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Senators (or proxies) present: Doug Allen, Anneliese Andrews, Eric Boschmann (proxy: Paul Sutton), Jeff Bowen, Daniel Brisson, Ryan Buller (proxy: Elia Trucks), Libby Catchings, Santhosh Chandrashekar, Sara Chatfield, Kate Crowe (proxy: Elia Trucks), Ron DeLyser, Claude d’Estree, Peter Dobelis, Xin Fan, Rachel Feder, Gustavo Fierros Torres, Christina Foust (proxy: Santhosh Chandrashekar), Pat Garriott, Brian Garry (proxy: Gwen Vogel Mitchell), Kingshuk Ghosh, Ashley Hamilton, Tamara Hannaway, Tayana Hardin, Darrin Hicks, John Hill, Deborah Howard, Barbekka Hurtt, Scott Johns (proxy: Kate Stoker), Oliver Kaplan, Mike Keables, Megan Kelly, Michelle Knowles (proxy: Brian Majestic), Paul Kosempel, Christina Kreps, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Richard Leaman, Andrew Linshaw, Zulema Lopez, Kevin Lynch (proxy: Michael Siebecker), Julia MacDonald, Brian Majestic, Ann Makikalli, Keith Miller, Linda Olson, Sarah Pessin, Andi Pusavat, Chip Reichardt, Jason Roney, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Aaron Schneider, David Schott, Jonathan Sciarcon, Michael Siebecker, Derigan Silver, Dan Singer, Amrik Singh, Emily Sposeto, Mary Stansbury, Margareta Stefanovic, Trent Steidley, Kate Stoker, Ron Throupe, Scott Toney, Elia Trucks, Michele Tyson, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels (proxy: David Schott), Gwen Vogel Mitchell, Roberta Walbaum, Sarah Watamura, Anneoos Wiersema (proxy: Kate Stoker), Kate Willink, Terri-Jo Woellner, Matthew Zalkind

Faculty Senate President Darrin Hicks called the Senate meeting to order at noon.

The Senate then observed a moment of silence to honor the passing of our valued colleague and former Senator, Luis Leon (Professor of Religious Studies).

President Hicks announced a request for nominations for four faculty members to serve on the Knowledge Bridges selection committee. He requested nominations be send to John Hill by next Thursday. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will meet to discuss the nominations.

President Hicks then provided a review of the agenda.

At Large Senate Elections
Senator John Hill: There will be two elections using paper ballots. The first vote will be to elect a single At Large Senator for a three-year term. The second vote will be for one At Large representative to serve on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee member must be a sitting Senator. There were two candidates for the Executive Committee position: Claude d’Estree (Korbel) and Mike Keables (NSM). For the Senator At Large position, there were also two candidates: Bobbie Kite (UCOL) and Keith Miller (NSM).
Senator Hill then asked for nominations from the floor, but there were none. Each candidate then had a minute or two to speak.

Claude de’Estree: Prepared remarks on being considered as an At-Large member of the faculty Senate Executive Committee.

At first I thought, only half-jokingly, that I would put on my hat as the Buddhist Chaplain here at DU and lead you all in a 2-minute meditation or a MBSR exercise. I am sorry to say that that will not happen, at least today.

I initially joined the Senate not just to represent the Korbel school, but with the expressed intention on working on behalf of what we then called “contingent faculty.” I had spent the first 7 years at DU as a “Visiting Professor,” though I was not visiting from anywhere and being paid by the course, teaching upward 10 courses per year to scratch out close to $40K. When I was finally given the distinct honor of being appointed as a Lecturer with benefits, and adding to my teaching load directing the human rights degree program and two academic centers, I also discovered that I was an “at will” employee with a one-year contract that wasn’t worth the paper it was written on, no governance privileges, and no due process that would be made available. I jumped at the chance to work on the revision of the APT under the remarkable leadership of Chip Reichardt. When we took the APT around to the various academic units I was disheartened to hear that some of my tenured colleagues expressed the opinion that if the title of “professor” were given to people like me it would diminish their own status. We have made some progress since the implementation of the current APT, if you consider “separate but equal” to be progress.

