

From: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
To: Mary Clark, Leslie Brunelli, Linda Kosten
Date: 9.17.20
Re: Report on Faculty Responses to Sept. 2020 Financial Values Survey

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	2
2.0 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.....	2
3.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	3
3.1 CONSIDERING Q1 & Q4: RATING PRE-ASSEMBLED VALUES AND CUTS	4
3.2 CONSIDERING Q2 & Q5: IDENTIFYING ADDITIONAL VALUES & CUTS.....	6
3.3 CONSIDERING Q3: DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION	9
3.4 CONSIDERING Q6: ENGAGING AND RETAINING STUDENTS.....	11
3.5 CONSIDERING Q7: NEW REVENUE STREAMS	13
3.6 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS & SENTIMENTS FROM SENATE FLOOR, FACULTY CONVERSATION ON 9.8.20, AND OTHER FACULTY & SENATOR INPUT	16
APPENDIX 1: THE 7-QUESTION SURVEY	19
APPENDIX 2: DETAILED ANALYSIS OF Q1 FOR ALL FACULTY AND PER FACULTY RANK.....	22
APPENDIX 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS OF Q4 FOR ALL FACULTY AND PER FACULTY RANK.....	24

1.0 Introduction

As part of our commitment to upholding strong principles of Shared Governance, the Faculty Senate works with Senators and faculty across campus to provide ongoing faculty guidance to key financial planning decisions at DU. In this spirit, in addition to a Special Senate Finance Meeting on 8.31.20, on 9.3.20 Faculty Senate issued a faculty-wide survey to 875 faculty addressing financial values in relation to COVID contingency planning to which we received 435 responses. We also hosted a faculty conversation on 9.8.20 with approximately 50 participants. In this report, we present to the Provost, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance, and the Vice Provost for Budget, Planning, and Administration a summary analysis of some of the main takeaways of this vital faculty input. We ask that this information be shared with the Board of Trustees and with the Scenarios and Financial Solutions Task Force (SFS). We look forward to hearing back about ways this input will help govern the direction of the contingency planning that we understand is underway. In the spirit of partnership, we also look forward to working together on follow-up data gathering and communications structures and strategies for the days ahead.

2.0 Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

The survey was drafted in a partnership between the FSEC and the SFS faculty representatives in consultation with Leslie Brunelli and Linda Kosten. The survey was administered to appointed faculty. Of the 435 respondents, 150 were Teaching and Professional Track faculty (which includes 13 Visiting Professors), 252 were in the Tenure Track, and 33 either declined to self-identify or responded “Other.” The survey questions are included in Appendix 1. The survey

results were analyzed by 32 faculty (mostly Senators): Survey responses to questions 1 and 4 were analyzed on a 4-point scale to arrive at averages and rankings across all faculty respondents as well as according to faculty ranks (see Appendices 2 and 3). Narrative survey responses (viz. answers to questions 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7) were each divided into two data sets per question, with three faculty assigned to each data set; each analyzed the data independently (after a volunteer-wide norming session) thereby yielding three separate reports per data set to best ensure we were capturing key themes in the original data set. Volunteers' summary reports were forwarded to the drafters of the current report, viz. Faculty Senate President and the Chair of the Senate's Financial Planning Committee who is also one of the three Senate-seated faculty on the Scenario and Financial Solutions (SFS) task force. Relevant individual parts of this report were then shared back with all 32 of the volunteer data analysts for further input and approval, and the entire report draft was then shared with FSEC and the additional SFS faculty for input and approval.

The report also integrates in comments and sentiments from a 9.8.20 Senate-hosted faculty conversation, as well as from ongoing input from various Senators and faculty.

