Faculty Senate Meeting, Friday, September 29, 2017
Graduate School of Social Work Room 120, Community Room

Senators (or proxies) present: Doug Allen, Linda Bensel-Meyers, Eric Boschmann, Peter Bowen, Ryan Buller, Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Sarah Chatfield, Frederique Chevillot, Mac Clouse, Kate Crowe, David Daniels, Jared Del Rosso, Ron DeLyser, Peter Dobelis, Claude d'Estree, Xin Fan, James Gilroy, Sarah Hart-Micke, Darrin Hicks, John Hill, Deborah Howard, Barbekka Hurtt, Scott Johns, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Judy Kiyama, Michelle Knowles, Paul Kosempel, Christina Kreps, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Richard Leaman, Andrew Linshaw, Mario Lopez, Zulema Lopez, Kevin Lynch, Brian Majestic, Eleanor McNees, Ved Nanda, Pallub Paul, Ronnie Pavlov, Raul Perez, Sarah Pessin, Andi Pusavat, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Jeremy Reynolds, Jason Roney, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Jamie Shapiro, Orna Shaughnessy, Derigan Silver, Amrik Singh, Shannon Sliva, Emily Sposeto, Mary Stansbury, Margaret Stefanovic, Kate Stoker, Nicole Taylor, Ron Throupe, Scott Toney, Armond Towns, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Gwen Vogel Mitchell, Stephen von Merz, Sarah Watamura, Annecos Wiersema, Kate Willink, Melanie Witt

11:00-11:30 New Senator Orientation

Kate Willink welcomed new senators. Asked everyone for name, affiliation and "top reason they are here."
New Senators include: Xin Fan, Sara Chatfield, Emily Sposeto, Krystyna Matusiak, Andi Pusavat, Andy Linshaw, Pete Dobells, Eric Bosh (couldn't locate in DU directory), Annecos (Anna) Wiersma, David Daniels, Kevin Lynch.

Kate W. talked about "scholarly speed dating," and using it as a way to meet many people's goals of "getting to know other units." Her initial Senate service was the smoking ban (2004-2005), and she remembers being irritated that we spent so much time on that, and less on the undergraduate curriculum, and in ways that are in line with the expertise in the Senate, and make sure that motions that are made in Senate have a deep and lasting impact. She reminded all of the "miss 3 meetings in a row (without a proxy) and you're out" rule, which is especially important as we have constitutional revisions coming up which require a quorum for voting.

Kate also reminded everyone of their role to report out to their unit/department, and to check with everyone's respective chairs and department heads about current unit/departmental practice. Also, past rule
of thumb was that every Senator should have a reach of 10 people, but Kate is realizing this year that that's maybe not even enough, so she asks that in addition to reporting out, that we deeply listen to our colleagues and bring this back to Senate. Last year the Senate made university-level decisions and using only that "10" doesn't account for all the variance within and around the university. So – reach out to other faculty members beyond that "10," so we can bring as wide and deep a perspective to the Senate as possible – make it "University-level thinking." In many ways, Faculty Senate is like a House of Representatives that calls itself a Senate. Think about your "Senator hat" as you’re sitting in meetings, etc. The sub-committees are also where a fair amount of things get done – and they have the same "three strikes and you’re out" rule – again, so that we don’t have a committee where half the people are doing all the work.

For this year, priorities include moving "motion to action." The Senate haas three significant motions in the last 2 years which are in some ways new for the Senate, because they are taking a motion made in the Senate and enacting it. First, Policies and Procedures for the Freedom of Expression – faculty, staff, and undergrad/grad students will be thinking through what does it mean to hold to our values. The Provost's Reception (Wednesday) will be around the Freedom of Expression Policy and the committee. The Chancellor's Roundtable (Monday) will be the future of the professoriate and the changing landscape of higher education. Second, Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development – this is moving into infrastructure-building and also links into the Chancellor's Roundtable about the future of the professoriate. Third, Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative, again – funding and infrastructure-building with faculty taking a leadership role in this and enable growth. The other two are: enacting shared governance, via "Whither the Wall" committee, which will be faculty, staff, and students and the Bookstore committee: The committee solved some perennial issues that had been ongoing by making small and large changes to better experiences. Also, Activity Insight – gathering feedback on faculty's experiences with this software and having a voice. The last one is "housecleaning," making sure that what the Senate is doing aligns with its documents. Executive Committee will also have an "issues log" for issues that are university-wide, as they come in.

