Call to Order
Kate Willink, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 12 PM.

Discussion of 2U
Because Dean Brent Chrite from Daniels College of Business had to leave early, President Willink announced the Senate agenda would change to begin with a discussion of 2U. She explained it was important to her as Senate President think through how we make decisions together. She wanted to make sure the Senate thinks about the whole of the faculty and is aware of key questions in relation to institutional change.

Dean Chrite: Thanks so much for inviting me. This is my first Senate meeting and I appreciate the opportunity and apologize for the schedule conflict. This is really vital, and I have a couple points to make:

We want to hear from you, answer questions, and have a dialogue.

There are three broad themes: we will summarize market conditions and the rational for moving forward with 2U. Amanda McBride, Dean of the Graduate School of Social Work, will talk about the 2U/DU partnership and the rights of faculty.
It is not dramatic to suggest that one chooses to look at the higher education market enduring, and the competitive challenge to traditional higher education is competency-based. There are profound disruptions and challenges to traditional higher education, including changes in technology, demographics, pedagogy, price point, knowledge transfer, and the way in which millennials and working professionals choose to learn and engage. The trajectory of enrollment in response to our orthodox, high-touch approach to the market is simply insufficient to meet the full set of demands on the part of students. I have said to the Provost and colleagues that as much as I adore this approach and what this university stands for, there is no option but for us to offer additional scenarios, especially for working professionals. The costs associated with traditional graduate school are fundamentally changing. We need to ensure access and opportunity for our fastest growing market. We also need to consider career changers (36% of students), as well as career strivers, those staying in their careers but wanting to move up (33% of students). Thus, 2U is an important, logical, and necessary next step in the evolution of this university.

Dean McBride: In 2011, I was on the Senate in Washington University when 2U was implemented. In that short 6-year time period, it is no longer an experiment but here to stay. When I came to DU, the previous dean started an online program. Everything from marketing to field work to technology was all on the back of the school (GSSW). By the end of fall quarter of 2016, we knew it was going to fail, based on enrollment and financially. We then looked at outside providers. 2U is a platform for online pedagogy. We are not partnering with the University of Phoenix. They are the Michelin tires on a Cadillac, or the Pirellis on a Subaru. They prop up our program. They have been in the field for 12 years, since the beginning. They set the gold standard. They are also a content delivery platform, providing a container for asynchronous and synchronous content. They are committed to student success, and have a student advising model that they can adjust. They also have a range of other services depending on the program.

What distinguishes them from other platforms? They work with Harvard, Yale, and Vanderbilt. They have signed on with the best universities. And they only deal with graduate programs, not undergraduate. Their level of partnership and service also distinguishes them. They made over 20 presentations to different segments of the faculty from GSSW. The GSSW faculty really interrogated 2U, trying to determine quality and whether it would be the right program for us. This is online 2.0. They are in service to us and how we want this program structured. There has been faculty governance throughout the partnership process.

What are the results of partnering with 2U? It raises the brand of the school overall in the field. The number of applications for our online program increased as a result. It raises revenue. The model enables us to admit more students, both quality and scale. Having just come from a budget meeting, I know DU needs more support in that area at the graduate level. Diversity and inclusion is a top priority; social justice and equity are a part of the mission through the strategic planning process. We want to take our mission into communities near and far, from reservations to rural Vermont. We want to be national in our reach to communities all over the US. Our student profile will be very different, from a predominantly white 20-year-old to 30-year-olds of color changing careers.
We have some sense of the first failed experiment, internally on our own. Before we had 103 inquiries, and 11 students signed up for the winter cohort. Now, we have over 8,000 inquiries for 36 slots. This fall 190 applications have been submitted so far.

**The floor was then opened up for questions.**

President Willink: Talk more about the faculty lens and what this means for faculty on the ground and DU Senators.

Dean McBride: It’s still our faculty. All our faculty will teach online and on the ground. It’s not an online faculty on the side. Though we still have adjuncts, there is faculty governance connected with them.

Dean Chrite: Before, Daniels looked at other opportunities on our own, and the faculty overwhelmingly rejected these options. Fast forward, there was near unanimous support for this partnership with 2U. The faculty leading this effort are tenured professors in marketing. The faculty engaging with the modules are actively involved in scholarship. For business, there are strict guidelines we have to look at. For us, one of our core priorities is to overhaul the curriculum. We are preparing a generation of students for a market and for opportunities that do not yet exist. We could not do that by having students come to campus twice a week. For young faculty, this will be part of their academic environment. This is the highest quality partner available.