Certainly there is more investment in the hiring and promotion of NNT lines in the various units, but we have a long way to go. Compensation packages and the pay bumps from assistant to associate and associate to full are only one area. At my own school there is no governance structure and no merit pay review. We are developing, for the first time in the school’s history, a comprehensive governance structure. During those discussions there have been serious suggestions that NTT faculty should have NO vote in ANY aspects of the school’s policy, curriculum and hiring decisions. Others suggested that the NNT faculty vote should cap at a maximum of 30% of the faculty vote. One of my NNT faculty colleagues aptly noted that why not give each NNT faculty a 3/5 vote and be done with it. Clearly we have a long way to go.

Outside of the military, I have never witnessed a more hierarchical and status driven institution than I find in academia. I have often joked that we should all be wearing Star Trek uniforms with proper colors and collar pips to denote rank and status. A colleague recently wrote to me a lucid and well-articulated argument that the academic institution ought to be strictly hierarchical and that it was the natural order of things. Perhaps he was unaware, but it was, in fact, a classic argument for the caste system as the natural order of the universe. We definitely have a long way to go. This Quarter I will initiate the first listening session for NNT at Korbel. With the help of the Faculty Senate and AAUP I hope to take these listening sessions to all the other academic units on campus this year.

We have 342 appointed NNT faculty which represents 41% of the total appointed faculty (of 843). Those numbers will continue to rise because we are cheaper, teach significantly more
classes, and have less power. In addition, we have approximately 550 adjunct faculty each Quarter, which represents 65% of the total NNT and TT faculty. It is my intention to be a strong voice for NNT faculty, but also for the large number of adjunct faculty who are not represented by this body at all. Thank you.

Mike Keables: I have been at the university for 33 years and have seen a lot as a faculty member and as an interim dean under two chancellors in two schools. I understand how the administration works. I will be an advocate for all faculty. A key initiative I am interested in is looking at the balance of a career on a career pathway. I want to be a voice for all faculty and would be happy to serve on the Executive Committee.

Michelle Kruse-Crocker (on behalf of Bobbie Kite): Bobbie came to us from Ohio; she is on the teaching professor line, and is an advocate for health care access. She is from the Healthcare Management program in University College and is focused on interdisciplinary work. She wants to ingrain herself further in the DU community and the Senate.

Keith Miller: I’ve been here since 2003 and have been a member of the Faculty Senate for some time, though I’ve been out for a while. I’m faculty in Chemistry, a faculty representative for athletes, and I direct the Honors Program. I’m interested in this position because I know a lot of you in all of my roles, and I would like to speak and participate collectively as an At Large Senator, speaking for everyone, not just from my department. I would welcome the opportunity to serve.

After these statements from the candidates, ballots were distributed for voting. Senators received one ballot, proxies receive one ballot, and Senators who are also proxies have two ballots. No one should have more than two ballots.

**Modern Think Survey Results**
President Hicks then provided an overview of the results from the Modern Think survey, which is a replacement for the Administrator Evaluations. Hicks explained that he would go through the results quickly as a review, and that there is more to do with these results like report out by unit. The slide deck is available on the Faculty Senate website under the Faculty Resources tab ([https://www.du.edu/facsen/resources/index.html](https://www.du.edu/facsen/resources/index.html)).

The survey was conducted by Modern Think, which specializes in evaluating institutions, and is known for the Great Colleges to Work For survey in the Chronicle. The benefit satisfaction results are currently being analyzed. We added 4 open ended questions, and 8 demographic questions.

The response rate for the survey is 54%, a huge increase from the previous Administrator Evaluations, which were below 10% and therefore invalid. The breakdown of the response rate is: 61% for tenure line faculty, 55% for non-tenure track faculty, and 19% for adjunct faculty (which is not a great response rate but pretty typical).

