Faculty Senate Meeting, Friday, October 27, 2017

Location: Graduate School of Social Work, Craig Hall Room 120 (Community Room)

Senators (or proxies) present: Doug Allen (“JB” listed as proxy), Lynn Baker, Linda Bensel-Meyers, Eric Boschmann, Peter Bowen, Daniel Brisson, Ryan Buller, Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Sarah Chatfield, Frederique Chevillot, Kate Crowe, David Daniels, Jared Del Rosso [Megan Kelly proxy], Ron DeLyser, Peter Dobelis, Claude d'Estree, Xin Fan, Pat Garriott, Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Sarah Hart-Micke, John Hill [Kate Crowe proxy], Deborah Howard, Barbekka Hurtt, Meg Jackson [Deborah Howard proxy], Scott Johns, Nadia Kaneva, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Paul Kosemple, Christina Kreps, Michelle Kruse-Crocker [Magdalena Red proxy], Richard Leaman, Andrew Linshaw, Mario Lopez, Zulema Lopez, Kevin Lynch, Brian Majestic, Steven Mayer, Julianne Mitchell [Stephen von Merz proxy], Pallub Paul, Raul Perez [Armond Towns proxy], Sarah Pessin, Andi Pusavat, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Jeremy Reynolds, Jason Roney, Dale Rothman [Claude d’Estree proxy], Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Aaron Schneider, David Schott, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Orna Shaughnessy, Derigan Silver, Dan Singer [Sarah Hart Mice proxy], Amrik Singh, Emily Sposeto, Margareta Stefanovic, Kate Stoker, Billy Stratton, Matthew Taylor, Nicole Taylor [Brian Gearity proxy], Scott Toney, Armond Towns, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels [Dave Schott proxy], Gwen Vogel Mitchell [Jamie Shapiro proxy], Stephen von Merz, Eugene Walls, Sarah Watamura, Annecoos Wiersema, Kate Willink, Melanie Witt [Cheyne Kirkpatrick proxy], Duan Zhang.

Provost’s Update:
The Provost spoke about recent losses of Fred Cheever and Lawrence Argent. He also announced that Jim LaVita, retired faculty member in Anthropology, had very recently passed away as well.

Budget: The Provost stressed that we are tuition-dependent - for each year, 70% of our revenue is dependent upon it. Any volatility in tuition revenue impacts the budget quite a bit, and this year we have less revenue than we had planned for, due to increases in student financial aid. He stressed that the sky isn’t falling, but notes that we will be a bit tighter on new initiatives this year. Urges us to read the budget transmittal that the Provost’s Office puts out every year, as it lays out the priorities for the University. The gross price of the tuition has gone up 40%. Net price, after financial aid, has only gone up 12% over 10 years. Controlled for inflation, the net price has actually decreased. All things considered, we’ve held the line, in many respects, which is impressive given our tuition dependence. He noted that most of the issue in tuition revenue is around Daniels and Korbel, and in both cases, we need to get the revenue/expense ratio back in line. In the meantime, we need to be more mindful of new expenditures across the University. He also noted that enrollment and tuition revenue at the graduate level of the University is extraordinarily complicated – there are people who dedicate their entire professional life to studying and managing it! The most important thing for faculty to know and take away from this report is that the merit budget is 2% for this year. The response during the downturn during the recession was far more severe – no merit and 122 staff positions cut – and this isn’t that. Over the
years, the University has tried to add $1M or so each year to the merit pool to increase our competitiveness. The shortfall ten years ago was $10K, it’s now closer to $5K in terms of pay at DU vs. peer institutions. The multi-year increase to base pay is too much given the tuition-dependence, but the merit. Victor Castellani: “Why do you call the undergrad class expensive? It seems like based on it being the largest class ever, it should be lucrative.” Provost: “It should be, but given the financial aid we give, it’s expensive. We spent $5.7M more on financial aid than was budgeted for. Net revenue from undergrads is about $3M. There are also 23% domestic students of color in this class, and hitting those numbers required an investment in them via financial aid. Basically, we overshot our financial aid, and don’t have a lot of net to balance it out. At the graduate level, we are running a negative, with all factors considered. We have a plan to climb out, but that’s where we are now.” Matthew Taylor: “Years ago, DU referenced a ratio for parents to look at, of ratio of faculty/students. What about the ratio of faculty/staff?” Provost: “Well over 122 of those staff positions cut during the recession have been hired back. Since 2006, there’s been a ratio of 2 staff/admin to 1 faculty member for most universities – which includes administrators as well. Right now, we’re at 2 faculty to 1.7 staff/admin. We have recently loaded up on staff in Advancement, as we’re in the silent phase/about to begin a comprehensive campaign to raise $4 billion. This campaign wouldn’t be possible without this staffing increase.” Kate Willink noted that this report is a teaser for the Provost’s Budget Update, after the next Faculty Senate meeting. She also stressed that this conversation isn’t unusual, it’s habitual. What’s unusual about our Provost’s reports is that you have the context for this set of issues that affect the budget. If you’re a new Senator, the fact that this is being reported out isn’t evidence of the sky falling, it’s a normal part of shared governance at DU.