Closed with an encouragement to sit at separate tables and networking across the lunch tables.

Call to Order

At noon, Kate Willink called the meeting to order and asked Senators to approve the minutes as published, Doug (?) seconded, minutes from May 19, 2017 are approved as published.

Election for At Large Executive Committee Member

First, Kate W. asked for any other at-large nominations. Dean Saitta nominated Aaron Schneider as at-large Senator, as Korbel faculty and chair of DU AAUP chapter. Kate said that the person needs to be a standing Senator, and Dean did confirm that he is not a standing Senator. There was some discussion about
appointment vs. election – John Hill confirmed that all Senators should be elected by their faculty, and not appointed by the Dean. Kate also thanked John Hill for his diligence in ensuring that elections ran in March so we had a full Senate. Kate also said that she could be contacted via the Senate page with any additional questions. Question from the floor: does the Senator have to be an at-large Senator? John Hill said no – that the position is for an at-large Executive Committee member, and could be any elected Senator.

Jared Del Rosso made a brief presentation about his candidacy for At-Large Executive Committee Senator. He said that in the past academic year, he had been invited by Art Jones to replace an outgoing Faculty Senate Secretary (Erin Meyer), and became a member of the Executive Committee. Based on his experience last academic year, he would love to opportunity to support Kate’s agenda over the next year. He hadn’t put his name in last year because he thought it was a great, well-rounded group, but would like to put his name forward for this vacancy. John Hill asked that with only one candidate, that we take an open election, which was moved and seconded (Ved Nanda). Jared was elected by acclamation/unanimously.

Opening Narrative: Tink Tinker

Kate introduced Tink Tinker and recalled his introduction to the Senate from last year. This is Dr. Tinker's last official quarter at the University, and she acknowledged and celebrated his 30 years of service to the University as a teacher, leader, and mentor on campus and across the city and nation.

Tinker stated that he was honored to be reinvited-he doesn't "get invited back very often." He opened identifying himself as a part of the Wazhazhe Nation, which is a member of the Earth Division and the Eagle Clan. He said that he identifies himself when he speaks, so that he knows if there is another Native person in an Eagle clan, so that they might speak with one another. He is very appreciative of the work of the John Evans Study Committee and the work they did on the history of American Indian people on this land, this University, and the role of Territorial Governor John Evans and clarifying Evans' role in 'clearing the territory of Indian people to make it "safe for Christian habitation."' Here, Dr. Tinker is paraphrasing Evans from an 1884 interview with H.H. Bancroft, the well-known University of California historian. He then talked about DU's new commitment to Indian peoples, living the treaties signed with different nations, education and welfare for Indians. He asked us, as faculty, to acknowledge that as we recruit more Indian students, that we think about what we will do with and for them. How will we teach them? He recalled John Joseph Mathews' novel "Sundown," where the protagonist plays football and joins a fraternity with two other Osage boys, and helps two other boys, Running Elk and Sun on His Wings, pack their bags so they could leave the university because they just didn't fit. He asked: "How many people do we lose because it feels like they just don't fit?"

He asked us to consider that there are factors with Indian people that you might think of as no-brainers – showing up on time, turning in work on time. However, the temporality in Western culture that you don't
have to think about, might be a whole different way of thinking from a Native American student. Native American culture is fundamentally spatial and not temporal. Native Americans, to be sure, have a sense of time like Christian people have a sense of space – but space is subordinate to temporality to Native Americans. Ceremonies are fundamentally about space, not time. In addition, Native American cultures are "collateral egalitarian," not "hierarchical" and in the Euro-Christian world (which he uses as a socio-cultural but not a religious identifier) - everything is hierarchical - professor/student, etc. When you have an Indian student, they will have different ways of sorting out hierarchy – they may look at you not as "the professor" but as an "elder" to whom they are supposed to show respect - but in the Indian world, elders don’t give orders. Here, professors give assignments and say "you have to do this work." It is a clash of cultures, and we as faculty must pay attention to it. Be kind. Be embrace. The Indian students in your class may be feeling very much alone. You get the chance to welcome, mentor, and encourage them. One more time: be kind. Also, you have as much to learn from the student as they have to learn from you.