Dean McBride: Our faculty decided to do this; it was not the decision of the deans.

President Willink: For our last meeting, we had the Intellectual Property office come. We started to think through the IP issues of a syllabus and a class. How does this get negotiated? What are the policies around IP?

Dean McBride: For course development, there’s a contract of hire. The content you are designing will be on the platform. If you leave the university, someone will take it over. DU has committed that if you create videos, you can take them with you.

Senator Dean Saitta: Will individual faculty be required to participate? Can they opt out after? What about academic freedom for how they teach without adhering to a mandated template?

Dean Chrite: We take the notions of academic freedom and governance very seriously. It is unambiguous: faculty with interest and desire are welcome. Those without desire is absolutely fine as well. There are faculty we would like to take part, and they don’t want to for various reasons, and that’s fine. We are grateful for those who do want to since we launch in January. We are mindful of issues of governance. This is a sea change; not too long ago this was overwhelmingly discouraged. I think it was the way we curated it.

Dean McBride: One of the components of the platform is asynchronous and synchronous, and where they come together in a classroom with the instructor. 2U has been flexible. Some want
more asynchronous some want more synchronous. We can adjust based on what faculty deem appropriate.

Senator Christina Kreps: I think you mentioned hiring adjuncts for courses, and one thing that DU can be proud of is that we don’t have high number. That’s something that I worry about. And the tendency to increase non-tenure track faculty. I also have a question: how much have people looked into studies of universities going in the other direction? The new president of another university, for example, cut online courses and adjuncts because he thought they compromised the research status of the university.

Dean Chrite: The standards for us in terms of tenure/non-tenure cannot change. We have no alternative but to manage them as we do now. We do rely on lecturers and adjuncts, appropriately. The faculty of record for every course is a tenured or tenure track faculty member. I came from a Research-1 institution and understand that environment. For business and other professional schools, I don’t know that we have the luxury at this stage, with this price point, to not move forward. What we have done is start this dialogue several years ago. We did due diligence and honestly believe this is the highest standard. I am comfortable that this is prudent but not without risk. I don’t want to suggest otherwise. I’m pleased with the numbers so far, but it will be a matter of execution. Enrollment trajectories for traditional graduate education, all kinds of new entrants, price points, and opportunity costs all challenge how we deliver programs. One reason enrollment is declining is because we have not been providing students with an alternative platform to coming to this campus. If you have kids and live in Parker, for example CU Global is more attractive and is part of what is driving this decision.

Dean McBride: Having looked at over a decade of data, 60% of all courses at GSSW have been taught by adjuncts. They also have a certain number of years of professional practice. We don’t want that ratio to be perverted in an online environment. We have to be accountable to different accrediting bodies and standards.

Senator Kingshuk Ghosh: Speaking of pedagogy, the lab is also important, maybe not for you, but for peer learning pedagogy in the sciences. How is that being handled? I can see pedagogies colliding.

Dean McBride: In social work, our accrediting body requires 1,200 hours of practice in the field. We have created a structure so that students will get a quality internship to match course quality online. Also, with peer learning, the 2U platform can work with group projects, and there’s an app you can use on your phone. You as an instructor can break students into small groups. You can also have conversations and workshop on a topic.

Dean Chrite: Data analytics show that, for us, we can transfer a body of knowledge onto a platform, but what creates value is the experiential piece beyond technical skills. It bests happens in face-to-face settings, where we are challenging them. 2U recommends one residential piece per quarter. Our faculty has committed to more. While it may increase the price, it enhances learning. In terms of the number of students per class: it’s an average of 18 for GSSW, and Daniels is lower. Intimacy in the classroom is important. We had faculty spend 3 days with this serious, high-quality institution privately over a period of days and asked them to tell us what it’s
like. The data suggests that we will be able to do a good thing here, as transparently and comprehensively as I know how. I will come back in January to report back after we get going.

Senator Billy J. Stratton: Having experience with online education at 3 universities over 10 years, I wonder how to deal with issues of academic rigor. Some students take online courses because they don’t want to engage with the material. There are also issues of academic honesty, access to materials, and the testing of student knowledge.

