



Faculty Assembly
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER

CU Denver Faculty Assembly Meeting

February 7, 2023

12:00 pm - 2:00 pm

Learning Commons 3rd floor – Lecturer Landing Zone

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Joanne Addison, Vivian Shyu, Dennis DeBay, Thorsten Spehn, Fernando Moncella-David, Wendy Bolyard, Greg Ragland, Mia Fischer, Traci Sitzmann, Larry Erbert, Jeffrey Schrader, Tammy Stone, Jamie Hodgkins, Karen Sobel, Todd Ely, Karen Spencer, Melissa Tackett-Gibson, Linda Fried, Larry Cunningham, Ilkyeun Ra, Colleen Donnelly, Jeremy Nemeth, Eric Jewett, Thomas Beck, Dan Maxey

(12:00 PM)

Joanne Addison, Acting Chair of the Denver Faculty Assembly

- Meeting Brought to Order
- Request for leniency and grace as FA leaders work to temporarily cover tasks in face of loss of FA administrative support staff
- Approval of December Minutes – problem with file that was attached to meeting invite, thus December 2022 and February 2023 minutes will be up for approval at March meeting
- Faculty Senate Grievance Committee CU Denver campus membership -
 - 2 reappointments - Gita Alaghband and Omar Schwartz
 - 1 new appointment - Tom Altman
 - Motion made to vote all as slate –seconded
 - Motion made to vote for full slate appointment – seconded
 - All present voted “yay,” 0 “no,” 0 “abstain”
- Meeting scheduling: (this, our first meeting in person – as per Jarrod’s efforts)
 - March – Regents as guests
 - Official call for nominations for Chair in March
 - April meeting – Chancellor wants to come
 - Election for Chair
 - May? - Items for agenda
- Remaining hybrid or fully online? – discussion
 - HYBRID for now, unless we hear otherwise

(12:20 pm)

Turan Kayaoglu, AVC for Faculty Affairs

- Agreed to hold his report for later in session

Constancio Nakuma, Provost; Jennifer Sobanet, EVC – Budget/Campus update

- → handout: MEMO Doc to Deans distributed
- Jennifer St. Peters unable to join as planned due to illness

- Joanne prefaces “How do we get feedback” and “How do we build in accountability?”
 - Faculty want an opportunity to provide feedback on the consultation process with Deans
- **Jennifer Sobanet** shared the RACI process
 - → handout: RACI for budget process with faculty for period 1/13 – 2/8 distributed
 - Talked about the sprint to get some input during that first deadline crunch; process was constrained by what needed to be provided to our leadership and then to Regents
 - Shift in process then made in response to faculty’s comments of “too-fast”
 - Resulted in a newly revised timeline/process:
 - First half of budget realignment process for June 2023 is focus for April 2023 Board of Regent’s meeting
 - Second half of budget realignment process for June 2024 now allowed more time; so now we can make this a more inclusive process
 - Using the RACI process (which is being designed as we go along)
 - Working with shared gov leaders to see that when proposals are decided there has been input from faculty and staff; asking for schools/colleges to include their student government input
 - Proposals due to Provost from Deans by February 8th
 - They will then tally to see that targets are being hit and that the proposed strategies are the correct cuts to make
 - Then subsequent RACI process for reviewing and consulting and ultimately finalizing decisions will guide remaining steps in process
- **Constance Nakuma** – taking these steps to ensure as much input from faculty as possible
 - Process really takes place at coll/sch level
 - Change based on knowledge; want to give power to all of “you” to determine how we proceed at dept/college level
 - Posed question to Assembly, “what level of engagement have you experienced?”
 - Zero/none – about 25% of members present
 - Some? – about 25% of members present
 - Some members qualified their response with “informed but not consulted”
 - Consulted? – very few raised hands, maybe 5
 - Realizing the lack of consultation reported here, Provost shares that AVCFA Kayaoglu is working with schools/college’s without shared governance structures already
 - Discussion between Provost and membership: “Do faculty have a primary unit meeting where administrators sit in? Or, do Deans delegate to a dept level, where there are no witnesses present, so people can speak freely and then those comments/sentiments/concerns are taken that to Dean?”
 - Provost asks, “Do you feel you’ve had a chance to consult at dept level?”
 - Comments: “Sometimes deans have their people they consult;” “things get collected but then no engagement after (one round of gathering comments without anything after that – so really engagement?)”
 - Provost: “This is supposed to be happening now”
 - He is meeting with Deans now to ask what kinds of engagement and then working through the ideas asking:

