
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 29, 2011 was seconded and approved.

New Senators introduced themselves to the Senate.

Don McCubbrey reminded the Senate of the following:

- The new DU VIP Card will be available on July 1, 2011. For $99 it includes tickets for the holder and up to three guests to regular season home events, discounts to many other events.
- DU’s lacrosse team will be in the national finals if it wins tomorrow’s 2:00 pm match.
- Commencement is one week from today.
- The Senate calendar and documents are available at http://www.du.edu/facsen/

Senate Elections

Elections were held for the following Senate positions and the results are listed below:

President-elect (1 year term, 2011-12):
    Scott Leutenegger (Computer Science Department)

Secretary (2 year term, 2011-13):
    John Hill (University College)
Faculty Forum Editor (1 year term, 2011-12):
  Jennifer Campbell (The Writing Program)

Senator At-Large (2 positions, 3 year terms, 2011-14):
  Frédérique Chevillot (Languages & Literature, AHUM)
  Paul Sutton (Geography Department)

BOT/Financial Planning Committee Chair (2 year term, 2011-13):
  Rick Leaman (Daniels College of Business)

BOT/Faculty Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC; 2 positions; 3 year term, 2011-14):
  Jack Donnelly (Korbel School of International Studies)
  Michele Hanna (Graduate School of Social Work)

Graduate Council (1 position; 2 year term, 2011-13):
  Chris Gauthier-Dickey (Computer Science Department)

**Faculty Review Committee Report—Frank Laird**

The FRC had two cases over the past year; Frank could not comment specifically about the cases, but commented generally about the work of the committee.

We have noticed a change in the timing of appeals. Formerly, most appeals occurred in the summer, now they are coming during the academic year, which makes it far more difficult to achieve a quorum for meetings.

Dean Saitta underscored three AAUP concerns:

- Timeliness of responses; some cases take longer than the recommended 30 days;
- Completeness of files (this is an appellant concern); and
- Freedom of FRC to remedy injustices, rather than just fact finding.

In response Frank provided the following:

The biggest issue is the deadline problem. The process works reasonably well in the summer, not during the academic year. Committee members simply have too many schedule conflicts; we don’t have an answer for this. We generally meet the 30 day requirement in the summer.

We generally have very complete files. We sometimes seek additional materials; we have never encountered a situation where requested materials were not provided. We also sometimes receive unsolicited information.

FRC takes its lead from the AAUP documents regarding tenure reviews. We are not a tenure review committee. Accordingly, we restrict ourselves fairly narrowly. We are explicitly not
allowed to undertake discrimination cases. Some universities have a campus-wide promotion and tenure review committee; Frank does not favor such committees replacing the judgments of individual departments. The committee does convey its sentiments regarding tenure decisions to the relevant departments.

Dean Saitta noted the FRC can look at the quality of the case and that the Senate constitution contains provisions to right wrongs.

Frank replied that he does not know of any cases at DU where a department was so dysfunctional that the faculty was stripped of authority, but this has happened at other universities. Deans need to know how their departments are performing regarding such matters. There would have to be very serious errors before a unit’s faculty governance would be forfeited. The FRC does take academic freedom cases and will inform units if it sees problems. There are some departments where FRC is not very welcome; we let people know if we believe they made mistakes.

**Bookstore Update—Tristy Hillestad**

Tristy Hillestad provided the following update regarding outsourcing of bookstore operations.

**Reasons for considering outsourcing:**

The Internet has dramatically changed college bookstores and the buying patterns of students. At least 30 percent of US college bookstores are now run by outside companies, and this is expected to increase. Revenue and net income are declining for all college bookstores. Consequently, there is an increasing and heavy emphasis on managing expenses. Maintaining the required level of service is increasingly challenging. Despite all of these changes we still have a large number of students who buy from the bookstore.

An RFP will be sent to three major bookstore management firms (i.e., Follett, Barnes and Nobel, and Validis) by mid-June, and proposals will be due in early August. The topics to be addressed by bidders include: product lines to be offered, how they would work with faculty, services to be provided, proposed services beyond those currently provided, textbook buyback, textbook rentals, and financial commitment (e.g., guaranteed net to the university). We are seeking a very high level of service to students and faculty.

An independent consultant has been retained to help prepare the RFP and evaluate bids. We will have faculty and student representatives involved in the conversations with the consultant. We have already initiated conversations with about a dozen faculty members.

**Timeline:**

We expect to make a decision in early October and make the transition (if warranted) on or about December 1st.

**Responses to questions:**
Course packs will be addressed in the RFP. Bidders will have to address where the course packs would be produced, timely reorders, and the role and use of the copy center.

Possible additional services might include mobile commerce and online ordering, but we won’t know until we see what the bidders offer.

Proposals will address the bidders’ plans regarding the retention of existing bookstore staff.

Current revenues are about $7.6 million including about $1.5 million for computers and $5 million for textbooks. The net is about $540K.