Dean McBride: The technical piece is that the software monitors time on task, from reading to working on an assignment physically within the app. In terms of ethics and honesty, we don’t test that. Testing is through the application, such as role plays that students record and upload. Texting takes on different contexts for us. There’s a lot of face-to-face, where you can tell if they’ve read the materials or not.

Senator Paul Kosempel: Regarding the student in Vermont: what are our responsibilities in terms of career placement?

Dean McBride: We have a choice model that allows students to pick their placement. 2U said no, but we said it’s a non-starter. We want students to identify career objectives and careers within a 50-mile radius of their home. 2U makes sure the organization fits our criteria. But they pass it onto us and our field faculty who monitor quality.

Senator Kosempel: Do our career counselors need to be skilled in online placement?

Dean McBride: 2U has student coaches that are checking in with students, asking: How is your experience? This is the quality control piece: Is GSSW right for me? Students are passed to academic advisors here. They do provide career services support as well, but for now, we plan to loop them into the school.

Brian Gonzalez (GSSW Faculty): One of the things I started out with was healthy skepticism, but the online world is here to stay. We don’t want to get behind; we want to be pioneers. What technologies are out there that I’m not using? How can I improve my face-to-face class? Lastly, I’m looking at trends in tele-health and tele-therapy preparing our students for this work.

President Willink: We are bringing this discussion to the Senate to make sure we aren’t reacting 5 months down the road. As a Senator, to be honest, I don’t know the technicalities, but how can we think proactively. Hopefully, this discussion has been useful to provide a context. If you have questions later, we will find a way to keep these important conversations about higher education going.

**Master Plan: Process & Next Steps**
President Willink: The Senate Executive Committee went on a “Magical Mystery Tour” to invite faculty leadership to think through some key questions: How do we collaborate? How do we solve social problems? How do we design places to best achieve the shared goals we have around the purpose of education, and how will this change over time? Most likely, those of us in
this room are the folks that will be here in a decade or two. We are the folks that will inherent the choices of the master plan—not students. How do we make sure that faculty are active and engaged in this process? On a Senate level, we invite your thoughts on this.

Vice Chancellor David Greenberg: I want to invite Fatima Rezaie up, and I will talk about this process of the master plan and the interesting parts for faculty. We are talking about the built (not digital) environment. DU has not had a master plan since 1960, but that has not stopped DU from growing and evolving since 1995, investing $1 billion in the physical parts of campus: 50% has been new buildings and the other half of that 50% renovations. The campus has evolved into a beautiful, formal 125-acre campus, bounded by Buchtel, High, and Harvard Gulch. We own a few properties to the east, and a 5-acre remote parking facility. There is a tennis site, a joint project with DPS, going north of I-25. Psychologically, DU is now crossing this barrier (north of I-25).

How do we relate to our neighbors? You can define our neighborhood in concentric circles. The more immediate area of the DU District is a 1-mile radius around DU. The interesting thing about us as a district is the very affluent single-family homes separated by 1970s-style shopping centers. If the residents of these homes want to shop or entertain, they will go other places but not within walking distance of their own homes. We don’t offer anything for them. We also don’t offer anything for parents when students are going on tours.

The real estate market in the US is crazy. There has been a lot of development not generated by DU but that is having an effect on the DU District. This is all by private developers. As a result, there are more cars on University Blvd. And there is less housing for graduate students and staff who would like to be closer to DU.

We need to think of the future academic needs of faculty, and we need to place those needs within a hierarchy of other needs and how we plan. The conversation was driven by the strategic plan and IMPACT 2025. There are programmatic and aspirational goals. How do we create more serendipitous interactions between academics, students, and neighbors? We need to think about land and costs. How do we do it?

We did a national search of architecture and planning firms for the best of the best. We looked at 14 national firms and decided on Ayers Saint Gross. They have done similar planning for Harvard, Emory, and 200 other projects across country. They also worked for Trinity in Dublin. We started in March with a monthly series of workshops, bringing in consultants to have conversations. Thematically, we were interested in the economics of the edges. What is the value of the properties that DU owns? We own all 6 acres east of the Ritchie Center, which is a parking lot and apartments. What are the possible uses of this land, and what are the economic forces in play that would dictate uses of that property? What would constitute economical housing if DU could get into that in some way, either alone or with partner?