**Activity Insight**

Linda Kosten opened with some context for how we got to Activity Insight as a software solution for managing faculty data. First, recently the Personnel Committee and Academic Planning Committee jointly formed a committee to collaborate with the Provost’s Office and Budget and Financial Affairs as the University decides what the next steps are for Digital Measures (company that runs Activity Insight) and the University. That committee consisted of: Victor Castellani, Christina Foust, Julianne Mitchell (who is no longer with DU), Derigan Silver, Nancy Wadsworth, Bridget Arend, Katie Schroeder (Research Analyst), and Linda Kosten. She then gave some historical context - in summer 2011, the University signed a 5-yr contract with Digital Measures. Products initially included both Activity Insight and Course Response (a course evaluation product). The stated goal was to purchase software that could serve as repository for faculty data across the university. There was faculty representation on the committee, both in terms of initial selection and adoption of the software, as well as the development of an RFP. At the time, Activity Insight was the top vendor to provide this service, and they are still up there, but there is a lot more competition and pushback from vendors with easier to use/navigate solutions in 2017. The University did sign a second 5-year contract in summer 2016. They would like to use the next 3 years productively, especially so that we don’t need to needlessly migrate, if we do in fact migrate.

We then received a brief overview of what kinds of data is stored in Activity Insight. The University does import quite a bit of data from Banner (contact info, rank/series history, teaching data (course evaluations, grades), grants data. [I was unclear here if the University did actually import any of this data from Banner, or if it was data that they would LIKE to import] In some cases, the University also imports administrative assignments, advising, publications, presentations, department /university/professional/public service commitments, as well as professional memberships and/or positions.

Currently, the University uses Activity Insight for the annual report process, “Celebration of Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work,” accreditation reporting for AACSBB and Higher Learning Commission (HLC), university research assessment, and it is a repository of course info with course evaluation data and grades.
Potential future uses include: population of faculty profiles onto the University of Denver website, the DU Connect Database, exporting and importing of publications into Digital Commons, storing evidence of teaching activity. There is also the potential for the APT process to be managed through Activity Insight, which is something happening on other campuses. The University could also solicit more specific data collection around DU-specific goals on Inclusive Excellence, OneDU, research, etc.

Next steps in the process:

- Solicit input from faculty (Fall 2017)
- Meet w/Chairs and Deans (Oct 2017-Feb 2018)
- Develop more training for 1st year faculty (February-March 2018)
- Make screen revisions based on feedback (March-July 2018)

During this review process, the committee will also be working on short-term improvements to what we’re already doing – can we embed instructions at different levels that will help, etc.? Can we upload from Scopus or other research repositories that can make it easier for faculty? We still would have to address service and other issues, but at least in terms of citations and automation, there may be improvements that can be made.

Notes from discussion at Kate Crowe’s table, as well as University Libraries faculty:

**What people like/how Activity Insight is currently used:**

Annual reporting purposes: In both the University Libraries and Graduate School of Social Work’s case, it’s used for annual reporting officially – but at least in GSSW’s case, the faculty also send a formatted CV separately per the dean’s preference, as well as often a one-page summary. Several people mentioned that they like the year-to-year reporting and being able to add to it as they go – but mentioned that there didn’t seem to be a way to run a report for academic year vs. calendar year if necessary (for example, for accreditation purposes for faculty), which seemed like it should be possible and would be very useful.

Automation/import from Banner: People appreciated the automation of what comes in from Banner, and any pre-populated data that they didn’t have to enter themselves.