The dimensions in the survey cover a wide range of issues (see Slide 9). The dimensions are ranked from the highest rated to the lowest rated on Slide 10.
The most useful slides, which were compiled by Laura Maresca and Linda Kosten, include a comparison between the overall DU scores and the “Honor Roll,” the top schools that perform well in 7 of the dimensions over several years. These “Honor Roll” schools include Hofstra, Texas Christian, Illinois State, and Mississippi State. With more than 10k students, we are in the “large school” category.

Slide 11 shows how we compare to these other schools, and it shows we have some work to do, though there isn’t a huge chasm. The dimensions are listed in order of rate of positive satisfaction. With the Collaboration dimension, we dip below 55% satisfaction.

The slides include an item breakdown for each dimension across all faculty series. Faculty are invited to look at these slides more deeply on the Senate website, and we will talk more about the results later in great detail.

Slide 14 is a breakdown of tenure line. Compare this slide to Slide 15 and NTT lines. There is a point or two of difference across dimensions but not huge differences. Fairness drops to the bottom with NTT, as Claude has suggested from his opening remarks. For adjunct faculty, there was a lower response rate overall, but their responses were generally positive.

Slide 17 is a heat map. Everything indicated in green is pretty positive, with results just a point or two below those with similar enrollment size and on the honor roll. Based on this breakdown, people feel good about job fit and job autonomy, and have good relationships with chairs and supervisors. When individuals are asked to think about their own jobs, they are positive. But when asked to think about systems across the institution, the numbers drop a bit.

The issues that warrant attention are indicated in bright yellow (fair to mediocre). There is a lot to think about in these results that relate to what we do together as faculty. We need to start digging into the data and think of how to increase these numbers to make work life here better.

Questions asked of the Chancellor are broken down across line and then all of DU. The two dimensions that are lower include: general interest of faculty and staff and open communication.

Responses for past Provost Gregg Kvistad are a tick lower. Communication is consistently lower across the board. One result on the breaking point (55%) is credibility, but responses were high for the assessment of knowledge, skills, experience, and values.

On the unit level: with deans, chairs, vice provosts, etc., open communication ranked lower.

For supervisors and department chairs: feedback from supervisors is an area to focus on. When you start looking at item breakdowns, general things to work on is compensation. Do they feel we compensate equitably? Performance reviews are also a consistent thread. People want better review standards. Are low reviews handled in a direct and open manner?
Another issue to think about is engagement. People want more open lines of communication, to be more involved in decision making, and for decisions to be made from robust discussion and debate. There is not enough robustness and debate in these conversations.

Slide 23 includes the top statements in the survey: job contributing to mission of the institution and responsibility and freedom. The requirements fall sharply for NNT lines.

Slide 25 includes the more negative responses: adequate faculty and staff, institutional culture, and reflection on advancing career. We need to reflect on these more.

Overall, there is positive feedback and there are some real issues of concern. We will keep analyzing and talking about this data.

Jeff Bowen: I suggest we throw out adjunct data. They primarily have other jobs.

Darrin Hicks: Many adjuncts have multiple jobs, are teaching at multiple schools, and it’s a tough existence. Those that are adjuncting as a side job to their career, I imagine, might be happier in their job. But I don’t think we throw out their data, but instead try for more feedback next time.

Kate Willink: Send this information back to your colleagues. Even though shared governance isn’t a great score, this whole thing came about because of it. Jared del Rosso, Billy Stratton, and Laura Maresca worked to put this together, and we spent a lot of money on this instrument. This is the first time as a Senate that we have shifted from an in-house assessment to a validated instrument that allows for peer-to-peer comparison. This is a big step forward to making data-driven decisions. In terms of the issue of compensation: talk to Paul Kosempel and ask about the compensation study being conducted right now by the financial planning committee.

Darrin Hicks: Thank you to Mike Furno, Linda, and Laura who have been very responsive to questions.

Doug Allen: This is a good scanning system to identify priority issues, even if some of the responses seem problematic. Less than average does not seem like an acceptable place to me. It’s not a sustainable environment for the university. We don’t want to give ourselves a false sense of security with the heat map.