We’ve had another conversation about mobility and sustainability. We have a series of problems: we are divided by Evans, and bounded by high traffic streets. And it’s only going to get worse in the future. What do we think of how DU develops in terms of this difficult traffic situation?
Another conversation was on signage and place-making. DU wants to be more inviting to non-traditional communities, and a different demographic of students, faculty, and staff. We want to appeal to communities who haven’t thought of DU as a resource. There is no true entry point, no good entry, and people don’t know where to go for parking. Also, related to place-making, we have park-like facilities, but they are not activated. There could be outdoor dining where you can hang out, and outdoor lighting can be cool and fun. We want to make the campus more accessible and fun.

The last workshop next week is on core academic and research needs. ASG will meet with deans, heads of institutes, and other individuals for determining what the priorities are for long-term academic needs. What are the facilities that need to be replaced or moved off campus? They will also meet with academic and staff diversity councils for considering how DU will represent itself in the future. Next, we will go to Baltimore and see Johns Hopkins. We will develop a draft document around February 1 to show to Chancellor Chopp and the Board of Trustees.

President Willink: We want to make sure that folks have an opportunity to ask questions about the master plan, about what happens next, and about how faculty will be involved in the decision-making over the next 6 months and beyond?

Senator Jonathan Sciarcon: Are we stalled in terms of how we can expand because we can’t expand into the expensive residential areas? Are there zoning laws?

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: We are also bounded by zoning. We are not going to develop Observatory Park, as an example. But we have a lot of capacity on campus, like 5-acres of parking. The real issue is that 17.5% of the land at DU is surface parking. Five years from now, we might have autonomous vehicles and shared vehicles. So, we are starting with this inventory that may be repurposed over 15 years. We have a commitment to moving undergraduates on campus, rather than being adjacent to campus, so we are building a 500-bed residential unit on High and Asbury. We see a lot of opportunities that will surprise you in terms of space and capacity.

Senator Raul Perez: Thinking about the master plan now and comparing it to online education, you say we need more housing but there seems to be a disconnect. Do we need more space for students who will not be here in the future?

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: Here’s what we know. Residential colleges are appealing. There are opportunities for spontaneous interactions. We want more kids active on campus: 365/24/7. There are huge arguments in favor of more people living closer to DU: it would reduce traffic and increase the dynamics of the neighborhood. And we can’t meet the demand for housing close to campus.

Senator David Daniels: Can we access slides online? They were pretty cool to look at.

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: You can ask Fatima where to find the slides. More information can be found at: http://impact.du.edu/our-progress/denver-advantage/.
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Douglas Becker (Law Faculty): At Washington University in St. Louis, how many of the development proposals are revenue enhancing? Consider the hotel and convention center attached to business and law, and also connected to the hospitality school: is that part of the criteria for proceeding?

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: We are certainly looking. Things will be in the master plan that are revenue generating. For example, there is a strong argument for a hotel, but DU would have to find a partner. Metro is a model, as well as Delmar (in St. Louis) and the redevelopment there. They build residential housing and a “way better than Trader Joes,” which we also think would be an important thing to have for a real retail street. We want to have DU be a college town in a big city. The Delmar development has 345 units of graduate student housing, a diner, and the TJs on the bottom floor. The street is killing it. It’s safer and more diverse. We are impressed by that model.

Senator Frédérique Chevillot: I’m very sensitive to words. Can we choose another word than “master”? Something like the “best” plan or a “forward-thinking” plan?

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: I’m speechless.

Senator Sarah Pessin: I know that you have a meeting with diversity councils, but I have a broader question as it relates to IMPACT 2025 and diversity. One of the concerns I have is that it’s important to integrate questions about diversity into all of the things we are looking at. The meeting I went to was the “edges” meeting. The conversation after that was asking questions about an emphasis on diversity. Can you say more about the thinking behind the diversity meeting as a separate meeting and, if there are future conversations, how to integrate diversity conversations into other meetings moving forward.

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: It has been a conversation from the beginning. We went to Wash U and Delmar because it’s an example of a forward-looking plan that looks at how to operate in a way that promotes diversity. The reason it’s a pullout for the last meeting is that Frank Tuitt recommended it. We have been talking to Frank since day one. We try to get different lenses on it in terms of who participates.

