



University of Denver **FACULTY FORUM**

VOL. XX No. 3

MAY 2006

At Year's End...

A Word from the New Provost:

Dear faculty of the University of Denver,

In the summer of 2006, the University of Denver is in very good condition. We have run budget surpluses for the past sixteen years, built hundreds of millions of dollars worth of campus buildings, and substantially supported many academic programs. DU's renaissance has involved people playing many different roles – some more complex and pivotal than others, but each contributing directly to what we are today: from the custodial staff who keep our buildings in pristine condition, to faculty members who wear out work boots at academic building construction sites; from faculty and staff members who volunteer to interview every single undergraduate applicant to the University, to faculty and staff members who devote countless hours to innovative programs to bring people of color into the DU community; from faculty who partner with students in labs, in the field, and in archives, to staff members in residence halls who treat every single student as a unique human being; from the untenured faculty member who creates, publishes, teaches, and serves the institution – all with equal intensity and skill – and does it because he really believes that is his calling, to the senior administrator almost nobody sees, who works eighty-hour weeks, is rarely home, and believes she has the best job in the world. Such examples abound at the University of Denver, and,

combined, they account for what DU has become in the summer of 2006.

In short, without its extraordinarily talented people, finely-woven systems of accountability, and forward-driving ethos, the University of Denver would certainly not exist as we know it, and it might not exist at all. Over the years, the University's energies have been directed toward creating and sustaining excellence in every single thing we pursue. In the process, we have worked within a tightly constrained environment that rewards innovation and risk-taking, but only after our bills are paid. It is to the enormous credit of DU's faculty, staff, and administrators that we have come as far as we have within these constraints. In the past decade-and-one-half, significant investments have flowed to units across the University. As we reach our enrollment goals across campus, the vehicles by which we have historically managed to make those investments – primarily tuition volume and rate increases – are about to diminish dramatically. It is in this context that we now operate, and it will challenge all of us as we proceed.

As the University turns from constructing buildings to increasing substantially our budget-relieving endowment, the faculty at the University has an enormously important role to play. Now it is DU's academic story that must convince alumni, foundations, and friends that the University of Denver is deserving of their support;

we must aggressively encourage the creation and maintenance of the very highest standards for every one of our students, academic programs, and faculty. DU's future hinges on the excellence of our programs and our ability to communicate that story in the clearest, most coherent, and utterly compelling manner possible.

As provost, my role will be to help produce that story by gathering together the many stakeholders who constitute our community and leading the conversation about where we are and where we want to go. Of course we all work within an academic context that is by its very nature collaborative, and that fits my personal proclivity. Still, as provost I am more than nominally the leader of a team that includes the deans, the faculty, and the staff of the academic departments in the University. That team also includes the University Planning Advisory Council – a body that produced the University's vision, values, mission, and goals that index the things that matter to DU and things we want to achieve. Clearly, not all of us will be involved in every conversation or decision about how we move forward, but it is imperative that every member of the University's community understand where we are, where we are going, and how we will get there. Broad and appropriate participation must be augmented by virtually complete transparency when participation is not possible.

I am absolutely delighted to be in this position, and I look forward to our collaboration. My ties to the faculty of the University of Denver are deep and fundamental. I promise to do everything I can to earn your trust as we move forward.

Gregg Kvistad

From the Past President of the Senate:

It has been a great pleasure to serve as President of the Faculty Senate. And, it is a great pleasure to welcome Dean Saitta as our new President, and Provost Gregg Kvistad. I believe that both of these leaders will seek ways to increase the faculty voice in the envisioning, planning and implementing initiatives that will shape

our future. It is important that faculty voices come forward from many sectors of our campus. The Faculty Senate is one place where Senators from each division consider issues that impact the University as a whole.

