

**University of Denver  
Faculty Senate  
Minutes  
November 14, 2014  
Renaissance Room South, Mary Reed Building**

**Senators (or proxies) present:** Annaliese Amschler Andrews, Jenny Bowers, Victor Castellani, Claude d’Estree, Terri Davis, Ron Delyser, Maha Foster, Tony Gault, Jim Gilroy, Jennifer Greenfield, Annabeth Headrick, John Hill, Tim Hurley, Self, Tim Hurley (Proxy for Scott Johns), Arthur Jones, Beth Karlsgodt, Ray Kireilis, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Frederic Latremoliere, Rick Leaman, Luis Leon, Scott Leutnegger, Sergio Macias, Lisa Martinez (Proxy for Jared Del Rosso), Steven Mayer, Laleh Mehran, Erin Meyer, Gloria Miller, Keith Miller (Proxy for Scott Pegan), Julianne Mitchell, Michele Morrison, Ved Nanda, Vi Narapareddy, Anne Penner, George Potts (Proxy for Aimee Reichman-Decker, Tom Quinn, Allegra Reiber, Chip Reichardt, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Amrik Singh, Mary Steefl, John Tiedemann, Ron Throupe, Robert Urquhart, Josh Wilson, Melanie Witt, Carol Zak-Dance, Duan Zhang.

**Welcome and brief summary of meeting goals—Art Jones**

Art Jones called the meeting to order and briefly described the meeting’s agenda.

**Approval of minutes from October 24th Meeting—Art Jones**

A motion to approve the minutes from the October 24, 2014 Senate meeting was seconded and approved.

**Senate updates: Follow-up on public good work and community engaged scholarship and teaching; planned Diversity Summit presentation—Art Jones**

Community Engagement discussions follow-up: We are hoping to be able to make some Senate resolutions on matters such as: better informing the DU community about what we are doing and accomplishing, expanding involvement, and refining digital storytelling so that it is much more than mere numbers.

We have prepared a presentation for the Diversity Summit on the topic of “Inclusive Excellence,” in collaboration with graduate students, undergraduate students and staff groups. The Diversity Summit has been accelerated to January so that we have the remainder of the academic year to follow through on its initiatives and suggestions.

**Provost report: Short-term chancellor task forces, long-range strategic planning, and additional updates**

We have initiated systematic preparations for “strategic doing” through the formation of four task forces.

- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusive Excellence
- Student Access and Support
- Professional Development for Faculty and Staff
- Expanding Sustainability on Campus

The Chairs and members of these groups are posted at:

<http://www.du.edu/chancellor/news/strategicplanning11-14.html>

The formation of these task forces was informed and guided by the reports from the Strategic Issues Panel and Chancellor-appointed committees on the Status of Women and the Status of People of Color, the University of Denver Sustainability Plan, and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

The task forces will make recommendation reports by February 1, 2015.

The Chancellor will soon announce an advisory group of faculty, staff, students, and trustees, supported by a dedicated staff member, to identify three to six transformative directions that will guide DU and unit-level strategic planning. The Chancellor will chair this group, and the Provost will serve as vice-chair. The advisory group will consult broadly, including brainstorming sessions, conversations, and meetings regarding transformative directions over the next several months.

We have also retained some expert consultants.

The Chancellor has used this approach previously at Colgate and Swarthmore. This is a fast and inclusive process. I am spending the bulk of my time on this, and less time on budget and planning.

### **Responses to questions:**

Question: What is the size of the advisory group?—Answer: I don’t know; I would guess about 20. It is not intended to be representative, it is consultative. I expect a huge amount of interactions and conversations.

Question: How will the advisory panel interact with the Senate?—Answer: I do not know yet, but I am sure we will. Perhaps members will attend Senate meetings?

### **Discussion of options for next steps in the APT approval process**

Art Jones briefly reviewed the 3½ year timeline of the development of the APT document leading to the Senate and faculty approval votes last spring.

FEAC reviewed the APT over the summer and approved it, but also requested some changes to clarify language and maintain consistency. Art Jones, Chip Reichardt, Scott Leutenegger, and George Potts worked with FEAC on these refinements. The next step is a Board of Trustees vote in January 2015. The Chancellor is fully supportive of the APT and she views it as a “trendsetter for the nation.” The Executive Committee of the Trustees is “enthusiastic” about the APT, but did not vote on it at its recent meeting.