3.0 Summary of Findings

(Note: "Q__" in the pages that follow refers to the question numbers from the survey; to review the survey questions, see Appendix 1)

3.1 Considering Q1 & Q4: Rating Pre-Assembled Values and Cuts

When asked (in Q1) to rate values and principles from a pre-assembled list (see Appendix 2 for the full list and ranking), and taking as a given that DU will do everything possible to make non-personnel cost cuts and to increase revenue before even considering personnel-related cost cuts, the top three values that emerged (based on average ratings for all faculty respondents, and with a tie for third place) are:

- 1) “We support quality of learning for our students”
- 2) “We value progressive cuts that consider pay reductions to personnel based on their salary, not based on their different roles” (i.e. if a faculty and a staff person each makes \$89k, we approach them in a single group together)
- 3) “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are key guides to our work”
- 3) “We support no further cuts to pay”

We might here add that the top answer—in support of quality student learning—was significantly higher than the next highest answer.¹

¹ The top answer had an average rating of 1.4, whereas the second highest answer had an average rating of 2.0. The difference between an average rating of 1.4 and 2.0 is statistically significant and probably also substantively meaningful. See Appendix 2 for full ratings and for a precise meaning of the 4-point scale (1 through 4); in short: For question 1, a rating of 2 indicates giving 'high' and a rating of 1 indicates giving 'highest' priority to a value.

When asked (in Q4) to apply their highest-rated values to rating a pre-assembled list of possible cuts (see Appendix 3 for the full list and ranking), the three cuts that were given priority (based on average ratings for all faculty respondents) are (in the following order):

- Continued Travel Freeze²
- Continued Hiring Freeze
- Reduce University Reserves

The three cuts that were most counseled *against* (based on average ratings for all faculty respondents) are (in the following order):

- Reduce Faculty/Staff Benefits
- Additional Lay-offs
- Eliminate Retirement Match

In considering the results of questions 1 and 4, it is important to keep in mind that these are based on pre-set lists of options (see appendices); for a fuller sense of faculty responses, it is important to couch these data points within the larger qualitative responses in Q2 and Q5 to which we now turn.

² The top three answers had average ratings respectively of 1.2, 1.3, and 1.7. See Appendix 3 for full ratings and for a precise meaning of the 4-point scale (1 through 4); in short: For question 4, a rating of 2 indicates giving medium/medium-burner priority and a rating of 1 indicates giving high/front-burner priority to considering a cut.

3.2 Considering Q2 & Q5: Identifying Additional Values & Cuts

In response to a question (Q2) about whether faculty wanted DU to prioritize values other than the ones above in its budget deliberations, respondents overall indicated support for different faculty lines in equal measure. In other words, faculty shared different views on which series or rank should be most protected from budget cuts, but the number of respondents were about equal for different series. However, faculty overall agreed that they are being asked to do more given the shift to multiple teaching modalities. Specifically, one respondent noted, “We value our faculty and staff and will hold them with the same care that we hold students, especially all the extra work they have done. We value the health and safety of our community.”

Additionally, another faculty member shared that “faculty are the ‘essential workers’ of the institution and should be treated as such - in terms of compensation, safety and support.”

Faculty indicated that the pandemic is magnifying existing inequities and grievances with concerns that it will increase inequities along multiple dimensions (units, faculty rank/series, etc.). Some comments touched on points of equity between departments/divisions/units along the lines of this quote: “Aim to improve structural equity among units, rather than entrench pre-existing inequities (e.g., different teaching loads in different units).”

In addition to addressing pre-existing inequities, numerous faculty suggested a meritocratic approach should needs to eliminate personnel and/or programs arise. Merit was understood along multiple lines, including performance as well as how many students are served, and

attention was drawn to the need to balance fiscal considerations with considerations of the ways people and programs contribute to DU's reputation, DEI outcomes, and other key metrics.

Low morale was also mentioned in multiple answers. In this regard, one respondent pointed out that supporting faculty need not come with a monetary cost: "...reciprocity is critical; I have yet to hear a word of how DU, its board, and the admin are going to make faculty life better in ways that don't cost the university a lot of money, even amid all this talk of cuts..."

A theme emerged that faculty do not want any further pay cuts. Keeping faculty salaries where they are after the last cut was a "priority" emphasized by a majority of respondents. The relatively low salaries of DU faculty, the high cost of living in Denver, and the need to pay for increased childcare were some of the reasons cited for opposing pay cuts. If salary cuts are needed, a number of faculty indicated a need to cut higher salaries first, and a few indicated a need for symbolic administrative cuts. Multiple faculty expressed concern about administrative bloat with the proliferation of vice chancellors and other administrators. Other themes around pay cuts included the desire to protect lower paid employees, to rely on pay cuts as a last resort, and the need to initiate cuts to building expenses, programs, and outside consultancies before any additional personnel cuts. Multiple faculty indicated the desire to increase teaching loads before cutting salary.