Each year the Senate manages Sabbatical, Faculty Award, and Faculty Research Fund decisions. It organizes the Administrator Evaluation process and provides members to the Faculty Educational Affairs, Budget and Finance, Athletic Affairs and Student Relations committees of the Board of Trustees. Senate members from the Finance and Executive Committees see and discuss the budget of the University with the Provost and the Vice-Chancellor for Business and Finance. In the past few years we have created an advisory linkage to the undergraduate admissions process and played a major role in the development and implementation of the PROF initiative. Our members have served in the Chancellor search and Provost search processes. The Senate played a role in the creation of the Teaching Task Force and the current Research, Scholarship and Creative Work Task Force, and our members have served in each alongside colleagues from all divisions. A salary study that seeks to "drill down" to the unit and department level is in process; the small steering group represents a Provost Office, Human Resources and Senate partnership. There is a great deal going on here at DU, and the Faculty Senate is increasingly involved as initiatives move forward. What is on the horizon? First, perhaps is a reconstitution of the University Planning and Advisory Council (UPAC).

If you have an interest in information about the internal processes of the University and in the issues at play at the University level, I highly recommend serving in the Senate. Understanding the budget, having an opportunity to serve on university wide initiatives, watching (and sometimes engaging in) the occasional battle, getting to know those whose jobs and perspectives are very different from your own -- Priceless. In the meantime, offer Dean Saitta your congratulations and your support. And keep your eyes open for dsaitta@du.edu in your email inbox!

Cathryn Potter

From the New President of the Senate:

This is an exciting time to be taking on the Faculty Senate presidency. The university is well-positioned to strengthen core academic programs and develop

new ones that can propel us into the first rank of great educational institutions. The Faculty Senate needs to be a major player in brainstorming about the future and in strategizing to get us there. Three challenges strike me as especially important:

1. Developing a mechanism for substantive faculty input on big picture academic planning. Asserting the need for faculty involvement in academic planning is commonplace on campus. The challenge is to empower faculty who are good at asking “what if?,” “how about?,” and “why not?” questions in ways that open up—and give us a fighting chance for realizing—new possibilities. This is especially important if we orient what we do around issues of compelling public interest. These issues are inherently interdisciplinary. If research and teaching initiatives to address them are to percolate up from the faculty, then we need more and better mechanisms to encourage conversations among a variety of faculty across a variety of academic units, and to share these conversations with administrators and trustees.

2. Exploring new approaches to research and creative activity that unite scholars with overlapping and/or complementary interests and expertise. Research excellence, or the potential for research excellence, exists throughout the university. The challenge is to better support excellence where it resides and better articulate it with excellence that resides elsewhere. Faculty in the natural sciences have been talking about collaborative approaches to research that build off of existing strengths in ways that promise greater competitiveness in attracting research dollars. Interdisciplinary Centers and Institutes offer another set of mechanisms for integrating scholars across the arts and sciences, and may hold increasing promise for attracting outside support if oriented toward significant public issues. Of course, a truly enlightened university is one that also supports and rewards scholarship that political and funding mainstreams consider to be abnormal, unfundable, and even “dangerous.”

3. Finding some common ground regarding the evaluation and development of teaching. The response by faculty and administrators to this year’s Teaching Task Force Report—the problems with its narrative style notwithstanding—didn’t reflect well on our collective ability to have a useful conversation about how to evaluate, develop, and reward teaching in ways that respect disciplinary differences, the changing interests of faculty at different stages of their careers, and the public good mission of the university. There’s unfinished business here, including some missed (but

not vanished) opportunities to think about teaching in light of the one quality that, for many observers, makes DU distinctive: our ability to bring faculty and students together in collaborative research and other forms of experiential learning.

There are other longstanding issues around how we attract and retain excellent faculty via enhancements to salary and start-up packages, benefits like mortgage assistance and tuition exchange, and rewards for good university service and citizenship. As Senate president, I’m looking forward to engaging these issues in productive and possibly even creative ways.

Dean Saitta

Continuing the Conversation on Academic Quality...

From Deb Grealy, Library and Information Science Program

Our feeling is that academic quality lies in providing focused, student-centered instruction, grounded in a set of shared values and beliefs, informed by research, and enriched by best practices. Quality lies in the commitment to engage with and actively facilitate the learning of the student by helping lay a foundation for ongoing, lifelong inquiry and learning.

