

**University of Denver  
Faculty Senate  
Minutes  
April 29, 2011  
Renaissance Room South**

**Senators (or proxies) present:** Bill Anderson, Victor Castellani (proxy for Ralph DiFranco), Frederique Chevillot, J. Michael Daniels, Christof Demont-Heinrich (proxy for Sheila Schroeder Sandy Dixon, Rachel Epstein, Judith Fox, Chris Gautier-Dickey, Sylvia Hall-Ellis, Michele Hanna (Jennifer Campbell), Annabeth Headrick, Darin Hicks, John Hill (Secretary), Jennifer Hoffman, Allison Horsley, Ruth Ann Jebe, Scott Johns (also proxy for Tim Hurley), Arthur Jones, James LaVita, Rick Leaman, Tiffani Lennon, Scott Leutenegger, Michael Levine-Clark, Mario Lopez, Sandy Macke, Mohammad Matin, Don McCubbrey (President), Erin Meyer, Keith Miller, Ved Nanda, Vi Narapareddy, Alba Newmann-Holmes, Paul Novak, Linda Olson, Pallub Paul, George Potts, Martin Quigley, Tom Quinn, Charles Reichardt, Paula Rhodes, Polina Rikoun, Karen Riley, Nicholas Rockwell, Nancy Sampson, Robert Stencel, Matthew Taylor, Bruce Uhrmacher, Gordon von Stroh, Nancy Wadsworth, and Bill Zaranka (proxy for Laird Hunt).

### **Call to Order, Approval of Minutes**

Don McCubbrey, Senate President, called the meeting to order at noon.

A motion to approve the minutes from April 1, 2011 was seconded and approved.

Don McCubbrey reminded the Senate of the following:

- Faculty Club, Thursday May 5, 2011, Postponed until fall.
- Faculty Recognition Reception, May 18, Renaissance Room, 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm.
- Chancellor's Roundtable, Friday May 20, 2011, Renaissance Room, 1:00-2:00 pm.
- Faculty Senate Meeting, Friday May 27, Renaissance Room, 11:30-1:30 pm.
- The Senate calendar and documents are available at <http://www.du.edu/facsen/>.

### **Provost's Report and Questions**

For those who are looking for something to do tonight there is a fundraiser at Newman.

### **Admissions**

May 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline for deposits for first-time first-year students. We have 958 deposits as of yesterday. This is our best qualified class ever: SAT average is 1224 (1208 last year); ACT average is 27.78 (27.15 last year). We have 63 percent out-of-state students (57 percent last

year); students of color are 12.42 percent (15.32 percent last year). However, this is likely to increase since Daniels Fund awards were made only two days ago; we expect students of color will be equal to or greater than last year. Students show an increased interest in math, science and engineering. We currently have 8 Boettcher scholars versus 15 last year. More Boettcher scholars are choosing science and engineering, and our facilities are not attractive; the Boulder dual degree program is also very attractive to Boettcher scholars. International students have increased to 8.87 percent from 6.42 percent last year; the diversity of international students has increased. We have many initiatives planned for fall including a more expansive orientation and expansion of programs at the English Language Center.

Graduate applications appear to be about the same as last year.

## **Budget**

Information about the FY 2012 proposed budget has been shared with the Senate's Finance Committee. The proposed budget will be formally presented to the Board of Trustees' Finance and Budget Committee on May 5. The entire budget transmittal will be shared with the faculty and staff of the University after the budget is reviewed and approved by the full Board, which meets on June 3. There are no major surprises in the proposed budget. It includes 26.5 new appointed faculty FTEs and 24.7 new appointed staff FTEs. We are investing as much as possible in financial aid; 43.4 percent of students have need. Some merit aid goes to students who have no financial need. The need gap is \$7300 after aid from all sources. The annual cost is about \$52,000 for tuition, books, room and board, and travel.

We are creating a challenge fund: \$25 million for undergraduates and \$10 million for graduate students. This money will be taken from below the line which is the most conservative manner possible to do this. These funds will be used to match contributions from donors; we have raised \$4 million thus far. The funds will be used to close the need gap. This money will be stacked and will go to the most academically qualified applicants, so it is possible that it could be concentrated in a few units. It is also possible some donors will want their contributions to go to specific departments. The deans will be publicizing this.

## **Academic Commons**

I have talked with several faculty groups. This is a tough issue. It is especially tough for units where the collection is regularly used. There are two principle issues:

Process—I am responsible for this situation. There was a small window where decisions had to be made. I should have made better use of it to contact involved parties and initiate conversations. I have continuously heard about concerns since the decision was announced.