Faculty also expressed a desire for the university to focus on its core educational mission, including eliminating as many non-academic programs as possible. But maintaining a strong

student-friendly and “student-centered” classroom environment was also emphasized by many respondents. Others suggested divesting of fixed assets and spending less on buildings and more on academics. “Protect that which contributes directly to the knowledge imperative of the university: research, teaching, and scholarly service.”

•

When asked (in Q5) about cuts that should be given 'front-burner' consideration (beyond the set list of options provided in Q4), one of the most common responses from faculty was to reduce the athletics budget, by perhaps eliminating low revenue and/or underperforming sports, with a number of faculty believing that major salary cuts were needed.

Faculty also noted that deeper cuts were needed in salaries for administrators in addition to potential consolidation of functions as well as furloughs. Data also revealed that many faculty had negative views of the upper administration.

Faculty indicated strong consideration be given to using funds from the endowment or strategic reserves to weather this storm. Specifically, multiple faculty expressed notions along the lines of “the rainy day is here” or “if this does not qualify as an emergency, then what does”. Additionally, many faculty balked at the notion of salary cuts without tapping into the endowment at all.

Another area that faculty suggested with respect to budget cuts included facilities and grounds. Many spoke of avoiding or halting new construction to save funds. Within this category (facilities, buildings, and landscaping) several faculty mentioned the need to adjust the landscaping budget. There were also multiple comments about selling off DU-owned real estate.

The data also revealed that some find the Impact 2025 initiatives to be unnecessary expenses at this time. This finding was aligned with recommendations for cuts in areas that are seen as non-essential to the core mission of teaching and learning. Areas for cuts included fringe (travel, meals, technology), non-educational programs, small grants, professional development funds, and enhanced funding for Sabbaticals.

3.3 Considering Q3: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

In Q3, we asked faculty to focus in particular on the value of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and on specific DEI concerns or opportunities DU ought to keep in mind in order to ensure more equitable outcomes during these budget deliberations. Responses to this question showed significant support for DEI including a desire expressed in multiple responses to protect DEI's budgets first.

By far, the most commonly cited concern with respect to DEI was the need for any adjustment to compensation to be progressive in nature. The largest number of respondents reported that some kind of progressive compensation is essential. They called out the need for equitable

considerations for lower-paid employees, most of whom support higher-paid employees. Some pointed to disparities across academic role, with pleas to make deeper cuts at the top of the salary scale rather than at the bottom in a progressive, equity-focused approach. Some notable quotes in this regard include: “Progressive cuts should be made that acknowledge the racialized nature of the pandemic and try to preserve the salaries of people of color at higher rates than white people,” and “A 5-10% pay cut affects us much more gravely than others because we are already stuck right at the just-barely-making-it-in-Denver-Metro line to begin with.”

A number of other responses indicated some clear priorities with respect to DEI. First, faculty indicated support for doing more to recruit students from historically under-resourced backgrounds. Another clear theme arose that we need to protect financial aid and resources for BISOC. A few faculty responses indicated a need to think about diversity more broadly, stating that gender, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status matter too, and while we need to protect Faculty of Color, we also need to pay attention to other challenges members of certain groups face. A few expressed concerns with too many resources going towards DEI.

Some faculty also shared a perception of administrative bloat. In relation to student support staff, there were mixed thoughts: While some see this as an area for cuts, others emphasize that this area needs to be maintained or expanded as it is critical to the success of Students of Color.

3.4 Considering Q6: Engaging and Retaining Students

In response to a question about how to engage and retain students (to off-set revenue losses), the most common emphases revolved around DU's sense of community and close interpersonal relationships, including ways of both highlighting and increasing creative and meaningful one-on-one student/faculty engagement and communications. To help retain and grow this important feature of the DU experience during COVID times, faculty emphasize focusing on quality teaching regardless of modality, thinking with care about the different needs of undergraduate and graduate students, and more opportunities for one-on-one faculty-student attention and connection in teaching and research (in person and online), including:

- faculty-student research projects
- student team projects and challenges with faculty mentors/guides/participants
- faculty phone banks to reach out to students, and
- faculty-student mentoring groups around broadly construed intellectual and creative topics selected by students.