Academic Planning Committee Update—Linda Olson

During the 2010-2011 year, the Academic Planning Committee was asked to build upon the outcomes of the 2005 Teaching Task Force, and to recommend specific avenues for enriching the culture of teaching and consequent student learning on our campus. As a result, our committee has identified five Teaching Excellence Initiatives (TEI) that suggest steps we can take as individuals, departments, and as a University community to support excellence in teaching at DU. We hope the University community will consider, respond to, and join us in making these recommendations real. The initiatives seek to acknowledge and build upon the excellent pedagogies and practices already present on our campus, as well as offer opportunities for faculty development, inviting (rather than mandating) our colleagues from across the University to participate in the following:

- New Faculty Teaching Development Initiative
- Evaluation of Teaching Initiative
- University Teaching Fellows and Associates Initiative
- Departmental Excellence in Teaching Initiative
- Award for Departmental Excellence in Teaching

Discussion:

What are the funding requirements and sources?----The committee will work with the Deans and the Provost to determine this. The committee does not yet know what amounts are required.

Linda noted there is an array of evaluation options in the detailed TEI document. It is intended that faculty would use methods such as self-reflection, peer evaluations, and review of class outcomes to create a culture where faculty help each other develop and grow. The initiative is not about promotion and tenure. Rather, the focus is peer cooperation and professional development. Whether and how this would fit into tenure and promotion is a matter for units to determine. The committee did not address whether or how this might be used in third year reviews.
It was moved by Rick Leaman, and seconded, that the Senate “commend the Academic Planning Committee for its outstanding work in producing the Teaching Excellence Initiative report identifying several possible avenues for enriching the culture of teaching and consequent student learning on our campus; and that the Academic Planning Committee present the Teaching Excellence Initiative to the deans at their September meeting to initiate collaboration and support for implementation.”

The motion was passed by a voice vote of the Senate.

**CTL Update—Julanna Gilbert**

Julanna provide this update about CTL ([http://ctl.du.edu](http://ctl.du.edu)):

**2010-2011 Workshops**
- Oct 1, 2010 Inclusive Excellence: Diversity in the Classroom
- Oct 26, 2010 Effective Grading: Saving your sanity & that of your students with rubrics & expectations
- Nov 12, 2010 Why don't they get it? Understanding how students think
- Jan 21, 2011 Managing Laptops and Mobile Devices in the Classroom
- Feb 18, 2011 Fostering Critical Thinking in Online Discussions
- Apr 29, 2011 Social media in the classroom: Using blogs, twitter, and video essays to enhance learning

**2010-2011 $20k Grants**

- Increasing Social Work Students' Information Competencies through Online Interactive Course Tutorials
- MCEconnect: A 21st Century Framework for Faculty Development ([http://ctl.du.edu/funding-opportunities/funded-projects](http://ctl.du.edu/funding-opportunities/funded-projects))

**2010-2011 Creating Online Courses**

- What?
  - Create excellent online courses for our traditional students
- Why?
  - DU students & faculty are interested
  - Learning outcomes can be as effective as f-2-f
  - Trend for corporate, professional, graduate & undergraduate education
- Who?
  - 28 faculty members funded
  - From 11 academic units
  - [http://ctl.du.edu/funding-opportunities/funded-projects](http://ctl.du.edu/funding-opportunities/funded-projects)
Faculty Development Teaching Online Workshop

- Has been offered for more than 5 years
- Survey provides input for improvement
- Current workshop
  - Three weeks
  - Time commitment 5-10 hours/week
  - Introduction to pedagogy, online tools, best practices
  - Participants begin developing their courses
  - Peer review of courses

What’s coming?

- Provost Conference: Oct 28, 2011:
  - Keynote Speaker: Candace Thille:
    - Director of the Open Learning Initiative at Carnegie Mellon
    - Research – applying results from the learning sciences to the design, implementation and evaluation of open web-based learning environments
  - Conference committee under construction
- Proposal for the Extreme Makeover of the New Faculty Orientation and Workshop Series
- The CTL is moving to Aspen Hall.

Academic Technology to support T & L

- DU CourseMedia
- Portfolio
- Assess-It!
- Blackboard
- Adobe Connect
- ECTD (Electronic Capstones, Theses, Dissertations)
- Camtasia Relay (lecture capture system)
- Student Clickers
- Interactive White Boards
- Web 2.0 Tools

On the horizon

- Video archive/discovery/dissemination project with Penrose/ Univ Com/ academic units
- Student auditions online
- Interactive white boards & language instruction
- Educating Tomorrow’s Lawyers
- ...and other projects!

Connecting with the CTL

- Faculty advisory board
Provost’s Report and Questions

First, I would like to start by thanking all of you for your hard work this year.

Thanks to those who worked on the Strategic Initiatives, an especially demanding task when done at the end of the year.

Thanks also to the FRC for your careful and thoughtful work. This is extremely important and difficult work for faculty to do, not least because they are called into action only when there is a conflict or need for clarification on a sensitive matter.