The Library and Information Science (LIS) Program in the College of Education is a graduate program that delivers professional education (Master’s of Library and Information Science) by challenging students intellectually and technologically while preparing them to enter the field of information management. Upon graduation, DU students will serve as proxies for information seekers and researchers in their own right. Students are invited to take advantage of the faculty’s experiences and established professional networks. They are urged to “think outside the box” and to “push the envelope” of established professional practice. Driven by technology, many DU graduates will not work in traditional library settings. Rather, they will serve their clients without walls and sometimes without books.

LIS Program faculty deliver quality instruction by blending a theoretical framework with practical application to prepare and socialize students into the information professions.

DU's LIS program is locally, regionally, and nationally known for graduating and placing students of exceptional caliber. Quality of professional programs is indicated by the following:

- Students know what to do and why they're doing it.
- They learn to challenge and change professional norms while they study them.
- They have the freedom and encouragement to go beyond the books they're reading.
- They learn to think critically about solving old problems with new solutions.
- They are successfully placed in positions where they can make a positive difference in the advancement of their profession.

More Thoughts on Academic Quality:

Transforming the Academy through Radical Inclusion
S. Lily Mendoza, Human Communications
(Excerpts from Keynote Address to Faculty and Graduate Students of Color, October 20, 2005)

We live in interesting times—they say this is actually a curse in Chinese when you're told, "May you live in interesting times!" Because what the phrase really means is, may you run into the most extraordinary challenges that will test your mettle, show the kind of gut you have. For sure, "interesting times" doesn't connote safety, or party time, but rather a bracing up for the difficult road that lies ahead.

What are the interesting times we live in?

I could list any number of things, foremost of which for me is the return of the imperial moment—not that it has ever been not there, but what we're seeing today is the unprecedented consolidation in this country of a consensus around an agenda aimed at creating a unipolarist world where the goal is to have the U.S. stand alone uncontested as the sole remaining superpower in the world (this is not a concoction of deranged minds; read it on-line in a document titled, "Project for a New American Century").

Second, the phenomenon of peak oil or the impending end of the era of cheap oil that Pentagon itself is worried about, along with the growing environmental crisis brought on by the unbridled extraction of wealth

from an already ravaged earth to feed the consumption demands of First World nations such as ours.

Third, the ever-tightening noose around civil liberties demanded by the ongoing War on Terror with the increasing surveillance and ever stricter policing of what you and I do in our lives, including what goes on in the classroom particularly in institutions of higher learning (cf. the controversial House Resolution 3077) advocating sanctions through the withholding of federal funding from institutions deemed to be teaching "anti-Americanism" or of fomenting, in the language of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders, the syndrome called ODD: Oppositional Defiant Disorder, otherwise known as a type of mental illness characterized by "an excess of the passion for liberty" (at least as referred to during the era of John Adam's Sedition Act).

In a much more local way, here at DU, we also live in interesting times.

Just when the administration seems to have committed itself to the goal of diversification and internationalization, we face the embarrassing notoriety of ranking #1 nationwide (according to the *Princeton Review*) for having little race/class interaction and 20th in homogeneity or lack of diversity in our student population (not to discount all the wonderful initiatives taken by our Office for Multicultural Excellence).

What is the relationship between these two spheres and scenarios—the constricting of the democratic space with the rise of imperial ambitions on the national level, on the one hand, and the challenge of diversity on the local level, on the other?

I would say everything. I say everything because one of the perils of triumphalism or the arrogance of imperial power is the narrowing of its scope of vision as a function of, but in turn also resulting in, the increasing exclusion of perspectives not in accord with its triumphalist conviction.