Faculty also focused on excellence across modalities, including:

- high touch delivery and small class size across modalities
- more in person courses
- more hyflex/hybrid courses, and
- maximizing online experiences.

Other takeaways include calls for

- small-group synchronous experiences for students (e.g. pods, cohorts) in the spirit of LLCs (e.g. COVID-safe interterm or weekend mountain learning/project retreats)
- focusing more on students' intellectual and creative growth in relation to current and future life and career readiness outside of the university experience (e.g. internships for every student as per Northeastern's model)
- ensuring course relevance to real-world applications
- expanding experiential learning options (including at-home options)
- increased program and credit flexibility (such as more 4+1 and 3+2 degree programs, full course offerings in summer (including the possibility of treating the school calendar as a year-round calendar in which faculty would choose to teach in any 3 of the 4 quarters and in which students would not pay separately or extra for summer))
- more part-time student options
- more expansive/creative use of independent studies (e.g. to fulfill gen-ed requirements and gen ed and other course substitutions to facilitate completion of requirements and degrees); and
- increased networking/job opportunities (e.g. through alumni networks and professional/industry mentors separate from academic advisors).

Another creative idea was for faculty to build new courses *together with students*, as well as a call to DU be more transparent in communications with students and involve students in more of the administrative discussions and decisions especially at this time. Faculty also emphasized the need for compassion and flexibility with our students at this time, the need for increased

mental health outreach to and services for student at this time, the need to consider lowering all/some DU costs to students (e.g. reduced graduate program rates for students holding DU degrees; special offers like 4 quarters of classes for the price of 3; value-added and benefits for DU graduates [e.g. free post-degree courses/lectures], etc.); and more social opportunities (e.g. Zoom social hours and outdoor events).

On the question of retaining students, faculty also strongly emphasized the need to support faculty in terms of workload and in terms of morale: Many noted that faculty facilitate student retention first of all and most significantly and effectively by providing excellent high-quality course experiences. The call for increased faculty support in an effort to retain students returns frequently to such measures as increased faculty training resources, not increasing faculty workloads, and increasing flexibility around teaching/research/service expectations (including reducing non-teaching expectations and putting on hold any less time-pressing or otherwise inessential committee or service work). All of these elements need to be rethought and improved upon in tandem with and with consideration for diversity, equity, and inclusion so that calcified structures, expectations, and responsibilities from past models do not hinder faculty and students from thriving in innovative new presents and futures.

3.5 Considering Q7: New Revenue Streams

When asked to brainstorm new DU revenue streams, faculty once again returned to the importance of offering flexibility in programs and degree options, including calls for

- certificate programs

- online programs that can reach a wider market of out-of-state students, including online programs designed to
 - meet international student need
 - meet graduate student needs (e.g. 3 years remote; 1 year on campus)
- shorter degree-completion options
- awarding returning students life-credit towards degree completion
- part-time programs
- one-day and other professional development short courses / micro-credentialing
- integrating summer into the regular school calendar

In considering enhancing non-tuition revenue, faculty thought in creative ways about repurposing DU facilities and providing services rooted in DU faculty and student expertise.

Examples of recommendations along these lines include:

- New uses of campus space, e.g.
 - drive-in movies/concerts/events in parking lot
 - outdoor Lamont concerts
 - more use of and/or connecting up to local/regional tourism—e.g. Evans Observatory
 - renting out tennis courts
 - renting out Newman for live-streaming events
 - if we move online, renting out DU buildings as socially-distant workspaces or K-12 education spaces

- Emerging as a content provider for a wider public with reasonably-priced (and ideally grant/contract subsidized/absorbed) paywall content, webinars, short courses of interest to wider audiences (e.g. music and art lessons, election issues, climate science, etc.) towards wider public good outcomes.
- Community, government, and corporate/industry partnerships, including
 - working with DPS to offer paid “e-study halls” for their students as well as opportunities for our undergraduates to tutor DPS students (especially in math and science)
 - developing/increasing high-school pipeline programs with AP credit that can be applied to a DU degree and/or reduced DU tuition opportunities for participating students
 - industry partnerships/pipelines through which employers sponsor DU students as part of their workplace onboarding/training
 - DU-industry gateways for graduating students (e.g. on the model of Arizona State’s work with Starbucks)
 - offering remote conferencing support for businesses and non-profits who want to develop deliver more engaging remote events
 - charging other schools for access (one-time or subscription) to our OTL resources (including our new FIIT course), and
 - creating incubators through DCB and Law (among others) to offer low-cost services to the community (e.g. offering help in relation to bankruptcy, eviction,

etc.) and/or to partner with industry as in the case of the Colorado Women's College "Equity Labs" work.

