasing student demand for this, and it would make use of DU infrastructure that is largely unused during the summer. Absent a more intentional summer quarter, students have little choice but to take courses elsewhere in the summer. The Board of Trustees and the Chancellor asked for an aggressive proposal.

Summer 2010 yielded about \$4 million in tuition with a 6.3 percent discount rate. Our plan is for a 25 percent increase next summer to \$5 million with financial aid increased to a discount rate of 15 percent. We are adding money to the units for this; budget expectations have been distributed to the deans. The planned increase is the equivalent of about 260 enrollments, or about two courses per unit. These 260 enrollments are distributed across the 6 traditional undergraduate units. They are not evenly distributed, because some were already doing a great deal, while others were doing very little.

It is hoped the summer session will include at least two online courses per unit; our expectations is a total of 17 online courses. These are guidelines; this is a unit level decision. About 40 faculty have signed up at CTL for training in online course design and delivery. The online option is especially important in summer.

We need to be careful and thoughtful about this. We want to maintain incentives for summer research. Additional summer teaching is usually not good for junior tenure track faculty.

Responses to questions about summer term:

There is a wide range of possible instructors ranging from adjuncts to senior faculty close to retirement.

Summer courses are not part of the culture in many units.

Communication about summer term has been hit and miss. We intend to establish more marketing and a website. Many students already know about it, and they have said they will come. There is an element of “if you build it they will come” to this. Since 40 percent of our students have no financial need, the relatively low financial aid is not expected to be a significant adverse factor.

We need to be careful with course selections, i.e., figure out what students need and want.

Summer session should be raised and discussed during advising week.

No change in the pay structure is planned. Courses will be paid on overload unless the instructor is on a 12 month contract.

The normal budget consequences would apply if the goals are not met, i.e., the standard operating practices are extended to summer. This has been discussed with the deans.

The graduate level is a very diverse landscape and is not a focus of this initiative. There is more demand at the undergraduate level.

We would expect the normal minimum numbers to run courses.

Support services would not include everything offered in other terms. However, housing, health services, and Penrose would be available.

This may be a good time to run some intensive language courses.

I will remind deans to communicate regarding this. Each unit has a way of running its curriculum, and I expect there will be unit-level conversations among deans and faculty. The deans know the expectations and have all the relevant planning information.

We have rejected “teaser prices” or differential prices by unit. This would commoditize our effort; it would be better to differentiate on the basis of financial aid.

**Admission Report**—Applications for first year students entering fall 2011 look very good. We have 6286 completed applications versus 5065 in 2010. Out of state applications are up by 32 percent over 2010. Applications from students of color are up by 32 percent over 2010. The early action applicants have very strong academic profiles: GPA is 3.77 versus 3.74 (2010), average ACT is 28.03 versus 27.76 (2010), and average SAT is 1241 versus 1230 (2010). Early action applicants express a decline in interest in business, 21 percent versus 29 percent (2007), and increased interest in NSM, 22 percent versus 12 percent (2007).

It is very early in the graduate application process. Completed applications are up 20 percent over 2010. Application from students of color are 10 percent higher than 2010.

**Provost Conference (Scholarly Communication in the Digital Age)**—I suggest the Senate pass a resolution regarding Open Access journals. We are currently paying in every possible way

for access to scholarly publications. This situation is untenable. Other institutions are increasingly recognizing and using Open Access scholarly publications. This is a faculty decision.

### **Responses to Questions**

In response to a question about DU's research rankings the Provost stated he has initiated discussions with the deans about this, and that research rankings often depend on research volume where a small University such as DU has little possibility of competing.

### **Executive Committee Report and Questions—Senate President Don McCubbrey**

The Senate Executive Committee meets one week before each Senate meeting to set the agenda and allocate time to each item. Please let us know if you wish to suggest an item for the agenda.

The next items on today's agenda are reports from the Academic Planning Committee and the Personnel Committee.

Here is a brief update on our other stretch goals that we will not discuss today:

- Creating a more cosmopolitan campus—we have not made much headway on this yet.
- The use of Open Education Resources and Open Access journals—The Provost's conference was a big step forward on this and further discussions are underway. Please see the Faculty Forum for more information and please contribute to the Faculty Forum conversation.
- Increasing interdisciplinary research—Substantial funds have been allocated for interdisciplinary research grants and an RFP has been released.

A former Daniels colleague is now the global information manager at 3M. They have a system that employees use to share information globally. We will pilot test this system at Daniels and expand its use if it proves useful.

We need a Senate volunteer to serve on the Wellness Coalition. If you are interested, please let me know.

### **Academic Planning Committee Report and Discussion—Linda Olson**

General Education Review—the Committee has reviewed the process for the recent General Education revisions. Our goal was to identify process improvements for the next revisions. We have summarized the processes that were used, surveyed department chairs, identified positive aspects of the processes, and identified pockets of concern. A draft of our report will be available soon. Please let us know if you have comments or suggestions.

