Members present: Roxanne Byrne, Chair; John Wyckoff, Chair-Elect; Jeffrey Beall, Library; English; Bruce Neumann, Business; Candan Duran-Aydintug, Sociology; Laura Argys, Economics; Michele Engel, Biology; Allison Bashe, Psychology; John Brett, Anthropology; Pamela Laird, History; Steve Billups, Math; Joy Berrenberg, Psychology; David Bondelevitch, CAM; Honorine Nocon, SEHD; Amy VonCanon, Modern Languages; Steve Thomas, Political Science.

Guests present: Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs Laura Goodwin; Steve Krizman, (title?); Kenneth Wolf, Director of Assessment; Richard Trystman, Vice Chancellor for Research; John Bryant, Student Body President.

Meeting convened at 12:31.

Introductions

Discussion Forum with Regent Bosley

Regent Bosley addressed the possible consolidation study as a major undertaking, but is clearly a matter of efficiency; is there a better way of doing this? There will be an evaluation of how the process is progressing; look to University of Illinois Chicago as a model 25 years after their consolidation. Why conduct a review before an accreditation visit? After the consolidation is completed would make more sense.

Regent Bosley: stated that this would be reviewed with the President and other Regents. Critical of many business mergers and acquisitions. A lot of these were not successful. There were seven different points were if these had been reviewed would have actually spending the money would have helped prevent other issues. This could be money well spent.

Rod stated that it is known that Boulder is not happy, that there are still people at AMC are unhappy, and that there are people in the President’s office think that UCD is no better than metro. Having two Research I institutions seeking different types of resources from the State of Colorado would be good. A lot of people are very concerned because they feel that it’s what in the best interest of the combined campuses. Is is achieving all that it can achieve?
Bosley: no preconceived notions but look at it and seed what it can produce. Heard that Bruce Benson didn’t like it from the beginning (did have conversations with Hoffman about this. Very pragmatic. Muth: accreditation does dictate the need for results of this consolidation.

Joe Juhasz: it was a top down situation and that faculty were not involved. The involvement of the faculty was real but not necessarily proper. What is the proper involvement of the faculty at looking at the situation right now? What should be factored in to this review? In that larger light and in taking Bosley’s words at face value, it does very odd coming from a governing board. Needs to be a formal and informal, not just ad hoc. Boulder faculty are not happy about this decision coming down from the Board of Regents. What’s his opinion?

Bosley: Does not know?

Juhasz: what does proper consultation involve legally? One does forget the details. It’s a shame that faculty didn’t take the lead. Suggested rereading the notes.

Steve: believes it has been a remarkable success. Eg. just the fact that this has been liquid gold in recruitment for faculty and students. Having been getting the cream of the crop. All the dean candidates were interested because of the consolidation. Believes that a review of this will hurt recruitment.

Bearded guy: thanks that the regent was willing to visit. Wanted to know what suggestions the regent has for people at the DDC? What might happen or what shouldn’t be happening?

Bosley: doesn’t personally know. Denver Center so he has an affinity for this campus.

Bearded guy: thinks that faculty were uninformed and didn’t want to make decisions about something they didn’t know about.

Bosley: needs to be a pairing of needs. Will the undergraduate programs be conceded to metro? This will likely not happen. Where is it going? Metro recently wants to change their mission. A legislator noted that they are both making changes; “mission creep?”

Dan: thanks for coming. Committed to building on the great urban universities. Would say that most of his new hires came on board for the same reason. Wants to make sure that the consultation with faculty does take place.

Bob Damrauer: 41 years ago. In the wave of hiring that the city of Denver needed a first class university in the city. There have been different types of waves of hiring and have all probably heard the same types of things. Thinks that the people who are now running the school are aware of what it should be.

Muth: agreed.

Bosley: how would someone describe what this school was before the consolidation?
Muth: thinks that much of it was rhetoric, what the school could become? Now talking about endowed professorships. It’s on the path to realization. Never really had structure to get to this point before. It used to be that boulder got everything and the other campuses got the leavings. Is this the catalyst?

Bosley: doesn’t want to challenge the consolidation but believes that that the other campuses felt bad as well. Defining what the missions are and defining them properly.

Muth: this is something that should be encouraged and believes that this should be supported before the accreditation.