The Senate and faculty will need to vote on the revisions prior to the Trustee’s January 2015 meeting.

### **Responses to questions:**

If we vote against the revisions, the Trustees would likely vote on the unamended version.

I do not know if the new titles would go into effect in fall 2015, but the Provost has stated he will do all he can to make this happen.

The Senate Executive Committee has developed a timeline for informational meetings and voting. Anyone interested would be invited to attend these meetings. Please talk to your faculty about this. Invite them to attend the meetings, or bring their concerns to the meetings. All faculty are welcome.

#### Timeline for Voting on Amended APT Document:

- Open Senate meetings: November 21 and December 3
- Memo to Senate and full faculty explaining voting procedure: Monday, Nov 17
- Open electronic vote for Faculty Senate: Week of Nov 17
- Close electronic vote for Faculty Senate: December 13
- Announcement of Faculty Senate voting results: Week of December 15
- Open electronic vote for full faculty: Week of Nov 17
- Close electronic vote for full faculty: January 5

Question: What if the Senate votes no, and the faculty votes yes?—Answer: Chip Reichardt explained that only a Senate vote is required, but we think a faculty vote is a very good idea.

Art Jones emphasized that the amendments are not substantive. They are intended to improve clarity and consistency.

### **Professors Nancy Wadsworth and Richard Clemmer-Smith: Summary of contextual framework for the DU John Evans Study Committee Report, followed by Q & A**

Art introduced Professors Nancy Wadsworth and Richard Clemmer-Smith and thanked them for their work.

Nancy explained that the committee included faculty volunteers, students, and Sand Creek descendants. The inclusion of descendants was a matter of due discipline, not merely outreach. The committee was supported by the Chancellor and the Provost, but not directed by them.

The committee was a few months behind the Northwestern study and decided not to cover the same ground. The committee did communicate with Northwestern throughout the study. The Northwestern study seemed to step back from the central question of whether John Evans bears some blame for the Sand Creek massacre. We felt there were several aspects that merited significant attention such as his role as Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the Colorado Territory.

The John Evans Study Committee reports and recommendations, as well as extensive resources and materials are posted at: <http://portfolio.du.edu/evcomm/page/45570>

Nancy and Richard presented a brief overview of their methods, findings, and recommendations. The John Evans Study Committee reports, recommendations, resources, and materials are posted at: <http://portfolio.du.edu/evcomm/page/45570>

Nancy distributed copies of Colorado Senate Joint Resolution 14-030 *Concerning Memorializing the Cheyenne and Arapaho People Who Lost Their Lives During the Sand Creek Massacre, Honoring Their Descendants, and Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of that Tragic Event.*

Nancy emphasized that this is of great interest to the Arapaho, Cheyenne, and all native peoples, and to the descendants of John Evans. This is a matter of public good and inclusive excellence.

### **Continued discussion of John Evans Study Committee Report (and its relationship to the Northwestern University report); looking ahead to continued conversations and actions**

Responses to questions:

Nancy: We believe Evans is “equal in degree” regarding culpability for Sand Creek. He had more authority than any other non-military persons.

Nancy: We did not want to judge Evans by standards of today. Chivington’s culpability is of a different kind.

Robert: This is an opportunity to examine our own history, and the nature of culpability.

Nancy: It would have been easy to side-step questions of culpability.

Nancy: The Confederacy did not make any effort to get Native Americans to align with the Confederacy in Colorado. Such efforts may have been made in Texas and Oklahoma.

Question: What is the reaction of the descendants?—Nancy replied: they are interested in long lasting relationships, e.g., students attending DU, not reconciliation payments.

Nancy: Northwestern did not work with descendants.

Nancy: The recommendations are a starter list for conversations.

Nancy: The Methodist Church is doing their own study to address the roles of their leaders. Iliff is also looking into this, but I do not know their plans.

### **Executive Session**

In executive session the Senate discussed and approved these Resolutions:

- 1) The Faculty Senate endorses the John Evans Study Committee's call for wide-ranging and substantive discussion of its report and recommendations, and encourages next steps toward intercultural healing.
  
- 2) The Faculty Senate respects the interdisciplinary scholarship and descendant community outreach that informs the John Evans Study Committee report, and thanks the Committee for its dedicated service to the university.

Resolution (1) was unanimously approved by a voice vote of the Senate.

The vote on Resolution (2) was:

Yes: 33

No: 1

Abstain: 2

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Prepared and submitted by

John Hill

Faculty Senate Secretary