In light of this, diversity is indispensable to our survival not only as a nation, but as a specie in these perilous times. In other words, we need voices that will sound the alarm, that will "out" the growing monolith around issues of national agenda, voices that insist not merely on token inclusion of oppositional viewpoints but on institutional and structural change that actually support a different vision of the future. Such voices, if they are to speak the truth of the suppressed hidden knowledges that can expose and

unravel the machinations of the will to power and to global domination must come from the margins, from the underclasses, from those for whom the dominant ideology doesn't work, who know in their gut its violence, deprivations, and ultimate consequences despite its glittering promises.

Let me make clear: I have no illusions about the academy having shown itself much to be such a place as would welcome, in the words of Foucault, the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges." My own despair at the academy is the contradiction inherent in its structure that seems to dictate that for one to have been given access to its hallowed halls is already, in effect, to step into privilege. This is the dilemma of the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire when asked whether his method of critical pedagogy—whose goal is societal transformation and the ending of oppression in all its forms—would work in the First World academy. He notes in an interview, "Obviously, a power elite [insofar as he sees first world academies as primarily elite institutions] will not enjoy putting in place and practicing a pedagogical form or expression that adds to the social contradictions which reveal the power of the elite classes. It would be naive to think that a power elite would reveal itself through a pedagogical process that, in the end, would work against the elite itself."

At the same time, to the extent that ideologies themselves are not seamless but themselves require tremendous labor of power to maintain their appearance of naturalness and legitimacy, I find hope in being able to find those places where I might insert myself, make visible their cracks and contradictions, and work to either transform or displace them.

Central to this task of transforming the academy is the achievement of diversity in higher education. And here, I'd like to share from the observations of Chicano anthropologist Renato Rosaldo in his volume, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* on what it takes to achieve diversity in higher education from his own 25-years of experience in working for radical inclusion in the academy.

Rosaldo identifies certain characteristic phases in processes of institutional change, e.g., initial efforts tended to concentrate on getting people in the door. He remarks, "Institutions of higher learning appeared to tell those previously excluded, 'Come in, sit down, shut up. You're welcome here as long as you conform with our norms.'" He calls this "the Green Card phase of short-term provisional admission in the name of increasing institutional inclusion and change."

Indeed, it is not unusual for an institution to pay homage to diversity as a value, but what is often not recognized are the kinds of changes needed to create an environment where difference is not only conceptually affirmed, but actually allowed to make a difference. It's been noted for example, that when all the material and symbolic representations around you are about a different world—in this case, white and, shall we say, straight (i.e., straight and white curriculum, readings, surroundings, communication norms)—and don't include anything of your own experience and reality, it is like looking into a mirror and finding no one, thereby disconfirming your identity and experience of the world.

In time, Rosaldo notes, institutions find that they have problems retaining newly admitted students, faculty, and staff. "The door of admission [turns] out to be a revolving one that whisked people out as quickly as they came in." (And I would add, in the case of those who actually make it through, assimilation to the dominant norm often becomes the primary condition for success, if not the willingness to pay the tremendous costs—both psychic and material—of resisting the pressure to merely conform.)

Once institutions become more reflective not only about recruitment but also retention, they begin to undertake efforts for full enfranchisement and participation such as building a critical mass of minority students, creating ethnic studies centers, establishing positions for minority deans, and opening minority student centers.

But Rosaldo warns of a different kind of challenge once an institution reaches this stage: "People who once had a monopoly on privilege and authority will suddenly experience relative deprivation." He continues, "When people become accustomed to privilege, it appears to be a vested right, a status that is natural and well deserved, a part of the order of things. In the short run, the transition to diversity can be traumatic; in the long run, it promises a great deal."

There is a hypothetical case he narrates which I love:

There once was a place where people of the male persuasion gathered. It was called the old boys' room. At times it seemed that men went there only to talk about absent parties, people who were prohibited from entering the room—in short, women. Sometimes their remarks were excessively flattering and

astonishingly graphic. More often they were downright crude, vulgar and demeaning.

Then one day the old boys' room was integrated. Both men and women began to hold their conversations there. The men had shockingly strong reactions. They felt uncomfortable; some said they were being silenced. One woman asked, "What exactly do you want to say about me? What have you become used to saying about me that you now feel inhibited about saying in my presence?"