Next Steps—We will move forward subject to the following caveats. If 20 to 25 percent of the collection remaining on campus proves to be inadequate, it can be changed but not now. A second issue is how to constitute the holdings that will remain on campus. This will be based on demand, use, and need, e.g., the sciences are not particular big users of the stacks, humanities are huge users, and social sciences use is discipline dependent. We have to make certain ample and

suitable volumes are available for research and teaching. This cannot be determined with a simple decision tree. It is expected the collection will change regularly and this means much more work for the librarians. It is possible volume access won't change much for humanities; in any case, that is the goal.

We need to build a library that is the most functional and flexible for the next 20 to 30 years; it is very difficult to raise money for library renovation. Our evaluation and decision-making included inputs from students. Student demand has been enormous for library usage. Student activities include browsing, reading, study, digital matters, and group work. We have about half the standard amount of space available for such student activities.

## Questions and Discussion

How does the university justify the costs, energy, fuel, and potential climate change impacts resulting from the constant transport of books between the storage facility and campus?----The Provost stated that a large part of the collection is already stored in Aurora, so the net costs and energy impacts are minimal when rental cost savings and driving distances are taken into account. We are also evaluating the possible use of hybrid and electric vehicles for book transport between the storage facility and campus.

The storage facility was bought at “bargain basement” prices, and the cost will be recovered within 6 to 7 years.

Will retrieval requests be vetted?----The Provost replied: No. I will guarantee that.

What are the conditions for a revisit of this?----The Provost stated we will monitor this closely, it is an experiment, and it worries the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and me. We will have to determine whether we are at the bleeding edge or the cutting edge on this. It is possible we will have to add more compact shelving or do something different with the lower level space.

What about people who use books at the library, but do not check them out?----We must have conversations about how people use the library and not merely wait to see what happens with requests. In particular we need conversations with those who are most affected. It is possible and intended that high use library patrons will not experience much change. We have to make this work as well as possible.

Will the library faculty and staff have funds to perform research regarding these changes?----Michael Levine-Clark answered: We do this continuously already and will certainly continue to do it for the new collection. The collection will comprise 300,000 to 400,000 volumes which is larger than many small colleges. We will have to understand the purpose of the onsite collection and how it is used. For example, is it about having a great collection or is it more about browsing? We will monitor and evaluate this. The Library Liaison Group will be meeting regularly over the next few weeks to discuss such issues. We need and welcome comments and feedback.

Annabeth Headrick moved that the Senate “Protest the decision-making process regarding the Academic Commons decisions.” The motion was seconded and discussed by the Senate; comments and suggestions included: form a committee to craft a precise resolution and introduce to the full Senate; this is a very important matter that affects the entire academic community; make a forceful statement immediately; do not make an on-the-fly quick decision.

Don McCubbrey stated there are two key questions: Is this the right configuration for the library? Were the proper processes followed? This illustrates the importance of, and lack of, a common understanding of shared governance. Faculty should clearly have a voice in such matters, but the Board of Trustees is the ultimate authority. There should be open discussions and transparency. Many who should have been consulted were not consulted.

Question: To what extent are the Trustees accountable to us? Don McCubbrey answered: We lack a common understanding of shared governance. We need further conversations and communication regarding what shared governance means. Things should be done with openness and transparency. No one should be afraid to speak truth to power. We need a culture of candor.

One Senator suggested the Senate reconstitute itself and define its role.

Gordon von Stroh noted that in the early 90s it was common for a Trustee to attend Senate meetings and perhaps this practice should be revived.

Bill Zaranka noted the FEAC was formed in part to help foster communication between the faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Don McCubbrey suggested that lack of common understanding about the meaning of shared governance is part of the problem and that it has been suggested there should be a faculty member on the Board of Trustees. Don noted that as Senate president he attends Board meetings, but he is not a member. The number of Board members is established by Colorado law. Selection of Board members occurs over an extended period of time and involves many conversations among the Board and the Chancellor.

This discussion of the Academic Commons Decision occurred in two parts. The second part occurred primarily after 1:30 pm (the scheduled end time for the Senate meeting). Many senators had to leave at 1:30 pm. Well after 1:30 pm the remaining Senators conducted a straw vote regarding the motion to “Protest the decision-making process regarding the Academic Commons decisions.” The vote was 18 for and 0 against.

Don stated he would report this discussion and the Senate’s concerns to the Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC) of the Board of Trustees.

### **Nominations, Credentials, and Rules Committee Report—Sylvia Hall-Ellis**

Sylvia has contacted all units that need to elect Senators to replace Senators whose terms are expiring.

The full Senate needs to conduct elections to fill 14 positions:

Faculty Review Committee—4 positions (conducted within units)  
Faculty Athletic Committee—2 positions (conducted within units)  
FEAC—2 positions  
Graduate Council—1 position  
Senator-at-Large—2 positions  
President-elect  
Senate Secretary (two year term)  
Faculty Forum Editor

Elections will be conducted at the May 27<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.