Dr. Tinker then thanked us for asking him to come back, and said that it was a lovely way to close out his career.

Welcome to Faculty Senate
Kate welcomed us all to the beginning of the academic year in Faculty Senate, and asked us to take a moment to remember our colleague Dr. Fred Cheever, who was here last year and is no longer, as he should be. She then took us through the priorities for the year.

Priority #1: Motion to Action
• Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development, Job Responsibility Distributions, and Peer to Peer Conversations, updates:
  o We are now able to do P2P conversations. See the newsletter for more information.
  o We are working on Faculty Development funds.
  o The Chancellor’s Roundtable will cover the future of the professoriate and this can be a part of this discussion. There is also time at the roundtable to ask questions about anything else that’s going on at the institution. Kate encouraged everyone to attend, as "shared governance only works if you enact it" and asked that we ask others to join you.
  o Matt Taylor from Geography: "Is this is a three-year pilot?" Kate: "Yes, but it requires reciprocal support from the faculty."
• Freedom of Expression Committee, updates:
  o We discussed this policy as a Senate last year, and then voted as a faculty to approve.
  o Kate gave an overview covering the formation of a committee, and what this means/will mean from classrooms to dorms to campus events.
  o Next Wednesday (10/4) nominations will open. This is a Senate-run committee, but anyone can nominate or self-nominate. The committee that drafted the policy will be interviewing nominated folks. Tuesday (10/3) at the Provost Reception we’ll discuss this further.
  o Darrin Hicks, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the FOE policy, gave an overview of the three aspects of the committee’s charge. The committee will have three particular purposes – pre-event, event, and post-event. So – before any “free speech” event on campus, the committee
can educate the community on rights and responsibilities re: free speech, and does it in ways that uphold safety and moral worth. Some of these will be videos, pamphlets. During/around events, the committee will work to design communicative events so that everyone who comes to the event has their voice heard. Darrin noted that, usually when we think of free speech we think of it in a legalistic way – prohibited or allowed. At the University, we have a lot of expertise in communication design and technology, and the committee could use this to create inclusive, safe spaces to ensure vigorous dialogue. They would consult with Faculty Senate and informed by restorative justice, engage with the students in an ongoing dialogue.

- Overview of the committee composition: The Big 4” - Presidents of Undergraduate Student Government, Graduate Student Government, Faculty Senate, and Staff Advisory Council. Then, standing ex-officio members: head of Campus Safety, VC of Campus Life/IE, and University Counsel. The committee will seek nominations of up to 6 community members, faculty, students, or staff. They want a representation of a wide array of viewpoints on campus. This could and should create a vigorous defense of free speech that is also responsible.

- Kate asked for questions and comments. Armond Towns asked who those 6 people might be on the committee, and did they want 2 faculty, students, and staff? Darrin said that no, they would be “the best six” of the applicants. Kate asked that people to please nominate or self-nominate, as the committee will succeed or fail on the strength of the membership. This form of leadership is not normal or traditional on campus, and it’s important that we do it well. Xin Fan asked about e-mail notification of the call for committee members. Kate said the e-mail would go out to faculty Wednesday, also the Provost’s Reception, as well as the “Bridge,” and ensuring that students and staff are aware.

- Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative: An initiative of the Student Relations Committee, this focuses on faculty being leaders in inclusive learning in the classroom, and being supportive to other faculty and students in the classroom and other spaces where learning takes place.

**Unit Level Communication Challenges**

- Unit Level Communication Specialists: Units that have 30 or more faculty may need to have a “communication specialist” who could work with Megan Kelly to address persistent communication issues. She asked that anyone interested ask about this after the meeting, and that this would be the Senator’s point of service in lieu of committee service.