**What could be improved or questions people had:**

- Clearer understanding of “who sees what” (deans vs. faculty) and what that looks like: Several folks mentioned that they weren’t always sure how what they enter looks like to deans and department chairs, and that it would be helpful to have a sense of “what’s for the dean,” and what’s for the teaching faculty, and what each looks like.
- Issues with annual reporting: GSSW faculty mentioned that the exported report isn’t formatted in a way that can include “highlights” for the year overall, which is something the dean wants. In addition, neither they nor their dean seem to feel that the exported research/service for the year is formatted in a way that makes it easy to get an overview for either faculty or administration – which is why they believe their dean asks for a separately e-mailed CV and “highlights” summary.
- Issues with co-authored manuscripts: Faculty from GSSW and all other represented departments mentioned issues with co-authored manuscripts and the inability of co-authors to edit.
- Inability to add rich text to citations and/or export in multiple styles: Multiple University Libraries faculty members mentioned this, and several folks at the table did as well. They also mentioned that they disliked that citations couldn’t be exported or imported in multiple styles/style guides.
- No inclusion of DU-specific goals: Several schools and colleges like GSSW are making specific efforts and goals related to inclusive excellence, and there is no way to specify this in the current Activity Insight setup. Same with other strategic planning/Impact 2025 goals.
• Lack of ability to use Activity Insight data to create a public faculty research profile – both for individual faculty, as well as departments/schools, and even the whole university.
• Clearer guidance on what the different categories in Activity Insight are/how they are to be used, and having the “most used” ones (Publications, etc.) up toward the top.
• More automation/pre-population/import ability: Several University Libraries faculty mentioned that it would be nice to be able to import from citation management tools like Refworks and Zotero. Several faculty at the table said that it would be lovely if university service obligations could pre-populate, or be entered by administrative/executive assistants for each dept. because each school has a list (or should).
• A clear “end date” to the editing of annual reports, with a potential for addenda if something is missed or needs correction after that date.
• The ability to output in multiple citation styles. It’s not “friendly” to add data.
• Public impact isn’t adequately addressed. There should be a way to pull in public documents and automate more of this kind of import.

Intellectual Property Policy Discussion
Alex Hall (Corinne Lengsfeld rep) from Office of Intellectual Property and Tech Transfer: There is a copyright policy, IP policy, and a patent policy. We do not have any documentation that the patent policy was ever approved by the board – there are a lot of documentation gaps. The proposal is to create one IP policy that would incorporate these three policies’ language. She’s gotten feedback from her IP policy group and SPARC (sp?) group. There is no question too small. Claude d’Estree: “Is there a procedure/ultimate arbiter in place if I were to present an issue of IP?” Alex: “It would be me, ultimately, with the advice of the faculty IP committee...if it relates to intellectual property, that’s me. I sit with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. There are 12 faculty from around the campus on the IP committee. I’m hoping to get more social sciences, most of them are in the “hard” sciences.” They meet quarterly.” Victor Castellani: “I understand why lawyers have to look at this, but perhaps a grammarian would be helpful [gave an example].” Alex suggested that anyone with any suggestions should reach out to Alex directly, which Kate seconded, and revisited the request to self-nominate if senators or others are well-versed in intellectual property issues.

Enacting Collaborative Governance: There are 2 ad hoc committees. One: “Whither the Wall.” That has been formed and will begin to meet soon, and is composed of faculty, staff, and students. Two: “Non Tenure Track Faculty Committee.” Created last winter, they are in the process of finishing a survey for NTT faculty, which will be distributed soon. There is also a Teaching Excellence Working Group that is part of Academic Planning Committee, which will continue to bring together people from across campus, including OTL and others around this area. Web-Based Faculty Activity reporting Subcommittee: Now a standing committee, looking into faculty experience with Activity Insight and having an ongoing voice in this process. Bookstore Subcommittee: Standing committee, created by the Senate.

Academic Planning Committee: Conversations & Canvassing
Sarah Pessin led the Senate in tabled conversations about different things Faculty Senate is working on relevant to Teaching Excellence working group. Prompt: What would be the value of adding student-directed questions as part of the student evaluation process, specifically if we added a way to allow/encourage students to assess their own role in the evaluation process – what would/could/might that look like, both in terms of positive/negative impacts on students and positive/negative impacts on faculty.

Summary of Kate Crowe’s table’s discussion: GSSW faculty: Some faculty do a student-directed midterm evaluation/check-in. There is some value also in just asking the students to consider these questions – but
they should be asked far before the end of the quarter, so that the faculty and the students could redirect efforts. There is also a benefit to doing this in-class, not electronically, so you get 100% and anonymous feedback. By the final evaluation, they’ve also kind of vented in the midterm check-in, and they feel “listened to,” so they give more productive, strengths-based final evals. Question from another faculty member: How would they actually incorporate this – would it just be another narrative box? There might be a concern with “one size fits all” approach, because not all classes’ formats are the same – some clinical or lab courses wouldn’t have office hours, and one of the sample questions dealt with office hours. You’d need to have some customization or students might think that they “didn’t get something” that’s just not a part of that kind of class. Also, is there an option to disaggregate for co-taught courses? This is currently an issue in course evaluations as-is.

**Motion for Senator Fred Cheever**

Motion brought by Megan Kelly, seconded by Frederique Chevillot. Question: Annetcoos Wiersma: second paragraph, would want to add “scholarship.” Megan pointed out the section of the motion further down that specifically dealt with Dr. Cheever’s scholarship, so no amendment required. Nancy Sampson: “Call to Question.” No one opposed, motion passes unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:32.