- What is impact?
 - How is it hurting?
 - How it impacting your ability to grow?
- Talking through all proposals and marking ideas as:
 - Plausible (keep in bucket)
 - Against principles (no, throw it out)
 - Needs more work (needs further discussion)
- This process above was done collectively
 - Just saying “leave it in” at this point, does not mean it’s set in stone yet (given big picture)
- Tomorrow (February 8) is final slate of ideas
 - They (Deans) were supposed to consult with faculty this time around
- **Feb 20 meeting is scheduled** – to work with larger group where each leader presents their ideas/proposals (Deans and Central Administrators)
 - Intention: consultation with shared governance: Faculty Assembly, Budget Priorities Committee, UCDALI
- Question from FA member: They were told not to worry about 2030 implications [while Provost intends this guides every step of process]. So, will the executive summaries will be shared, so that faculty can assess alignment with their experience.
 - Answer: while they are supposed to be considering the 2030 implications, we do expect less complex proposals this first round; more after this 1st phase
 - when met with Deans and teams, understanding that vacancy may be offered for cut now (as convenience), but if a high-enrollment program, asking “what is plan for how you’re going to backfill”
 - If no thought yet, then deemed a “follow-up” items
- Question for FA member: What will be communicated by whom, to whom?
 - Answer: what is relevant to your college needs to be considered in your college; What is in your college should be available to you
 - Follow-up discussion leads to request: “Can they get it out to faculty at large? This will help faculty feel more comfortable and informed”
 - Answer: these are not yet agreed-upon actions – some will not go forward; a need to provide personnel protection for some proposals. So, cannot share broadly; also some will be thrown away and could cause unnecessary fear;
 - Provost: Feb 20th meeting is where they will be shared with this smaller group; still need to decide where we share after that
 - FA member comment: If not violating policy, then we say it should be shared
- **Joanne A summary:**
 - We are asking for concrete decision points where information will be shared
 - For Deans to be informed, “This is the date that you will share this information with these people”
 - Desire some agreed upon dates, and what will be shared with whom

Lightening Question Round:

- Nonrenewal or closing of faculty lines, what’s the Admin thinking on this?
 - What else have you considered (especially for laying off)

- As members of FA, there are a number of us without job security (so can't fully use our voice)
 - Provost responds that Deans are showing up as sensitive/conscious of issues (of power dynamics)
- Colleges/schools don't speak with one voice (how do the 49% raise their objectives once the dept has made their decision)
 - Joanne: will ask for some mechanism for the 49% to have voice heard
 - Provost responds that minority often gets overridden; asks us for help to figure this out
- Can we also know what cuts are happening at Admin level?
 - Provost reports they will be sharing this also; this is how they really know this is hard; they will be transparent
- In one college (SPA) – there really hasn't been any discussion of the cuts (just show of budget breakdown)
 - Can you reinforce this process (as this is not the upcoming faculty meeting agenda)?; Can Provost enforce that shared governance matters?
 - Provost says they will ask Deans what their process is
- There is a lot of fear because there is not enough knowledge
 - Can they create a rubric of what each sch/college does have to share so faculty knows what to expect, or look for, especially for faculty feeling anxious
 - Provost responds that each school/college operates differently
 - The idea is that whatever is being shared has already been shared with those impacted (e.g. programs impacted, chair in discussion?)
 - They intend that those to be impacted are informed prior
- Many of us are working without contracts – need to give people opportunity to find other positions if their jobs are at-risk; since we are year to year, and could not know until August
- Shared governance is in one bucket, and decisions as to how to get through budget crisis is in another bucket. This cannot be, because people are quietly quitting.
 - Need to give people the opportunity to say as much as they can and feel safe
 - This is not what we have right now