Faculty also talked about stronger support for research grants, increasing research funding, doing better at tapping in-house expertise instead of outsourcing, incentivizing units to develop new revenue streams, creating new applied graduate programs (e.g. nursing, pharmacy, public health), charging for (currently-free) Lamont events, and new or more robust/creative fundraising strategies focused on students, not buildings (e.g. reach out to alums with "sponsor a student" opportunities, etc.).

3.6 Additional Comments & Sentiments from Senate Floor, Faculty Conversation on 9.8.20, and Other Faculty & Senator Input

Many faculty continue to support the temporary progressive pay cut structure over a flat-rate option, but there are at least three caveats worth emphasizing: (1) Any pay and other compensation cuts to staff or faculty should be an absolute last resort, (2) the last version of a progressive pay cut must be revised to avoid inversions and to have smoother curves between levels (and a number of faculty volunteers are currently working with FPC and FSEC to build out better models that we will share with SFS and the Provost), and (3) from a range of equity and morale perspectives, many continue to talk (and have talked since at least May) about seeing steeper progressive percentage cuts to those at the highest salary ranges (even if this generates only a token amount in relation to the goals of \$60m-\$160m of savings).

That said, faculty emphasize the importance of DU ensuring that the educational mission be the guiding principle for any future cuts and/or new initiatives. Faculty also urge DU to consider the inequities, morale implications, and impracticalities vis-à-vis best student outcomes of expecting DU faculty to do more for less. Faculty expressed differing opinions on whether furloughs or compensation cuts were preferred (and this is an area for additional fact-finding and conversation). In relation to progressive cuts, faculty also ask us to bear in mind—and factor into any cost-reduction calculus—salary compression and related inequity-in-pay issues that must be factored into any conversation about pay, retirement, or other benefits cuts.

Faculty brought up the possibility of giving faculty the option of partial or full year sabbaticals without pay but with employee benefits (e.g. health insurance); a few wanted to see cuts to all DU employee compensation should there be further cuts (and this was framed either in terms of symbolic value or as a necessary consequence of keeping the educational mission at the center of all budget cut decisions); there was a reminder of the importance of DU keeping public good as a goal (and eliminating any/all talking points that make DU sound like it's lording its successes over universities currently struggling to keep up); there was a request that DU look into cost-savings related to entering larger insurance pools with other universities; and there were conversations about the pros and cons of pausing landscaping and/or new projects while we ensure our footing at this critical time. We also received a [link to an article about how companies that delay layoffs do better in the longer term](#).

Faculty highlighted that students (not just faculty) need help learning how to learn / engage / and form community online if we want best outcomes. In similar spirit, faculty highlighted the need for funds to support and enrich community-building efforts in grad programs, while others raised ideas for creating more and more robust student peer support networks for coursework. We were also asked to keep in mind that unit-level budget cuts hit grad programs harder (since they are not budgeted centrally. A suggestion was also made about surveying returning students about what makes them come back to DU.

Appendix 1: The 7-Question Survey

Intro text

The Senate is working to get timely faculty input to DU's Scenario and Financial Solutions Task Force (SFS) as it works to identify a number of potential areas for budget cuts should we find ourselves in a range of new COVID-19 scenarios. **The SFS task force team includes three faculty reps seated by Senate in partnership with ODEI.**

In brief, the three scenarios DU is budgeting for relate to worsening COVID-19 conditions resulting in DU going online for one, two, or all three quarters of AY 20-21. If you haven't seen one of the campus presentations on these scenarios, **we highly recommend** you [watch this recording of an 8.21.20 Special Senate meeting on these budget scenarios](#). In sum, if we enter any of the three scenarios, DU might be looking at \$60M-\$160M of additional cuts. In such cases, DU is likely to face compensation cuts that go deeper and impact more faculty and staff than the Spring 2020 cuts. With that in mind, we are reaching out to get faculty thoughts that we will collate and report on to the SFS task force, the Provost, and the Chancellor.