Kingshuk Ghosh: Can we get unit level data?
Darrin Hicks: Yes, but some units are small. We will have the data by Nov 1.

**Election Results**
The election results were then announced: Keith Miller was elected as the Senator At Large, and Claude d’Estree was elected as At Large representative on the Executive Committee.

**First Reading and Discussion of Motions on Committee Constitution and Appointment**
President Hicks explained the process for debating a motion on the floor of the Senate. After points of clarification, we then move to general and open debate. We have about 30 minutes, and
we will do this again in November. If the debate is as robust as I hope it is, we need a 90 second rule. We only have a stationary mic in the room. Please line up and we’ll take the mic one by one. Now I’ll turn it over to Senator Aaron Schneider, who put forth this motion.

Aaron Schneider: Thank you for entertaining this motion. It comes from a problem that I have perceived on campus, that as a category we as faculty are relatively weak. The Senate can get pushed around by a centralized university with administrators with significant power. This came up with the Provost search last year. Jeremy is a great provost, and I’m positive we can work well together. This motion is not a critique of him or the committee that chose him, though the process seemed closed and unnecessarily accelerated. Tenured faculty have academic freedom to speak up, including to administration. NNT don’t have these privileges. They depend on strong faculty; we need to speak up for others. We hope these motions will help faculty have a strong hand. The Senate should have more of a shared role in governing the university. This motion comes from the DU Chapter of AAUP. I am the chapter president. The issues this motion addresses include: appointment power, legitimacy, and communication.

We should have the power to appoint, not just suggest, to university committees. We will be strengthened if we bring a member of AAUP to them. In terms of communication, if something is going on, Senators need to report back to their units. I’ll admit that I am new to the Faculty Senate. I don’t know the language but appreciate the help of even more skeptical colleagues. Help me craft this motion to work as it is truly meant to. I don’t take this personally, there is no ego in this. I am fine with tearing it up, but we need to attend to this critical problem. That is my explanation and I’m happy to take questions. Also, other people were involved that can answer questions too.

Darrin Hicks: Is there anything about the motion that you would like clarification on?

Kate Willink: I have three points. In 3C, where it mentions any other relevant body such as the AAUP. First: why are certain groups recognized and others are not? Of all the peer institutions with data, there were no special positions that aren’t elected. The only exception would be to represent students. There are also really important avenues for specialized groups to have a voice on campus—institutional structures not a Senate structure. This misplaces the location in the Senate. Second: do you think it will serve the Senate and the faculty more broadly with a larger Executive Committee size, depending on how many relevant bodies are identified? Have you been on committees where a larger group is more effective? What would we be doing in terms of effectiveness? Third: does the consolidation of multiple faculty voices into one mouth piece (EC) weaken the faculty? I think it does. The more faculty we have working to create change in myriad organizations, that benefits us as a whole. I would much rather have 10 different groups of faculty standing at a door around an issue.

Darrin Hicks: Other questions, clarifying questions?

Jonathan Sciarcon: There were two main questions that I heard from my department. One: how do we define relevant bodies? My colleagues wanted to see a stronger, more precise definition. Also, I don’t mean to be controversial, but why does AAUP continually show up? You
mentioned this a bit, but to put it bluntly, what is the end game of the AAUP regarding this motion?

Aaron Schneider: As far as the “why AAUP” question, I’m open to having this be as wide a net as we think is appropriate. I wrote these in response to shared governance issues, and AAUP has a history around those issues. I don’t feel strongly that AAUP has to be listed at all. I’m open to suggestions for how to make relevant bodies more clear. What I’m suggesting is that it should be a practice to bring in a representative. If we address every priority in a given year, it could be too big. But what is the issue that we want to signal? By picking one issue we aren’t saying other issues are off the table, but that it will be a focus of the Senate.

Derigan Silver: Looking at Bylaw 3A5: can you define which organizations on campus have legitimate faculty interest and which ones count?