CLOSING comments:

- Joanne A. –attachments FA members received with email invite are 2 new, huge data files (described them as financial data files of administration)
 - Jen St. Peter was to be here but is out sick; BPC is looking at this information, but they can too. If questions, please share with Todd Ely (BPC) so he can share those forward
- Todd Ely (BPC): we presented some data earlier, and this is Jennifer St. Peters' work to bring cleaner, better data
 - Also addressing vacancies, bigger picture
 - BPC has gotten some more information about the data file
 - Acknowledge leadership did put a lot of work into this to provide more transparency
 - Now is time for scrutiny from faculty, so share questions with us (BPC)
- The Question and Answer file is there for members to read, also
- Provost: "Your voice keeps us honest. The more you guide us, the better we will be as leaders." This is the basis of our partnership.

(1:10 pm)

Katie Linder, AVC Digital Strategy and Learning; Karen Sobel, CFDA; Crystal Gasell, Director of Academic Technology and Training – AI (e.g. ChatGPT) policies and practices at CU Denver

- Chris Puckett, University Counsel was scheduled as guest, but could not attend due to illness
- A ChatGPT workshop held by ThingStudio/TIPS earlier in day had 80 people in attendance

Joanne presented Main Topics for this discussion: What do faculty need? Do we need policy on this? Is Office of Student Conduct ready for this?

- This is an evolution we need to be ready to meet; What do you all think, what questions do you have; Concerns about Office of Student Conduct?; What training do you want/need?
- FA member provides examples of how this issue presents even more work, is a true issue (as AI produced a solid B paper), and have to learn program and detectors, ...
- JOANNE: 2 issues
 - workload (how effect workload)
 - how do we spend resources to pay for what purposes? and how are faculty involved in these conversations?
- FA member: how are we expected to determine what our own expectations will be in our classes? At the level of individual courses, it's got to be clear. Faculty have to clearly state, and students have to know; Some courses where it will be forbidden, others where it will be embraced
- FA member: is there a place where we can to go to get this information? (how used, ways used, ways moving around, avoid); Inserts for our Syllabi?
 - Need a place for Resources; Where will these things reside?
- FA member: this is an ethics issue – where do the ethics get imbued
 - Need to wrestle with this and don't think our Ethics Policy is ready to deal with this
 - What about when this gets monetized? Increase haves and have-nots
 - Microsoft just invested \$10m here, and our U invests resources
 - Where do the students learn about these ethics?
- FA member: not a one-size-fits-all
 - if comes down to individual faculty, we need to know that we have support to make our decisions for our classes
 - Do our chairs have training, are they prepared? Do Deans, administrators?
 - Some believe that when complaints are taken to higher-ups, "professors are always wrong"; even if it is still cheating – Chairs, Dean, admin will come back and tell us we have to regrade
- FA member: we've been talking about this all year – [in computer science, (the AI) code is better than ours!]. Trying to create a new type of assignment, but we cannot track down each of the different versions (like trying to catch a rat in NYC)
 - Grad students told to use it as a tool, and asking for them to be honest
 - We know that most of our students are cheating.
 - It takes us time to find these
 - Rumor that Microsoft is already embedding this in their products
 - University is going to need to invest in embracing rather than kicking it out (like we embraced calculators)

- FA member (teaches acting) – look at scene and write about what it’s about – 5/20 have disability – he feels there are many in the group [with disability] (students can speak coherently, but when writing he often doesn’t know what they are saying)
 - Feels like it could help some to use this as a tool
- JOANNE: Are there ways that disability services are working with faculty to collaborate, even with students, to use this as a tool?
- Also need to listen to students about how they feel about it (as study tool versus cheating)

Crystal Gasell:

- Hearing: there are a lot of layers
 - Where can TIPS be helpful? Getting groups together?