Byrne: dovetail. The money wasn’t provided. Betsy found a mechanism by which it could happen. Enough people embraced it so that it could happen. Administration is finding nooks and crannies where this can take place. There could have been other ways for this to happen but the important thing is to make it happen. This was relatively inexpensive and had fantastic results. It is happening the way it is now. Should have an external group come in to assess the data and make sure that the perception is accurate. This would be helpful as opposed to coming directly from a negative standpoint. Make sure that this is approached in a proactive fashion. Negativity will bias this. Need to read between the lines; the phrasing has people upset more.

Bosley: reminded everyone that there are naysayers and no matter how this is done there will probably be someone noting that there should be changes.

Joe Juhasz: has been in the system for quite a while. Thinks the role of faculty governance has increased. Remembers when there weren’t that many attendees to FA meetings and were faculty were not as comfortable approaching a powerful person.

Bosley agreed.

Lori: mentioned mission creep. This campus needs to be sensitive to the admission quilt. The identity of where this school fits as a resource shifts. The boldness of the move and the strength of the move is something that had been missing the past. Thinks that the review of the consolidation sends a negative message.

John Bryant: as far a student’s perspective, this has been a source of energy. Students are seeing the value of this change. This provides them with additional opportunities. See the value of the consolidated campus.

Bosley: had to split where he took classes between here and boulder. Dr. Nairn contacted him right after he began (Churchill.) Begun talking about what the governor and legislator wanted as a role for the university.

Dr. Nairn: noted that the regent should be thanked and that it was a good discussion. As far as the consolidation review goes, thinks that it will show it’s a good idea.
Budget: in the process of working on this. beginning to talk to the deans about what the implications are. Really not a lot more definitive information available. Communiqués from the chancellor, etc. better than having a lot of people giving false information.

Roxanne: thinks that most people think that there won’t be a raise. Wanted to know if this is something that a department will decide. If a department wanted to give a below satisfactory or satisfactory. This could save some faculty time.

Nairn: will try to get an answer. HR will need to look at the policies. Another issue may be that if something like this was to come about it would have to be systemwide.

Juhasz: buildings?

Nairn: ddc—there are several layers. The ahec piece.needs to be factored in. there are discussions about a shared campus building. Also the ideas of neighborhoods going to take it back to the AHEC board re: the neighborhood concept. Could still share certain buildings. First UCD building is to the the A&P: fbuildandin,g. there are a lot of pieces. Look at these things on all campuses. Looking at different types of classrooms. Learning communities, etc. complex at best in the aHCC environment.

Teri Burleson—provided an update on the new SIS system. Massive project coming this way. Wanted to talk about how this will impact faculty. It’s huge and coming soon. The timeline: regent approval in 0906 conducted a fitca process. Had to keep in mind the president’s mandate to avoid an unnnexxcary changes. Evaluated which ones were necessary. Customer relations recruiting tool (already live), admissions will go live in summer 2009. have built grading bases, have been testing what has been built so far. There is a conversion phase in which all student records will be converted over. Will need to clean this up. Will begin putting courses into the system in fall of 2010. fall 2010 everything will go live. It will be a database. Faculty will indicate every semester which classes will be input inot the system. All the trains are at the station at the same time. CRM (customer relation management) is the recruiting tool (if a student sends an email, they will be able to interact with the school.) data warehouse. PeopleSoft enterprise portals. MDM (master data management.) if there are students who have an id in multiple places, this product trumps this and determines which id is the only one that is necessary. Building training tools as the system is being built. DARS degree audit which will be used as a graduation checkout (have the minimum requirements been met.) this will save paper, time, will be much more efficient. The same as the document management systems. This will also be used partly for workflow: eg.

The new world of campus solutions. A student is a student (no D1 or D2.) faculty self-service will go through the peoplesoft portal (will be able to get rosters, etc.) and online grading with workflow (EG.) won’t have to fill out the old-fashioned rosters. Can even use things like an excel document. There will be one faculty of record who will be able to upload and approve. Grade changes will require a dean’s signature. This is all a workflow process and it’s tracked. There will training on this. this will be webbased through the portal. There will also be a student self-service portal (similar to SMART.) permission numbers which can be specific by a class or a by astudent. There are different ways to do this. student uses this number to register for classes. Will need to
be decided by the campus as to how this will be used. Joy berenberg: will this help to prevent students who don’t have prerequisites. Yes. These will be enforced. These will be a hard prerequisites. If there are not transfer tables approved for students transferring in, they still might be able to get in. need to think about and manage this. these tables need to be finalized. They are going to test it with a certain number of prerequisites. Eg. business—they want to do specific classes but can also ask for a sequence of courses. Math—accuplacer testing. Will also have certain restrictions for the specific major. This will stop the students from registering. Can create hard-prerequisites others will be more informative. Joy: who makes the decision. Teri—this is up to the department.