Thanks to Academic Planning. Some of your work will be reflected in the Strategic Initiatives; other elements will be addressed by the deans and the Senate.

Thank you to the Senate representatives to FEAC, yours is an important voice.

Thanks to Don McCubbrey for a good year, good conversations, stretch goals, and helping us achieve convergence of Senate, deans, and administration on many matters.

Budget

There is nothing new to report. The budget will go to the Board of Trustees on Friday and I expect it will be approved. Once it is approved, it will be available all faculty and staff. You will see exactly the same content that was submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Enrollments

We are very near our pinnacle in undergraduate enrollments and the summer melt is about to commence. As of May 24th we have 1278 deposits, the budget is 1200. We expect a 9 to 10 percent melt over the summer. We would need 1315 deposits if the melt were 9 percent. We expect to start the year with 1220 to 1230; we started this year at 1231.

Domestic minority enrollments are disappointing: 15.4 percent versus 18.7 percent (2011) and 18.5 percent (2010). This is a serious concern; diversity is a goal and we want an inclusive experience for students. We will explore ways to increase this.

International enrollments are up: 8.6 percent versus 7.5 percent (2011) and 4.6 percent (four years ago).
The academic profile of the entering class continues to improve: the SAT average is 1220 versus 1170 in 2007; ACT is 27.6 versus 27.1 (2011); 97 percent are from top half of graduating class, 80 percent are from top quarter, and 44 percent are from top tenth.

There is increased interest from applicants from the Midwest. Our lacrosse team is on ESPN tomorrow which increases our visibility in other parts of the county (e.g., northeast).

Chinese students account for 75 percent of international deposits and most of them are interested in business. It is a bit of a risk to have so many students from a single country. We are increasing our attention to international students. We want to be sure they integrate into the general student body. We want to improve the integration of all voices on the campus including domestic students.

Graduate deposits are up 5 percent. The quality of the applicants is strong and we are capping in most areas.

**Library Process**

Several key decision points converged in a manner that led to a bad process. I apologize for this. We will send questionnaires (to faculty and students) to gather information about how many and which volumes should be retained on campus. The Chancellor and I acknowledge this was a mistaken process and we did not have adequate faculty participation. We have informed the Board of Trustees about this and the need for more faculty participation. A process is being put into place to engage those most affected; the impact is not equal across all units. It will include the Library Liaison committee, deans, and faculty; the group will gather and process relevant information. We hope to establish an empirical basis for determining which volumes to retain on campus. I will work with the group and I will present the group’s recommendations to the Chancellor. The building renovation plans include options to expand compact shelving, and we will make changes if they are needed. The Chancellor and I appreciate the communications regarding this matter; we have heard, learned, and we are moving forward.

**Strategic Positioning Initiatives**

The top three initiatives from each of the six groups are due shortly after July 1st. The next steps are to have conversations with the deans, digest what went on in the committees, bring the committee chairs back into the process, bring additional faculty into the process, and select priorities. We will use the Senate Executive Committee to share inputs and maintain interactions with faculty. This is an organic process that is intended to keep the conversation flowing. We hope to have a clear statement about priorities by September 1st, and obtain comments and input regarding them.

**Searches**
- Vice Chancellor, Technology Service—some candidates will return for a second visit in June.
- Vice Chancellor, Communications—two candidates are retuning for a second interview; we are moving towards a selection.
- Associate Provost, Inclusive Excellence—one candidate is visiting this week, and a second candidate will visit next week.

Other Matters

Don McCubbrey stated: “Personally, I’m pleased that the Provost and Chancellor recognized that the original process for the configuration of the new library (Academic Commons) was inadequate, and that conversations with the faculty are being reopened following a revised process. The Senate looks forward to its active participation in the formulation and execution of the revised process.”

A motion was made and seconded regarding the University Tuition Waiver Policy:

The policy of the University of Denver that states that only those children who are enrolled in and taking classes at the time of the employee's retirement, death, or disability shall be eligible for tuition waiver benefits be changed to fully vest someone (thus allowing their dependents to attend regardless of death, disability, or retirement) after he or she has worked 20 years for the university and who either (i) dies while employed, (ii) becomes permanently disabled while employed or (iii) retires from employment with the University and is at or above 60 years of age at the date of retirement.

The motion was approved by a voice voted of the Senate.

Don McCubbrey noted that we still have a motion, made by Annabeth Headrick, on the floor from the previous meeting. The motion was that the Senate “Protest the decision-making process regarding the Academic Commons decisions.” The motion was passed at the April 29th Senate meeting on a straw vote of 18 for and 0 against. The Senate lacked quorum at the time of the vote, but needed a consensus to take to other meetings. Don McCubbrey noted that things have changed considerably since the last Senate meeting and asked whether the motion should be withdrawn. Annabeth Headrick declined to withdraw the motion.

A vote was conducted and the motion was approved:

For--16
Against--2
Abstain--19

Don thanked all Senators for their service and hard work and conveyed his best wishes for the summer.
Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Prepared and submitted by

John Hill
Faculty Senate Secretary