Katie Linder:

- Raising all the right issues, need to work across campus
 - Wide spectrum of response
 - had great meeting of bringing faculty together and that forum helps inform where we go
- Will download this for Chris Puckett, and see where he is thinking about this
- Will get information from what’s happening across system

CLOSING comments (Joanne A): So, here are the things we are thinking about, are worried about. Let’s quickly provide more forums to help keep up on what we are doing and how we are responding.

Katie Linder - Update on CETL search:

- In Fall search was ongoing; in November – the search paused given budget issues
- They used that pause to come back to the committee and do a deeper dive into CETL budget
 - Came to this: revise position to be internal search in CU Denver and make it a .5 position
 - Some worried about burn out, but now this person will have a more supportive/collaborative division to support their work in this role
 - Happy to share the draft position description
 - Unclear of timing of start (potentially this summer or into fall)
 - Dennis DeBay is a good person to contact with questions/concerns

(1:35 pm)

EDI Resolution – Joanne Addison, FA Acting Chair

- Draft of resolution: ExComm has seen and approved this draft
 - → EDI Resolution draft distributed
- We are now coming back around to do this process better; since FAR checklists were contested and removed last year, how should EDI activities be reported?
 - Rachel Brown (works in Antonio Farias’ office) drafted this resolution; offered to act as admin support to move this process along
 - We took a lot from Boulder; Trying to make sure that it’s flexible; intended as guidance
 - If we approve this, there is stipend money for work over summer
- [members given time to look over document]
- JOANNE asks for “Thoughts? Changes you’d like to see? Concerns?”
 - FA Member: no one thinks about Disability as persons who have issues with inclusion

- Is there a way to specify demographics? Because we mention race and culture, but then say we don't want to get into groups
 - Can we change language, so we are not just asking about a specific demographic (so that it's not just a discussion of white versus black/brown people)
 - Could remove any mention of race/culture OR can use Regent's list of protected groups
 - [pulled up Board of Regent list]
 - Question – have we been in touch with Farias team?
 - A. Yes, he is helping with this
 - FA member: issue of inclusion has been an issue in DEI scholarship (people doing work in this area don't like generalized Language)
 - Second paragraph – this language again belies problem; Take it out? and put all categories in?
 - This is where the proposed working group will be working
 - JOANNE: Sounds like we are agreeing on the spirit of this, do we agree on that?
 - FA Member: going to colleges to ask about diversity and inclusion, they are never going to consider "other" categories – can see this going nowhere quickly
 - JOANNE: at the end of the day, we cannot make the primary units do anything
 - FA Member: but we are being told to change by-laws to include DEI language (?)
 - primary units set the criteria; there are also issues of annual review versus P&T
 - JOANNE: Is this draft salvageable? – Answer: YES
 - Okay, get rid of the language? Or add some list that adds more (BoR list of historically marginalized groups)?
 - Regent's language? -- Several members like this
 - Still other saying like "No list"
 - **JOANNE closing comment:** Intention is to move forward, putting a statement out, and then pulling together a working committee this summer
 - We will rework this draft, and put back out for vote
 - You all go back to your sub-committees and get input to Joanne

Committee reports will be written and submitted

FA member requests continued discussion on FCQ – written comments

- Office of Equity having FCQ office mine FCQ comments for list of words – if found, then send report to OE, they send formal letter to notify faculty, goes in faculty file
 - Problem, for faculty, no way to clear your name (OofEquity says they cannot de-id student – which is not true)
 - Question – Is it okay for FCQ office to be mining this data? If okay at all, then under what conditions?
 - Answer: They won't stop, primarily because the Boulder Office of Equity tells them to do this. As a campus, we need to decide, is this okay?
 - Right now, the only thing we can do is have the campus say "no more written comments"
 - Can the campus do this?
 - FA member: this is "legally indefensible"; saying this is anonymous, but it is not
 - **we need to talk with LEGAL**

- JOANNE requests a subgroup be formed and meet to offer some proposals to address this issue (Turan, Karen S, Joanne, Vivian, and Dennis) – names will be sent to Turan to schedule