Juhasz—the system he’s familiar with is that the instructor can waive prerequisites. How can this be bypassed?

Teri—there is something in the system which will allow this (permission numbers.) It will remain the same. This will continue to evolve.

Alan wallis—what are the advantages to the students?

Teri—yes, it will be very student-friendly.

David bondelevtich—can see student photos?

Yes.

Bruce Neumann—d1 and d2 are going away as a student designation.

This will be one institution so the registration will be much easier to register on both campuses. The only difficulty will be the differences between the academic calendars.

Joe juhasz—will this be coordinated with boulder?

Teri—the structure will remain the same. Won’t be a lot different than what it is now.

There is a new communications expert at the site in boulder.

Byrne: it’s taking the offices a lot of time to input the course descriptions, etc. will be more paperless.

Dan montez and Leonard lenninger—task force on efficiency. Due to have a report. Asked the group for input. How they got here, brief overview,

Spring of 2008 when benson was being interviewed for the job. Stop the proliferation of policies, streamline the policy process. (try to get a copy of the outline.) don’t punish someone by having them train for something they didn’t do. Eg. alcohol policy. No state funds, appropriate level. Became a 20 page document. After nearly four months of work, will be able to make their
recommendations. When a new aPS is developed, it works it’s way up and goes out the the campuses. Different units are tweaking. the rules are what cause what seem to be so many changes: 1. need to examine the concerns that “drive people crazy.” Taking on certain things like cell phone policies. Need to get more campus input. Thinking about this, what’s the impact on morale, staff count, etc. need to make sure that recommendations that are adopted and implemented. Looking at major changes and the task force will stay on this. will go back to the campuses and then do it again. Recommending that the name of the office be changed. Need to make sure these things are streamlined.

Dan. Organization lacks an easy way to access the policies. All policies would be in one place. Trying to simplify and double check to make sure the policies are necessary. Also simplifying the language. Looking in the area of processes (eg. procurement.) correctional industries, limits and thresholds (the dollar amounts on OFFs), etc. sometimes it’s not the policy the practice of carrying out the policy. Would like more electronic ways of doing things. Other issues: subgroups working on academic issues, operational issues, HR and IT, training, communications (how to better communicate policies.) engaging the governance groups, routing form for when policies are disseminated will know that people have actually been made aware of them. Leonard: feels that it has been a great experience and that there have been constructive comments. Campuses will have more input earlier in the process. Have a good set of representatives. Will now be able to document these changes. These are the problems and this is how they can be corrected. Dan—this is a good time to make these changes. Loenard—benson is concerned about things like flexibility. There is some initial feedback.

Juhzs—are there going to be regular times for these documents to be reviewed. Agrees that these changes should be made but that there is a sense that certain people are being punished for someone else’s mistakes.

Dan—there will be a maintenance period (military caps, sunset provision), etc.; regular reviews. Joy—how is someone supposed to know when a policy is changed? Told to check the web. Thinks that the system should have a special email alert system, information plus something like a checkbox. Leonard—these changes are communicated in different ways to faculty and staff. Byrne—there is still time for input. Goodwin—it would be nice if there was a search function. Leonard—eg Minnesota is the best model. Dan—the long term goal is to have this happen. There is something called a university policy guide (find out the exact title.)

Rod—phone usage? How much money is being spent on phones that aren’t being used?

John Lanning—cap for k legislation. Provided an update. Looking at content model standards for k12, graduation guidelines for k12, assessment, admission to higher education changes, etc. CAP4K Colorado achievement plan for kids. Senate bill 212 requires the legislature to create a list of skills which will then drive standards. The latest meeting was very well-attended. Work-force ready high school students? What does a high-school need to be post-secondary ready? The results were brought back to the campus. Wanted to see if the assembly has anything to add. Might now want to look at what other people have said. Eventually the comments from the academic units will be collected and analyzed. A handout outlining the specifics was provided. There shouldn’t be any surprise of what faculty have indicated are concerned about.
Joy berrenberg—these are very vague. The point is to move to course content standards.