We certainly hope no additional cuts will be needed. But it is important for faculty to have these difficult conversations now.

We hope you will fill in this anonymous 7-question faculty survey.

Surveys are due by 5pm on Tuesday Sept. 8.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be submitting an initial report based on this data to the SFS task force which meets with the Board of Trustees on Sept. 10. We will be in touch as DU's budget plan takes more form throughout this month.

Senate will also host an informal opportunity for faculty to discuss these matters on Sept. 8, 1-2:30. The Zoom link is in the email that had the link to this survey.

Q1



For the purposes of this question, let's take as a given that DU will do everything possible to make non-personnel cost cuts and to increase revenue before even considering any personnel related cost cuts. With that said, in thinking about values and principles for DU to uphold as it relates to possible budget cuts, please rate the following (and please try to have a bit of 'ranking' in mind as you rate these; in other words, please try to avoid rating all of them as "highest priority"):



	This value should be given highest priority by DU (even as compared with other values on this list)	This value should be given high priority by DU (even as compared with other values on this list)	This value should be given medium priority by DU (when compared with other values on this list)	This value should be given a relatively low priority by DU (when compared with other values on this list)	Not sure how to rate
"Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are key guides to our work"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support quality of learning for our students"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support timely completion of students degrees"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support innovative classroom teaching and learning"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We value forward-looking cuts that shape DU to thrive for the long-term"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support no further cuts to retirement benefits"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We support no further cuts to pay"	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
"We value progressive cuts that consider pay reductions to personnel based on their salary, not based on their different roles" (i.e. if a faculty and a staff person each makes \$89k, we approach them in a single group together)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2-Q3

☐ 2 Are there other top values to which you would like DU to give strong priority in its budget deliberations? If so, briefly state that here.



☐ 3 Focusing in particular on the value of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, what are some specific concerns you think DU should keep in mind and/or specific solutions that might help us arrive at more equitable outcomes during these budget deliberations?



Q4-Q5

☐ 4 Keeping in mind the values you have identified in the previous questions, please rate the following possible cuts in relation to DU's contingency planning for \$60M-\$160M of possible losses. (Please keep something of a "ranking" mindset in view; in other words, please try to avoid ranking all of these cuts as "should not be considered"):



NOTE:

- **University Contingency** primarily refers to funds to support facilities, safety, and technology infrastructure expense. (They are discussed in more detail on the top of page 34 in the Budget Transmittal, available in the top middle of the Employee Tab in PioneerWeb.)
- **University Reserves** primarily consist of unit level gainshare and university-level reserves held to mitigate risk. These reserve dollars are invested in the endowment, and are not all immediately liquid.

	This cut should be a front-burner consideration	This cut should be a medium-burner consideration	This cut should be considered only as a last resort	This cut should not be considered	Not sure how to rate
Additional Furloughs and Administrative Leave	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Additional Lay-offs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Additional Salary Reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Eliminate Retirement Match	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Continued Hiring Freeze	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Continued Travel Freeze	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce Faculty/Staff Benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce University Contingency (see explanation above)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce University Reserves (see explanation above)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unit Level Budget Reductions (other than Program Cuts)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unit-level Program Cuts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

☐ 5 Are there other cuts you think should be given 'front-burner' consideration? If so, list those here.



Q6-Q7

☐ 6 Retaining students would help offset revenue losses. If you have ideas about ways that faculty (or others) can engage and retain students, please share them here.



☐ 7 New revenue streams would help offset revenue losses. If you have ideas about new revenue streams for DU, please share them here.



Final question



Before you
go..



Which best describes your faculty line at DU?

- ☐ Teaching and Professional Line
- ☐ VTAP Line
- ☐ Tenure Line
- ☐ Other

Appendix 2: Detailed Analysis of Q1 for All Faculty and Per Faculty Rank

Four notes related to the ratings and ranking associated with Q1:

- 1) The results below are based on pre-set lists of options (see below); for a fuller sense of faculty thoughts on values, it is important to couch these data points within the larger qualitative responses to Q2 summarized in section 3.2 above.
- 2) In response to Q1, the top answer had an average rating of 1.4, whereas the second highest answer had an average rating of 2.0. The difference between an average rating of 1.4 and 2.0 is statistically significant and probably also substantively meaningful. See below for full ratings and for a precise meaning of the 4-point scale (1 through 4).
- 3) It might also be noted that the values between each of the rankings between the second and the last answers are each within 0.2 of one another. Differences in average ratings of size 0.2 can be statistically significant but differences of that size are probably not of substantive importance.
- 4) In calculating the average responses to question 1, we did not count option 5, "not sure how to rate."