Aaron Schneider: In the AAUP language, a range of things is considered, but the main thing is related to academic questions. That would be the boundary I would set but can’t enumerate all of them. It becomes a question of organizing and articulating. Are there others involved in the writing of this motion that can help define the range of legitimate faculty?

Dean Saitta: What I had in mind was all university search committees, planning committees, and all university committees. The Senate Constitution has stipulations through a variety of means that involve administrator appointments. I don’t know if the EC is all that huge. Clearly the data suggest shared governance problems. Experience suggest silo problems as well.

AAUP is there because it is a faculty protector. The vast majority of faculty guidelines are influenced by AAUP. It is not a minor organization. If we want to talk about faculty pushing the envelope, we should reconsider AAUP and the Senate. Sometimes the labor is adversarial; all of this is motivated by the interest of protecting faculty and promoting an organization that works to protect the faculty. A part of me is deeply invested in seeing an organization that does work around shared governance be honored in this way. We are breaking new ground here.

Chip Reichardt: I think the motion should be defeated. It bolsters the position of AAUP at the expense of the Senate because it diminishes its independence. We are already required to consult with other bodies, and have members from other faculty bodies. It’s easy to see why AAUP wants this motion—to influence the agenda of these other faculty bodies. We don’t need the Senate to further their agenda, or have special status by being enshrined in the Constitution. We have many things in common and push for similar goals, but we are not always aligned and should be independent bodies.

Robert Urquhart: I have to disagree with my good friend Chip. This does not give an official place to AAUP on committees. AAUP stands for a principle that many of us regard as fundamental: unionization. The AAUP is an organization that has and will defend us, which is a good reason for a representative to be on the Executive Committee. I don’t think the issue of size is that great. I think there are real issues about what other bodies should be represented.

Paul Sutton: The Senate has been worthless, and review committees have been worthless.
Elia Trucks: Should we add other groups to the Constitution as well? Would we have to amend the Constitution as these groups disband?

John Hill: If groups were named, the only mechanism we have is to amend the Constitution, which requires a quorum and 2/3 vote.

Linda Olson: The reason you want this is to have more faculty representation on committees, which has been missing in recent times. We are not going to get more representation. And I’m worried about the Constitution having another organization listed in it. There is a legitimate role for the AAUP, but it could hurt that by naming it in the Senate. I read it as the AAUP wants to be part of the Senate.

Doug Allen: I’m not speaking in favor or against the AAUP, but I’m not seeing clearly a mechanism for who will be represented on these committees. I think at minimum there should be specific guidelines to make it a transparent process.

Jeff Bowen: Call for the question.

Darrin Hicks: We need a second reading before we can vote.

Claude d’Estree: For transparency, I am a member of AAUP, but I don’t want it to be a referendum. It sounds like if we were to take out “such as …” some of you would be relieved of the intention of a coup on the part of AAUP. The chancellor was in favor of a stronger AAUP that would work more closely with the Senate on other issues. And to work closely with other faculty bodies. If it satisfies conspiracy theories, take out the mention of the AAUP.

Sara Watamura: There are two important issue here: the governance of the Senate and our representation in the university. It’s clear that shared governance is an issue across campus. I’m worried about a rush to change the Constitution while not addressing these issues. We should make time for both of these two issues, and it might more naturally evolve into a change in the Constitution.

Darrin Hicks: We are required to vote, but suggest that we take up the vote at the next meeting. Is there an objection?

**New Business**

Nancy Sampson: It’s been traditional to have a report on enrollment and budget. Can we ask that the Provost be put on the agenda?

Provost Jeremy Haefner: The enrollments that Linda and I have just gone through are generally strong. There are drops in Law and certain Master’s degree programs. We are on top of that and trying to figure out how to address these drops in winter and spring quarter. Otherwise, the numbers are consistent across campus, but I don’t have the data in front of me. I’m happy to answer more later. What is the larger impact on the budget? We are working on an overarching
presentation on the budget. We are watching the numbers carefully and expect improvements over the course of the academic year.

Darrin Hicks: Motion to adjourn.

Rick Leaman: So moved.