The lesson of the story speaks for itself. Exclusionary environments foster a lack of accountability that in turn foments ignorance, prejudices, and the enjoying of privilege at the expense of others. And beyond political correctness, the struggle for justice and inclusion requires that we pay attention not to mere benevolent intentions but to the damaging *effects* that even the most benevolent of intentions can have.

Finally, the moment classrooms and institutions become diverse, change begins. There is no standing still. Rosaldo continues, "New students do not laugh at the old jokes. Even those teachers who do nothing to revise their yellowed sheets of lecture notes know that their words have taken on new meanings. New pedagogies begin.... Teachers find new ways to seek out pertinent works of high quality not only *about* people of color, women, gays, and lesbians but *by* them."

This is where change brought on by inclusion begins to entail pain and vulnerability and to demand as well a sharing of power. All of a sudden one can no longer be an expert in everything, one must rely on others, on one's students even, to teach one. "Instructors will probably find themselves listening to their students with the care and intensity that they once reserved for their own speech." The result is transformation. And for his money, Freire asserts, "Education is not the key to transformation, but transformation in itself is educational."

Which brings us back to the question of how now to articulate the concern for radical inclusion to that other sphere that we've mentioned at the beginning. If the academy were to be more than an institution of, by, and for, the ruling elite, what is to be our alternative vision for ourselves as its privileged members? Ultimately, what is the polity or community that we are wanting to be included in? Is it a vision of a global good where no one is excluded and no one has to suffer deprivation? Or is it ultimately to become

honorary members of the same ruling class that only earlier on had excluded us? As one astute black student says tongue-in-cheek, "I'm only after the right to oppress others as I have been oppressed. What's wrong with that?"

The world is no longer divided between East and West but between North and South, where the struggle over resources continues to be fought over along ethnic and racial lines, not simply so, but complexly so. What is education about if it is not simply to capitulate to the ideology that is responsible for the pillage and plunder, historically, of the two-thirds world and the decimation of majority of the world's indigenous populations? If our goal is not simply to seek to be tenants of the imperial armature that is bent on continuing to organize the world to benefit those in the seat of power at the expense of those who have no voice—or do not speak human languages in the first place, what would be our alternative vision?

For me, education is about interrupting that reality packaged for us by those who would profit from our unthinking patronage, that at stake in all the battles over diversity in the classroom are these larger questions having to do with the ongoing struggle, world-wide, over control of resources and power; of who have the means to ensure the continued Northward flow of such resources.

The battle over inclusion along the dimensions of race, color, ethnicity, gender and orientation, for my money, has its litmus test in the dismantling of the entire structure of privilege that is finally rooted globally in the question of the relationship of wealth and poverty. As stated in my opening, by definition, anyone in an institution of higher education has thereby already stepped out of lower class reality into a growing possibility of privilege. The struggles that a university like DU represent for those of us who do not match the white paradigms have their ultimate test in whether we can remain committed to global communities of the poor and vulnerable and the non-human or merely say yes to our own inclusion in a slightly wider ambit of organized wealth and power.

I confess my own struggle to simply settle for this latter option is profound and unresolved. But the question of whether I'm committed primarily to the university and my own ascent into middle class complacency or to other communities outside who are perishing even as we speak is for me the primary question of any education in our time.

In the end, the deep test of our struggle to transform the academy so that it includes all kinds of voices must finally be held accountable to a much deeper question of inclusivity, and that is, whether we can hold ourselves accountable to the kind of transformation that would allow us to be included as friend and ally in all of the communities that will never be part of the academy.

Information on the Faculty Review Committee (Input Requested):

What is FRC? When you as a faculty member feel you have a serious grievance -- unfairly denied tenure, systematically unfairly underpaid, saddled with impossible working conditions, or a similar problem -- there is a standard route for appeals; first to the head of your academic unit, then to the dean, then to the provost. If these appeals are denied, and you still believe you are right, you head for the last appeal within the University, a committee composed of your faculty peers. This is the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).