Claude d’Estree asked, in addition to faculty meetings and e-mail, what does this look like? Kate said that first the communication specialists would attempt to get info out via e-mail, but also coordinate with her and the Executive Committee to think through what the best way would be to disseminate, or to solicit feedback. She noted that she has spoken to all of the Deans twice. Claude noted that he doesn’t have access to the e-mails of all of his unit colleagues, and is "not supposed to just ‘blast them.’" In his case, information needs to go to and through the Dean’s Suite, which then makes a decision about how or how much information goes to colleagues, or how much time he gets at faculty meetings. Kate asked that he work with her to see if they could get access to listservs via Senate processes. Jim asked if they need to be a Senator in the unit in question? Kate said that they do.

**Unit Level Governance Audit**

Judy Kiyama, a Senator for Morgridge, updated that she and one of her classes are doing an analysis of shared governance structures across campus. Mary Stansbury asked if the Senate has a graduate assistant. Kate said
that they have someone for 10 hours a month, but that is just enough time to make sure the full Senate and Executive Committee have food and AV. However, for this project, the Provost’s office did fund a grad student.

**DU Interfaith Challenge: Sarah Pessin**

Sarah Pessin asked that we all make this the year that DU becomes a model of religious inclusivity. We need to commit, as colleagues, to checking the interfaith calendar - not a symbolic move, we need to actually transform our boring, daily online calendar into interfaith calendars. Center for Judaic Studies has created step by step guides for how to actually do this to your calendar of choice – Google, Outlook, etc. Step 1: is to do it, and to check it on a regular basis. Step 2: Get others in your division or office to do it, particularly the person who is in charge of scheduling things. Step 3: CJS brings you desserts and a poster! Then, each unit needs to develop best practices so that you don’t schedule events on major religious holidays, and including language for when you can’t avoid it. The last challenge: extra adventurous offices can come by the CJS and get superhero costumes, and join the Interfaith Calendar photo challenge with your staff!

Kate asked that all Executive Committee members (minus Billy Stratton, absent) stand, and we did.

**Overview of Senate Committee Business**

Paul Kosempe: Incoming chair for Financial Planning Committee. This year, the committee will study financial policies at the University, and meet quarterly with the Provost and head of Business and Financial Affairs, and Linda Kosten (Senior Associate Provost). The committee's priorities for the year: complete a salary survey for faculty. Committee's 2-year priorities: pay equity, tuition, and related policies.

John Hill: Chair of Nominations, Credentials, Rules Committee: Principal thing the committee does is keep track of senators, units represented, etc. – most significantly in the spring when they work with Deans to have elections for the following year. In addition, the plan is to take another look at the bylaws and constitution, and refine provisions which are out of date, poorly written, where our practices and our documents are inconsistent. Lastly, the constitution requires that NCR have a minimum of six members – they have four now, and so anyone else interested should speak with John.

Chip Reichardt: Chair of Personnel Committee. First, the committee regularly approves sabbatical leave applications, recommends to Provost, and decides on awards for university scholar/researchers. They accept nominations and recommend to the Provost who should get the awards. There is a related ad hoc committee looking at processes for promotion and review of non-tenure track faculty. There is also a policy for research that is being revised. A member or two on the committee will also be reviewing Activity Insight. Question from Matt about Evans Scholars. According to Chip, that's not under the purview of the committee, it is in the purview of current Evans scholars. Kate said that the Evans Award committee will be making an announcement soon.

Sarah Pessin: Academic Planning. First, the committee will be canvassing to get a better sense of curriculum issues on campus. Second, they will be working on identifying common ground with faculty across disciplines. Third, ongoing work on curricular review-content and process. They will be working with the Student Relations Committee and the Office of Teaching and Learning on issue of implicit bias in teaching evals. Also, the
subcommittee last year with Craig Woody and the Bookstore on enhancing bookstore/faculty/student relationship building will continue. The committee will also continue to award Faculty Research Funds, which went out in the last newsletter.

Scholarly Speed Dating: AHSS Connections Committee Representative

Eleanor McNees introduced the concept of Scholarly Speed Dating, which has been successful in promoting connections across Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences units among faculty. Each Senator got a packet with three questions, and we switched off with 8 different Senators, answering questions, until the conclusion of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 PM.