

The regular meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Bartschat. The following senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Bartschat, Courard-Hauri, Cramer, Dore, Esposito, Evans, Fairbairn, Freeman-Miller, Klipec, Koch, Lyons, Nelson, Reed, Reincke, Saylor, Schneider, Simpson, Vandegrift, Wrenn, Wright, Younger

Absent: None

Upon proper motion and vote, October 2010 minutes as amended were accepted.

President Maxwell Report

Deputy Provost Sue Wright presented the annual Faculty Salary report. She distributed a handout two page which gave a brief background of the topic and the process. Three bases were offered for judging progress which are the AAUP Salary levels, rank comparisons with peer institutions an percent above peer group rank and discipline median. She cautioned that there are important factors remain very important and universal including the reality of faculty hires around the nation. She took question – klipec are the ranking fairly similar across the college – SEW – no

Not really – the professional

Klipec – have your done a comparison of peers by college –

SEW – I do it by discipline – to try to get as close comparison

The pharm & law ranking are

D C-H – the salary are 9month or 12 ----SEW – this is 9month equivalent – AAUP & CUPA

Darcie – do you have a sense of what a good number would be in Table 3– what would it look like SEW – noting that persons are in rank for 6 years – the most we might expect is 50% Darcie – do we have goals??? SEW—to raise them ---it is hard to set goals because the need would be to have it set within the year of the rank

Klipec—when we are hiring at the Asst – it is at the least competitive

SEW – that has been a Deans Conversation – Renner – it would be a good conversation to have – we might think about having 50% as a target – we do want to be competitive but

SEW----AAUP compares nationally and we do compare BUT table three is our peers

Nelson – can you clarify—table 3 Full professors ranking are so different –

SEW – the answer lies in the fact that table three is a smaller, peer group which do have peer groups – the schools do have pharmacy and law but not medical schools.....

Nelson – it is a difficult job to keep track of these group – SEW – I will be providing the deans with data

Esposito –on Table three –is there a category – the numbers do not

SEW – visiting are left out – consecutive term faculty without rank

Reincke – the gender question as it compares to

SEW – it will be on the web – and I'll doing those as a gender within rank posted in the Databook –

No questions were presented to DEW

And he has read the survey responses --- and much of it was familiar and expected – much of it was thoughtful and detailed.....the themes are important –workload and resources – need to be addressed-----as somebody who has been through curricular change – because of all the issues which curric change raises, it is easy and natural to loose site of why we are doing this in the first place.....we want to make sure that the mission is real—to keep the promise ---

I wisht o address the question of the resources and workload demands of these changes, that as far as I am concerned --- the reason that we exist is to ensure that you have what you need to do the job for the student and our institutional responsibilities to our studnts.

Provost Renner Report

One announce – vice provist for int'l is out – searzh cmte has been assembled --

President Bartschat

Ben Cooper Student Senate liason recognized – Deans recap – thanks for coming – Stuent Senate appreciates having the relationship – 24th student senator has been elected – first year

Susan Breakenridge, All Staff Council Chair – we will be working on collaborative nate as issues arise.

Writen report sent with

What will happen next – the Senate Exec will publish a third poll tomorrow – a preview – escenatilly ----the first question has to do with whether you consider IN fit as a content or skill

set. On the UCC report this is on page three. The survey – also asks faculty to work on their definition of info literacy outcomes. You have the chance to start at zero and let us know what you think.---- to start that defining over--- and last, the survey asks if faculty support a stand alone an info lit AOI and then a comment box. ---

We are not planning to put forward a motion to have one AOI cover both the written and critical thinking. This was ---Klaus will not be brought by ----these requirements will stand as they are – that Critical and Written will remain separate as UCC recommended.

Senate Exec is not planning to put up changes to the FYS description. For sure not in December

Esposito--Did Senate Exec debated having a full faculty vote after Senate votes;

KB – yes we have discussed...and we have chosen to break this down – we can always go back and change ----Esposito – it would make it easier; to know if there was to have

KB – rejected as an idea --- you can ask for such a vote --- FAcSenate is the body to decide the curriculum --

KB-----somewhat email list – to find out who would exactly ---it is not simple

Esposito – the same number of people who are

Klipec – I am on the same page as Matt ---- there are very few of these that can all of these be done --- Esposito – it is the principle of the thing...We have had some good turnout with the faculty poll – and that should

Klipec – in over 30 years, there has not been a faculty vote; when the curriculum change has been made

LAS – I understand what is being ---it is our responsibility to make decisions – we got valuable feedback – but the comments which were made...I think we need to figure out as the Faculty Senate which option ----and then maybe address the issue of what is the next step --- I do not think there is anything to take to the Faculty Vote

Law – maybe there will not be anything to take to the faculty if we did

Esposito – that we are doing this ad hoc – LAS – I disagree – I think it is our responsibility – we need to address the substantive issues in front of us today

Esposito – the Faculty of Instruction is in charge and

LAS – I think it is FAcSena

Younger – we can decide that the full faculty would have the vote ----I think from the responses that it is not clear – that there ----I agree with Esposito

Schneider – the Senate could decide to have a full faculty vote

Klaus – yes, this body would have to vote – on that – and then decide how that would be done----Klaus –

DEM – my understanding ----if FacSenate did not vote – that would be poor -----once the facSenate has voted then to ask for an endorsement the decisions.....if you go directly to the faculty then you are ad-----Esposito I agree with you – to get a campus wide mandate ----

KB- we need to get something; there are two big documents and

Esposito – I want a cohesive as to how the changes will affect the curriculum in their entirety

Courshaw----after Senate; come out with something and then go to faculty for endorsement ---KB: to make that motion-----he questioned to know that we can make that motion now; but I

Esposito – there is a time lag in the endorsement and implementation --- budgeting and how each unit will be easier to get commitment from the faculty ----

Reinke – it would be nice to know that whatever final package – is voted on Faculty Instruction – ultimately – I would like to say to our colleagues that there will be a up or down vote...