### **Academic Strategic Planning Initiative Update—Don McCubbrey**

**Introduction and Timeline**—This initiative was started at the beginning of March. The intent is for each of six committees to develop three brief, powerful, and strategic initiatives. The 18 initiatives will be evaluated and prioritized by a steering committee. Today each committee will report on its status and progress. Each of the groups has established a portfolio site where further information is available. All committees welcome comments and suggestions.

The committees are working together and there are overlapping areas.

### **Internationalization—Rachel Epstein**

The committee has met several times and is now focusing its work on the following three initiatives:

- Create an externally funded international center—the center would sponsor activities such as research, language training, studies linking languages and subject areas, establish stronger links and coordination with universities abroad, and grant writing.
- Develop a robust preparatory course requirement to academically prepare students for Study Abroad—this would include study of belief systems, global power structures, and an assessment component. This would probably be a unit specific course. It could take the form of a new course or refinement of existing courses. It might also include the creation of an intercultural global studies minor; there are already many courses that would work well for this. Eric Gould has suggestions for coordinating with what is already available.
- Strengthen institutional ties with overseas universities—broaden research cooperation, expand and increase exchanges, enhance relationships, and further internationalize the student population.

### **Interdisciplinary—Phoenix Cai**

The committee has met several times. Specific proposals have not been crafted, but three areas of interest have been identified:

- Breaking institutional barriers regarding research, teaching and co-teaching, and student experiences.
- Strengthen the existing interdisciplinary research efforts. This might include a minor in sustainability or a center on aging.
- Distinguish interdisciplinary research through “branding” or articulating and emphasizing matters such as globalization, sustainability, cultural urbanism, and aging.

### **Faculty Research—Cathy Potter**

The committee has been meeting weekly. We do not yet have specific initiatives, but we have a number of ideas and themes and they are beginning to gel. These include:

- Enhance external funding for research, scholarship and creative work. This should be strategic and enhance our research credibility rather than merely “quick and dirty” activities for short-term funding gains. Initiatives should serve the broad university community.
- We are using data to determine what we should focus on. These data include discussions with units, the junior faculty survey, and a survey of principle investigators.
- We are looking for proposals that address the key themes of time and resources.
- Faculty retention and scholarly needs of associate faculty.
- Mechanisms for natural clustering of faculty who work in related areas.

In response to a question about declining research funding, Cathy noted that initiatives that stabilize funding are things that support growth in research funding.

### **Faculty Hiring and Development—George Potts and Don McCubbrey**

The committee has met five times. We are seeking initiatives that will promote a self-actualizing, harmonious and supportive environment (eudaimonia). We are collecting and considering new options and rethinking others. We have formed three subcommittees focused on the following:

- Hiring—becoming more competitive in hiring top candidates.
- Development (pre- and post-tenure)—this involves time, resources, and salaries.
- Retirement—we need more transparency and information regarding options. Factors and options under consideration include money, life after retirement, post-retirement opportunities, phased retirement, guest lecturing, and two faculty sharing a position.

### **Questions**

What are considerations for faculty who don't want to retire?—There are ways for them to contribute if they want to do so, but some do not want to do this. We want to show options to those who are interested.

Junior faculty need much more support than they get now; we don't deliver everything we talk about when recruiting.—We need candid discussions during recruitment that includes a realistic description of what the position would be like, and includes topics such as time, resources, and support for travel and professional development.

Do we have data on retention for new hires?—We don't have good information about this. Good people have pre-tenure opportunity and options. The Provost added that most who leave do so prior to tenure decisions.

### **Academic Technology—Julanna Gilbert and Doug Hessee**

The committee has established groups working on:

- Teaching—Clarify the role of technology in teaching at DU. For example, what is the role of technology at a primarily residential institution? Where are we and where are we headed with teaching online? Technology should leverage what we do with class time and contact time, it would not replace such activities.
- Research—Establish a digital curation and discovery center and thereby make data available for discovery and research. Key questions are how to do this effectively and efficiently.
- Public Good

### **Undergraduate Academic Experience—Ingrid Tague and Jennifer Karas**

The committee has had lots of conversations as we sort through this. We do not want to reinvent, but rather identify a few big changes that would enhance undergraduate education. Our current discussion themes include:

- Creation of a quantitative reasoning center—What would it look like? What would it do?
- Enhance international education and academic intellectual heft—Should this be integrated into the majors?
- Support and enhance the cultural of learning on campus—this would require rigorous faculty and student engagement.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

### **Prepared and submitted by**

John Hill  
Faculty Senate Secretary