Lanning—shares joy’s concerns. Eg. lack of success in math and science. Asked DPS official, on the course syllabus in high school would those standards be seen, and the answer was no.

Most of the committees haven’t met. Disabilities, diversity and experimental learning workshops.

Women’s committee will have a symposium in March.

Adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

following:

Task Force.
This entity looked at faculty governance for the consolidated institution. There was a good amount of representation from both campuses by people who were genuinely concerned about the issues of consolidation and faculty governance. The recommendation was that there be created with co-chairs, one from each campus. Details of how the new meetings will be conducted are still being finalized; however, the initial suggestion is that the first part of the meeting be joint (it will be a videoconference) and that the part of the meeting dealing with issues that pertain only to individual campuses will be conducted afterward without the video link. Additionally, there will be joint committees.

This concept will be field-tested and then the constitution will be written by a new task force and will be guided by feedback. More detailed information will be included in the bylaws. The first two meetings conducted jointly will take place this academic year, one in December and one in May. The Chancellor will conduct both meetings. The meeting in December will physically be held be at the downtown location and the meeting in May at the Anschutz location. Details about the videoconferencing are still being worked out; more information will follow closer to the downtown-December meeting.

The critical concern is travel, hence the reason for videoconferencing. Eventually, tools like breeze may be utilized to make the meetings even more convenient. One issue that may be difficult is to determine the proper procedures and etiquette for videoconferencing.

The Chair would like to ask folks for volunteers to assist with the new task force and wanted to remind people that the constitution is not voted on by the assemblies; it has to be voted on by faculty. She requested someone specifically for someone from UCDALI.
Allison Bashe had a question re: draft of an organizational chart. Judy Igoe is in the process of preparing this document, which will be posted on the FA website as well as sent out electronically as soon as it has been finalized. All of this is also part of the accreditation process.

Bruce Neumann had a question about the concept two versus three campuses. Dr. Provost Nairn provided basic information and admitted he wasn’t very sure about details. He indicated, though, that it makes more sense if you think of “campuses” as a replacement term for “institution.” The Chair indicated that part of this is also due to there being a need for clarification of branding.

Provost Nairn thanked the FA members for attending. Dr. Nairn provided some more information about his background.

He then gave some information about the convention and how it really didn’t impact the campus that much. Basically, the University was prepared for things which were anticipated but which did not occur. The two issues which were mentioned were the evacuation of one building and the temperature of the North Classroom building. Philip Joseph did have a question about why Jon Stewart wasn’t allowed to film on campus. Provost Nairn said that there were several requests for a variety of projects which would have draw positive attention to the school, however, the main issue was security.

Steve Thomas had a question about how to keep the schools separate in order to honor the differences between the schools. How are those two worlds “defended”? Provost Nairn indicated that there is no need to defend the differences and that the schools should continue to blend. Dr. Thomas indicated concern is that there is more of a trend to valuing the medical school side of things because of the revenue generate by things like grants. The Provost indicated that he knows how important grants are but that he also knows faculty is concerned about supporting the enterprise of the University overall.

Laura Argys then had a question as to how DNC affected the school financially. The Provost stated basically anything significant would be reimbursed.

The Provost then provided an update on the Strategic Plan. Different departments are being asked to create and/or refine their respective strategic plans to correspond with what the University is doing. This is something the accreditation committee will be looking at. Also, the University is gearing up for accreditation and trying to find out when the site visit will be. Currently they are lobbying for spring 2011 but it might end up being the fall of 2010. Dr. Nairn was just accepted to the peer review core which he feels will allow him to get a better feel for this process. He also wanted to know if anyone in Faculty Assembly had been involved in anything similar.

Candan Duran-Aydintug wanted to know the solidity of the University’s Strategic Plan now? It is very overwhelming and she believes that it might affect the accreditation, specifically, if the schools have to align with the University’s. It was indicated by the Provost that it is fluid but as solid as any of these documents are. The hope is to keep it dynamic. University should have a very broad unit plan view and should be generic enough for other units to be able to tailor their individual plans to reflect most of the same points.
Laura Argys asked for clarification of accreditation and it is basically regional accreditation of institutions, which means that there is a regional reviewing body as well as a national. There is a checklist of what the institution is going to do. Reports are issued which indicate if there are areas which need to be addressed. Dr. Nairn stressed the importance of faculty input in order to make the University better.