How does it work? The FRC is a committee of about ten members, chartered under the Faculty Senate Constitution. It works as an Advisory Committee to the Senate, but operates independently; it reports to the Senate on general concerns, but to the provost on each individual case. It may recommend remedies to the provost, if it finds inequities, injustices, or just procedural faults. How it is constituted and how it functions are detailed in the Senate Constitution, Art. VI, sec. A, available through the Senate Web site (from DU homepage, click on Faculty and Staff, scroll down to the bottom of the left menu to click on Faculty Senate).

What's up now? Some time ago, Faculty Review Committee requested instruction from the Faculty Senate on its mode of operation. In response, Nominations, Credentials & Rules Committee has drafted the By-law given below. Before we present the By-Law to the Senate for action, it will be scrutinized by University Counsel, and changes will probably be required. But first, before these negotiations begin, NCR wishes to present the draft to the faculty.

What you can do. Please look over the proposed By-law. Are there provisions you would like to change or add? Are there other problems you think we should address?

Please report your concerns to Nominations, Credentials & Rules c/o its co-chairs, Deb Grealy (dgrealy@du.edu) or Dennis Barrett (dbarrett@du.edu) before July 1.

Proposed Addition to By-laws of the Faculty Senate

IV. Operations of Faculty Review Committee

A. Prerequisites for Faculty Review Committee Action. The Faculty Review Committee shall consider grievances regarding administrative process, and complaints respecting faculty status, working conditions, or appointments. The Committee may review, investigate, evaluate and report, when:

1. the faculty member involved has made a written request to the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) of his or her academic unit to resolve the concern; and

2. the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) has responded, or has failed to respond within 30 days of receipt of the faculty member's request; and

3. the faculty member has made a written request to the Provost to resolve the perceived problem, within 14 days of receipt of a response from the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) or, if there is no response from that officer, 14 days after the 30-day period allowed for such a response in paragraph 2 above; and

4. the Provost has responded, or has failed to respond within 45 days of receipt of the faculty member's request; and

5. the faculty member has made a written request to the chair of the Faculty Review Committee to review, investigate, evaluate and report on the concern, within 14 days of receipt of a response from the Provost or, if there is no response from the Provost, within 14 days of the expiration of the 45-day period allowed for such a response in paragraph 4 above. This request shall include a concise statement of the problem, the appeals procedures already taken and the results thereof, a narrative of pertinent facts and circumstances surrounding the problem, and the relief sought.

B. Procedures for Action.

- a. Timing. Within 30 days of receiving a written request for review, investigation,

-
- evaluation and report, the Faculty Review Committee shall make a written report to the Provost, to the faculty member, and to any administrative officers who have previously considered the problem.
- b. Investigation. The Committee shall investigate the facts alleged, and determine the position of the person or unit against whom the complaint is directed. Employees and/or administrators may be called to appear before the Committee. The Committee shall be granted access to any documents it deems pertinent to the case.
 - c. Report. The report shall evaluate the administrative response to the faculty member's concern in the contexts of procedural fairness, academic freedom, and fidelity to the University's statement of vision, values, mission and goals, as adopted by the Board of Trustees. It may recommend remedies either for procedural inadequacies or for inequities or injustices. However, if the Faculty Review Committee determines that the prerequisites described in section A above have not been met, its report shall be limited to a statement and explanation of that determination.
 - d. Conflict of interest. Any members of the Faculty Review Committee who might have a conflict of interest in a specific case shall remove themselves from the Committee for the consideration of that case.
 - e. Rules. The Committee may determine its own procedures and may, in the interest of fairness, modify any of these rules, unless prohibited from so doing by this article or by the Faculty Senate Constitution. The Committee may request extension of time limits.
-

C. Informal Consultation. A potential complainant is advised to seek informal consultation with the Committee chair before a formal request is filed, concerning such items as the procedures and criteria the committee uses.

Margaret Whitt, Editor, *Faculty Forum*

Faculty Senate Website: www.du.edu/facsen