Senator Pessin: From the material I saw, and that others have shared, I’m a bit surprised, because I didn’t get that impression from the slides I saw. From the first presentation, I didn’t see that element in there. And I will keep my open for that in the future.

President Willink: We’ll wrap up with contact information. If I am Joe Schmoe faculty that finds IMPACT 2025 opaque, including how core decisions are being made, what’s my pathway and when will faculty have a voice in key issues?

Vice Chancellor Greenberg: I don’t know what the process is just yet. We are taking serious that the process will work itself through. We will be asking ASG to tell us what they think given the realities of DU. I don’t know what Chopp and the Board will say the next steps are. Lili Rodriguez has done all kinds of focus groups, and visited campuses for best practices and models. I expect that to happen in everything we do going forward.
If you voted for the GO Bond, you voted for $8.5 million to improve pedestrian safety, including bike paths and pedestrian crossings. We will work on the master plan with Transportation Solutions. There will be a traffic survey to build a case that Evans is dangerous and provide evidence to Denver traffic that Evans is too fast and too dangerous and that we need more safety crossings. There will come a time when we’ll send something out from the city wanting to hear from you. We’re advocating for things coming up on a regular basis where we need input, including conversations about signage that is multilingual and bilingual. Does that make sense?

President Willink: And faculty can reach out to you at any time. Please reach out to them. One window is now. We want to make sure faculty is involved in this decision making. It’s up to each one of us. In some ways, we are the stewards of the 30,000-foot view of the institution. It may not be that most faculty know about this. I trust you will do the work to bring this back to your colleagues so they can take an active role before it’s too late. We might not have known there is a committee of 12, we are working on the Senate to be aware of these committees. Let’s use our agency and be a part of the decision making.

Approval of Minutes from Senate Meetings: September 29 and October 27, 2017

President Willink thanked Senators for being diligent and noticing when they are not listed, or their proxies aren’t listed, in the minutes. If something isn’t represented or represented differently, we count on you to let us know if something needs to be changed.

There was a motion to approve the minutes, and they were approved.

Freedom of Expression Committee

President Willink explained that the Senate creates ad hoc and standing committees. The Freedom of Expression (FOE) committee will be a standing committee. She said they were in the process of selecting committee members.

President-Elect Darrin Hicks: We met as a selection committee, as well as with the Big 4 (Senate President Kate Willink, SAC President Mary Sue Coleman, Undergraduate Student Government President Morgan Smith, and Graduate Student Government President Ariel Zarate). Senator Armond Towns is on the selection committee, representing faculty of color. We have gotten together a couple of times and have received 20 applications (a mix of undergraduates, graduates, faculty, staff, and administration). All applicants will be interviewed next quarter. The committee will be seated within the first couple weeks of the quarter. We will pilot best practices to make sure they are fair and inclusive moving forward. We also paid attention to who was applying and who was represented.

President Willink: We have also now constituted the “Wither the Wall” committee, and they will start meeting next Wednesday. This is an ad hoc committee hoping to complete their work within the academic year. Their work has implications for all classrooms, students, faculty, and staff. We used a similar model to a standing committee, and we will be inviting all to be a part of the decision process. Look at the questions from the committee charge slide. How do we come
together in a more deliberate, intentional way? Hopefully by the end of spring, the committee will make a recommendation to the Big 4.

How does “Wither the Wall” connect with FOE? Wither the Wall will think intentionally about the existing wall and the implications in a discrete manner, while FOE is more about designing events and thinking through reconciliation issues. Education, design, and ongoing issues loop back in on each other. FOE will have more of their work cut out for them. It’s important to bring in multiple voices and to be responsible and active in making these decisions.

The Senate was then invited to organize into their committees and disperse around the room.

**Adjourn**

Senator Annecoos Wierserna: I was just asked to let you know that on Wednesday afternoon, our colleague Sheila Hyatt passed away after a long battle with pancreatic cancer. She was a beloved scholar and member of our academic community. I have information about funeral services on Sunday, and for a shiva. Come and find me, and I can share this information.

There was a motion to adjourn at 1:30 PM, and President Willink adjourned the meeting, inviting Senators to stay after the meeting for the Provost budget report.
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