Steve Thomas mentioned that historically the downtown campus has been historically low in funds. Wondering if the foundation and/or system should be helping to look at the needs to get more money to actually make all of these changes which the strategic plan implies will be implemented. Provost Nairn’s great concern is that the school is 48th out of 50 in state funding. Is there a plan to aggressively pursue other monies? Yes. It includes working with the legislature. The last two years there have been great amounts of fundraising taking place. Master plan for this campus is something that needs to be discussed in order to galvanize the campus. There is a very aggressive plan on how to receive more money for scholarships. Trying to make this case. However, there probably won’t be vast amounts of money. What are the plans going forward as far as space? Nairn stated that there was an aggressive plan laid out for this. Preview: He mentioned that AHEC did some master planning about a year ago. The three institutions in Auraria will still share space but there was recognition for each school to have their own “neighborhood.” This school UC has also done its own planning, too which would consist of its own district on both sides of Speer. Over the summer had architects have been looking at this space and are working on a plan for UCD that will go out to 2020 and beyond. They are working on a model right now that looks at the “district.” Concern about the There are several view plans that—limits certain things that can be constructed. The plans around include athletics, etc. The plans have devised a way of getting about 1 million more feet to help us accomplish our space needs. The new plans are as bold as the plan to move from 9th to Anschutz. Question from English department guy Another question addressed to the Provost was whether the plans including looking at the other side of Colfax. Looking at an area where chevron used to be (?) The Provost said he wasn’t sure but still in a discussion phase that this might be where athletic space could be put. As far as other buildings, not looking at currently.

Laura Argys asked if we had a short term plan right now to accommodate our projected enrollment growth, or are they looking at capping it. Are there questions about quality if space is not improved? Nairn responded that every year the deans look at enrollment targets, etc. he believes that they need to go in the direction of what’s the practicality of 25%/75% (graduate/undergraduate) student body and that still discussions need to be had. There is also a need to service the demand and figure out a way to provide the facilities. With space planning really needs to be at least four years ahead of the need. Had been hoping that the micro We need to anticipate where the requirements for space will be for the master plan for out to 2020 it would be good to anticipate where the requirements for space will be. One of the first new buildings will be A&P for A&P.

Vice Chancellor Camacho then addressed the Assembly. He believes strongly in having more diversity in schools. He would like to make the school a place of choice and believes that having more diversity would help achieve that goal. The University is one step away from becoming an
Hispanic school which would provide good funding opportunities. Candan Duran-Aydintug stated her frustration that there hasn’t always been a lot of interest in committees which deal with issues of diversity and that this frustration has increased with the consolidation. She does not believe that there should one series of diversity committees addressing these issues for both campuses because the campuses focus on different things. Dr. Camacho agreed that one diversity office could not do things on two campuses.

The issue of recruitment and retention was mentioned by Philip Joseph who believes that more teachers at the associate level need to be hired. Dr. Camacho thought this was a good question and agreed that the school has to be competitive in its hiring. Laura Goodwin stated that the schools and colleges need to make out a hiring plan in a way which makes more sense to them and which addresses budgetary issues.

Bruce Neumann mentioned Metropolitan State as being an Hispanic-serving institution. Vice Chancellor Camacho spoke about the fact that when you become an Hispanic-serving institution (which means at least 25% of the student body), it brings in a lot of other fiscal resources for the downtown campus.

The Chair stated that they are trying to reinvent the diversity committee as more of a diversity and inclusion committee which will meet with Dr. Camacho once a month.

Committee reports were then presented.

GLBT: Jeffrey Beall said that this committee will not be meeting until September 12th and will have elections at that time.

Disabilities: Philip Joseph presented the committee’s report in Amy Vidali’s place. She acknowledges that sex and other issues are important aspects of diversity but wanted to point out that so is disability. The committee’s goals for the year were then presented which include: designing a website portal, reviewing how accommodations are being provided through campus service offices, addressing campus access issues, and creating a longer-range project with regards to how people with disabilities are factored in to the campus emergency plan.