Saylor – when UCC; sent report to FacSenate to deal with – it is our problem ----

Was not to vote on in the the format the – this group is to take something

Senate is charged to make sense of this and making it real

Dore: I think it is too soon – work with what we have – there are details in

Saylor moved second by Simpson motion

DAW – in favor of this motion – courses change often – he thinks it is critical to make sure

While it increases UCC work, he sees it as critical

Nelson – how long would be the cycle – Saylor – take two per year thus four or five year

All courses in an AOI – not when a course was approved –

Courard-Hauri – largely in favor of this – review is appropriate in a --- also want to point out that if a course must be re-submit every four years; then why bother --- a concern that this might lead to a situation where classes are re-submitted are only the courses

Thus how onerous will the process be for faculty --- too time consuming?

Cramer – I had a concern – even though my problem is with establishing too much workload – and I have had to counsel faculty --- concern that

Darcie – how many courses could be looked at during one meeting --- DAW – about 10 minutes per meeting – Engaged Citz; is more ----Daric – look at 100 courses a year --- DAW – the problem is that the issue might be that the description – and form in a four years – To me it is much more burdensome on UCC than on faculty ---- the UCC will have to develop how to look at the description – at this point, no one is looking.

MJR – as a parent, there have been two occasions – where the course materials and description did not see-----drift over time and no one on purpose – some value to checking...

Klipec – support motion – and even five year cycle is not enough ----I am more concerned with assessment – I think the assessment I think good

Question called and passed

Motion passed without dissent

Motion 2 ---- Evans – and Schneider –second

Schneider – what does it mean ---it seems like there is something big under it but i

Saylor – we want to make sure that a group that directly reports to the senate – which concerns SHORT version is that DCAP committee did not tasked by the Provost – DCAP needs a place and within faculty control --- and there will be a motion coming forward DCAC with a

Escellianll getting a place for what we are doing and

Lyons – then why could we did not amend that ----SAYLOR – we had not gotten to

Esposito – I do not see why it is – a part of

Saylor – UCC does report and DCAP does not --- and want report to t

Klipec – will this committee be elected or appointed????Saylor – appointed, I believe

Klipec sees it as an elected committee that might help

Cramer – are we could tabled ----and would it come back as this

Schneider – it seems to me like if that is coming then either and TABLED Cramer second

Tabled – with two against.....

Motion 3----center Fairbairn wnd with Crmaer – seconded.....

DAW – question wihc I asked and SEND ME THIS QUEISONT.....great concern about laying upon current faculty work loadk

DEM – his big pictures response it is our job – it is to ensure that you have the respoursces to do your jobs for students.....I see the Center as a good point for what I want to make – we need to have a resource conversation – the large campuisign is to endow professors and that will be an increase to the instructional budgets. – that is the biggest part of the answer

Also, on e of the challenges in a curric revsions – instituosn are good at adding without taking away – we’ve been through that ----are there things that we do that we do not need and may be not need to do so often----I think that we are not done looking at the admin effeciences of the place – I am very much committed to identifying

The specifi aobut Center Teach---I want to make a cuse for why this is important – for several years-----what I hink is critical nature within the nat’l discussion is that we will look different in the next ten years --- who our student are –what they need to learn – the compiling education (from 3 instit) and the format of class-----if DU is to be as good as –there must be a campus wide conversation about the what learning Teaching will look like – the concept is that it is to create the resource to give faculty space in your faculty life to do all of these thing-----a vote for this is a good mandate to go out and get the money – admin structure and look is not as important as the conversations which create opportunities to the discussion of being as good as we can be in ten years....

Fairbar00if it goes forward – that our faculty be consulted as we have

Klipec – I find it intresting that persons support and did not write commens----my consitituiosts have spoken out aginst it --- if they donote and then we’ll do it

Motion to suspend rules and move on --- with four opposed

Evans – there are mandates – and are faculty mis-perceiving with the FYS

Renner – let me address what I hear – FYS – it was clear with the Deans the process was not sustainable; therefore we built a different model to bring out best – one suggestion was to hold back money so that col/sch; part of a package – to get linne, then commit to teach – it was not unfunded mandate – every col knows how many FYS; so as to regularize the process – it is in the curric and we can prepare for it

Renner – in the broader question about resources...we are looking to design the resources to put money where the students are --- there are many pieces to the puzzles – we have a historical budget process and we are trying to get an understanding of how the

Renner – we have begun to create the Center by having a virtual and not a dime came from instruction – the support to do the expertise to have ---it did not come from instruction.....

Renner – I do not know how to mention about adjunct – we are looking at cutting back and being efficient – and one of the goals is to reduce the fac/student ratio – thus to have the -----and three year budget goal includes having a 3% increase in inst and support

Fairbairn – how are the new faculty line defined inclusive ----- a new faculty line is with each hire – we look at

And

Old Business – none presented

New Business

Establish a regular cycle of review for areas of inquiry (AOI) and general education seminars. A course submitted to the UCC (University Curriculum Committee) for approval for an AOI must indicate how the course develops at least one of the designations and requires re-submission of course as part of the regular cycle of review.

Saylor – moved and