Question 1:

For the purposes of this question, let's take as a given that DU will do everything possible to make non-personnel cost cuts and to increase revenue before even considering any personnel related cost cuts. With that said, in thinking about values and principles for DU to uphold as it relates to possible budget cuts, please rate the following (and please try to have a bit of 'ranking' in mind as you rate these; in other words, please try to avoid rating all of them as "highest priority"):

1= This value should be given highest priority by DU (even as compared with other values on this list)	2= This value should be given high priority by DU (even as compared with other values on this list)	3= This value should be given medium priority by DU (when compared with other values on this list)	4= This value should be given a relatively low priority by DU (when compared with other values on this list)	Average Ratings for All Faculty
"We support quality of learning for our students"				1.4
"We value progressive cuts that consider pay reductions to personnel based on their salary, not based on their different roles" (i.e. if a faculty and a staff person each makes \$89k, we approach them in a single group together)				2.0
"Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are key guides to our work"				2.1

"We support no further cuts to pay"	2.1
"We support timely completion of students degrees"	2.2
"We value forward-looking cuts that shape DU to thrive for the long-term"	2.2
"We support faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity"	2.2
"We support no further cuts to retirement benefits"	2.4
"We support innovative classroom teaching and learning"	2.5

The primary differences between ratings by Teaching and Professional Track (TPT) faculty and Tenure Track (TT) faculty were on the following two items:

	<u>AVERAGE RATINGS</u>		
	All		
	Faculty	TPT	TT
"We value progressive cuts that consider pay reductions to personnel based on their salary, not based on their different roles" (i.e. if a faculty and a staff person each makes \$89k, we approach them in a single group together)	2.0	1.8	2.1
"We support faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity"	2.2	2.7	2.0
"We support innovative classroom teaching and learning"	2.5	2.2	2.6

Appendix 3: Detailed Analysis of Q4 for All Faculty and Per Faculty Rank

Four notes related to the ratings and ranking associated with Q4:

- 1) The results below are based on pre-set lists of options (see below); for a fuller sense of faculty thoughts on cuts, it is important to couch these data points within the larger qualitative responses to Q5 summarized in section 3.2 above.
- 2) See below for full ratings and for a precise meaning of the 4-point scale (1 through 4).
- 3) It might be noted that small value differences between answers (e.g. 0.2) can be statistically significant but differences of that size are probably not of substantive importance.
- 4) In calculating the average responses to question 4, we did not count option 5, “not sure how to rate.”

Question 4:

Keeping in mind the values you have identified in the previous questions, please rate the following possible cuts in relation to DU’s contingency planning for \$60M-\$160M of possible losses. (Please keep something of a “ranking” mindset in view; in other words, please try to avoid ranking all of these cuts as “should not be considered”):

1= This cut should be a front-burner consideration	2= This cut should be a medium-burner consideration	3= This cut should be considered only as a last resort	4= This cut should not be considered
Average Ratings for ALL Faculty			
Continued Travel Freeze			1.2
Continued Hiring Freeze			1.3
Reduce University Reserves (see explanation above)			1.7
Reduce University Contingency (see explanation above)			1.9
Unit Level Budget Reductions (other than Program Cuts)			2.1
Additional Furloughs and Administrative Leave			2.3
Unit-level Program Cuts			2.6
Additional Salary Reduction			2.7
Eliminate Retirement Match			2.8

Additional Lay-offs	2.9
Reduce Faculty/Staff Benefits	3.0

The primary differences between ratings by Teaching and Professional Track (TPT) faculty and Tenure Track (TT) faculty were on the following two items:

	<u>AVERAGE RATINGS</u>		
	All Faculty	TPT	TT
Additional Furloughs and Administrative Leave	2.3	2.5	2.2
Additional Lay-offs	2.9	3.1	2.7