Teaching Excellence Initiative—This is one of the Senate's stretch goals. The initiative comes out of an awareness of the increased abilities and expanded experiences of incoming

undergraduates: higher GPA's; higher SAT/ACT scores; many completed AP courses; experience with technology in a learning environment; and experience with engaged learning techniques.

I want to stress this is NOT a problem-based approach to teaching: we are not starting from the perspective that there is something wrong at DU. Rather, we have an opportunity, and this initiative is meant to stretch us to achieve higher levels of teaching effectiveness and professional continuous improvement.

Highlights of the Teaching Excellence Initiative include:

We want it to be self-selected for faculty, self-motivated and self-paced. We know faculty have many demands. This is not meant to be another demand, but rather a plan to use resources available with more awareness and efficiency and to create learning communities of faculty who can spur us on to more professional growth.

Individual approach: Utilize peer mentoring, cross-pollination, classroom visitations, and co-teaching. Use CTL courses designed around stretch areas identified by faculty; the Committee will work closely with CTL to develop these.

Pilot test a Group/Department approach: 2-4 departments will self-identify as departments willing to assess and develop a strategy for their own growth; two departments have already agreed to test this. These departments will identify their own needs, their own goals, and resources available (CTL and others), and include these to craft a self-determined strategy for improvement.

Ideas under consideration: a half day conference each year on Teaching; Faculty Learning Communities; Stronger marketing of CTL workshops and web-resources by faculty to faculty; Teaching Tip of the Month; and Weekly e-mail blast.

Questions for the Senate today:

1. Is there merit in this idea overall for a continuous teaching improvement initiative?
2. Is APC headed in the right direction and should we continue to work on this?

Comments from Senators:

- Faculty has a lot to do already.
- There are potentially conflicting messages: the importance of research versus teaching.
- Is this needed given the existing role and activities of CTL?
- There are pockets that need improvement.

Linda Olson noted this is not intended to be an imposition, but rather a move forward with professional development. The initiative would be narrow, tight, and focused. Linda said the Committee welcomes comments and suggestions.

Don McCubbrey stated the initiative appears worthwhile, although there are many items to address and specifics need to be developed.

In an informal vote, at least 75% of Senators present indicated the APC should continue its efforts as described to the Senate.

### **Personnel Committee Report and Discussion—Scott Leutenegger**

Scott presented the following summary of the Committee's activities and concerns:

- Faculty Awards: Reminder, awards nominations due February 7<sup>th</sup>.
- Grievance Policy Update:
  - Latest version has the approval of Human Resources.
  - Subcommittee will meet and discuss and then it will go to the Personnel Committee.
- APT revision process:
  - Subcommittee members: Chip Reichardt, George Potts, Rick Leaman, Art Jones, Arthur Best, Sylvia Hall Ellis, Judy Fox.
  - Issues that may need to be addressed include:
    - 3 year tenure review process/guidelines.
    - Language to include high quality open access journal publications.
    - Clarification of who is eligible for emeritus status (clinical and research professors?).
    - Process for hiring research professors.
    - Better definition of rules and responsibilities of clinical faculty.
    - Length of contracts for contingent faculty.
    - Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, and assistant to associate professor for clinical & research.
    - How the APT document articulates with the newly proposed grievance policy.
    - How the APT policy and grievance policy articulate with the FRC.
    - Alignment of divisional/department constitutions/bylaws with APT document.
    - The inclusion or exclusion of "collegiality" as criteria in annual evaluations, 3 year reviews, and T&P. Possibly changing to another term such as "citizenship" instead of collegiality?

Responses to questions:

Scott further noted that an effort was made to establish a committee with wide spread representation. The committee may need to add additional representatives and seek input where needed, particularly from contingent faculty. The subcommittee addressing the three-year review has not yet met.

Comments from Senators regarding "collegiality" as a criterion included:

- Should it be a criterion?
- How can it be measured?
- It has lead to disagreement with administration.
- Perhaps we should encourage "collegiality" rather than attempt to assess it?
- This criterion is not applied uniformly across campus.
- Perhaps collegiality should be included within the service criterion?

Scott stated he was not hearing much support for collegiality as a criterion. He also invited the Senate to send additional questions and comments to the Committee.

The Provost emphasized the importance of the APT document: it is a faculty-owned document at the heart of shared governance. He recommended that the Senate get a draft on the table and invite discussion of it.

In an unrelated matter, Jennifer Campbell, editor of the Faculty Forum, called for everyone to join the conversation about Open Access and Open Educational Resources.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

### **Prepared and submitted by**

John Hill  
Faculty Senate Secretary