Minority affairs: Philip Joseph also presented this report. This committee will have two projects—one to get more people at the senior level to get involved in this committee and second to have an event on February 12 (Lincoln’s) about the crisis of inclusion in higher education.

Budget committee: Laura Argys provided an overview of what happened last year. This committee focused on what departments wanted to pursue. However a problem was that most of the money was already allocated by the time BPC got involved. This year one of the anticipated changes includes being more involved in reviewing the hiring plan. BPC has done a lot of budgeting about space, etc. this year. One recommendation from last year sort of got a request from the provost. Feel as though making use of what’s available. Don’t think there was continuing money available. The Committee wants to get ahead on receiving input from faculty sooner this year. Don’t know if the initiative process will used last year will continue for this year. The Committee also wants to include a “raise pool” component. Last year
when it went the president. The system tried to build in a 1% cushion for the raise pool, if a campus could fund it, that would be added to this year’s raise pool. Hopefully by January, there will be another 1% cushion. There will have to be broad guidelines developed for this extra money—light the money is actually there. Pamela Laird suggested that equity and compression should be addressed. Dr. Argys stated that the funds won’t be allocated uniformly. Pam-Dr. Laird stated that this is important because the decisions/recommendations that the BPC will make in terms of its recommendation will involve trade-offs. One of the things related to operating costs has to do with staff. Staff hiring has not kept up with faculty hiring. It was stated that we really need to balance what we can faculty and staff. Dr. Argys stated that the idea of staff is being folded into this future recommendations. In the past, used to be that the colleges would have to find the money for staff support from their current budgets which are stretched too far now to continue to do this.

The Chair then relayed the following information:

Academic Personnel—The committee hasn’t met yet.
EPPC—The committee hasn’t met yet.
Women’s Committee—Chair was ill.

UCDALI: Allison Bashe presented this report. Elections will be held at the first meeting on September 4th. It is continuing to work on the issue of communication with new NTTF folks and will be taking the concept of an NTTF award to Laura Goodwin. The committee wants to draw attention to NTTF.

AHEC—Joy Berrenberg gave this report. The results of the satisfaction survey will be sent out. These results were presented to the Auraria Board, which is a governing board comprised of appointees and the CEOs of the three institutions, at its June meeting and the Board was not terribly responsive. FACAB has not been as proactive as it could have been. Some of the issues mentioned were things like parking, also too many chairs in classrooms, the temperature of classrooms, lack of enforcement on building limitations on smokers, etc. The response of the Board was that it was not their problem; for example, the smoking limitation could be enforced by faculty if they want to. One Board member expressed disbelief and wanted to have tour with two or three other Board members to actually see this. It was suggested that the AHEC committees FACAB needs to have a very high and active profile, taking measure like making sure at least ten faculty members attend these meetings the Auraria Board meetings. Joy also expressed disappointment that the Board didn’t seem to welcome feedback from the survey with 500 respondents.

Steve Thomas pointed out that there are people being hired to be in contact with the Foundation and to represent the downtown folks and suggested that someone faculty with ideas should speak with these people since they interact with the Foundation. |Argys: steve has been pushing hard to keep the pressure on to make sure we do get the resources. Agreed to keep in the loop with steve.||--|Joy Berrenberg noted that the campus doesn’t work on its visibility and that other schools are marketed much more heavily. She wondered if there is a way FA can help improve this. |Roxanne: Roxanne stated, thinks that UCD was hurt by President Benson’s decision to put the kibosh on the branding until after the system looks at the branding issue. Essentially
Anschutz got more money for this reason. UCD did have — Pushed for the posters in the windows for the DNC. The posters are nice and — Still kept to President Benson’s edict. Philip Joseph — again expressed his disappointment with the Provost’s response to the Jon Stewart response question. Roxanne Byrne stated that AHEC decided early that there would be nothing allowed on the Auraria Campus because if you say yes to one, you can’t say no to another. AHEC thought the risk of protesters, etc. would have caused too much damage. Also, AHEC would have had to hire additional security. Roxanne Acknowledged that there were a lot of good opportunities lost because of this but it may have been necessary. — That was the reasoning. Safest. Argys: sense of not being risk-takers. Chair is hoping that the new branding will help this.

Adjourned 2:25