

**University of Denver
Faculty Senate
Minutes
January 29, 2016
Room 290, Anderson Academic Commons**

Senators (or proxies) present:

Anneliese Amschler Andrews, Michael Brent, Tess Bruce, Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Frédérique Chevillot, Mac Clouse, Kate Crowe, Terri Davis, Jared Del Rosso, Ron DeLyser, Sarah Hart Micke (Proxy for Elizabeth Drogin), Maha Foster, Jim Gilroy, Kathy Green, Cynthia Hazel, Sarah Hart Micke (proxy for Elizabeth Drogin), Annabeth Headrick, John Hill, Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirckpatrick, Judy Kiyama, Paul Kosempel, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Luis Leon, Eleanor McNees, Laleh Mehran, Erin Meyer, Gloria Miller, Keith Miller, Ved Nanda, Paul Pallub, Amy Phillips, Rebecca Powell, Tom Quinn, Chip Reichardt, Aimee Reichman-Decker, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson (proxy for Vi Narapareddy), Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Orna Shaughnessy, Amrik Singh, Mary Steefel, Kate Stoker, Billy Stratton, Joseph Szyliowicz, Mathew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, John Tiedemann, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels, Kate Willink, Joshua Wilson, Melanie Witt, Duan Zhang

Call to Order, Approval of Minutes

Art Jones, Senate President, called the meeting to order at noon and announced that minutes from the November 13, 2015 meeting would be voted on in February's meeting.

Announcements – Art Jones

Art announced that as our meetings become more meaningful and accomplish more business, it is only suitable that Senate committee work be highlighted and discussed in our general meetings. To that end, at each Senate meeting we will try to have an update from a Senate committee or committees.

Updates:

- The Faculty Review Committee is being fully reconstituted because all terms expired as of this summer. The Deans are being consulted.
- The ad hoc Faculty Senate Investigative Committee on Divestment is now co-chaired by faculty member Darren Hicks.

- The Student Relations Committee will present an update today, including on their work in the area of Inclusive Excellence.
- The Executive Committee has formed an ad hoc committee on Freedom of Expression and today's meeting will include discussion around this issue.
- The Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) Committee will report at the February meeting.

Textbooks for Students – Keith Miller

Keith Miller asked that Senators be aware that faculty textbook practices can be harmful to students who may have limited access to credit and cannot, therefore, purchase Top Hat or Amazon versions of textbooks. Students receiving certain scholarships are also unable to use monies allotted for textbooks for online credit purchases. He reported that half of the 100 student athletes with book scholarships were not able to find their required books at the bookstore on the first day of classes this fall. Keith recommended that we make our faculty aware of this issue and urge them to order some copies of required texts through the bookstore. Scott Johns also noted that some students are required to purchase online platforms and have similar problems.

Provost Report—Gregg Kvistad

Gregg gave an update on the status of the strategic plan and the plans for implementation. He noted that the Board of Trustees applauded after voting to approve the final plan and that they are avidly interested in implementation. Faculty Senate feedback was incorporated in at least thirteen different places in the revised plan and virtually all that was suggested was included. There were 2,500 informants for the last version of the plan and fifteen drafts, and the Chancellor was involved in each draft. The Provost gives credit to the Chancellor for being so inclusive in this work.

The plan was always meant to be a vision document, but included several concrete examples, like the Institute of Policy Studies, for rhetorical purposes. Since those came across abruptly and were confusing, they are now called initiatives in the final draft. Some also expressed concerns about the length of the document; a consultant is now working to translate it into much more accessible imagery for external audiences, students, and parents.

The strategic plan is done for now and no new initiatives will be added. The implementation plan includes selecting Deans, Associate Provosts, and Vice Chancellors who have responsibility in the area of each initiative to co-chair implementation teams. The chairs need to be individuals who have the responsibility and authority to get the work done and can deliver on these ideas.

The work will then involve faculty and staff. He expects that we will pilot things and see what works, similar to how the Marsico initiative was implemented.

The vast majority of the plan is going to cost money we don't have. Rather than wondering "what will we not do" we need to think about making the pie larger. Armin Afsahi and Advancement, not faculty, will do the fundraising and are in a great place to do fundraising for us. Not every initiative will need fundraising, some we will just choose to do, but in general the strategic initiatives are about fundraising at this point. We will need to make strategic choices for every initiative, including recognizing our ability to fundraise around them.

The next step is for Deans and senior staff to meet with consultant Susan Frost, who will help us with prioritization and phasing. She may suggest things we have to do or things to avoid but the specifics will be up to us and our context.

Gregg added that he is fairly sure implementation will be done by a series of small teams, composed of five to six members, who will meet with constituents and concretize next steps. The teams need to be small to move forward, but they will consult broadly with stakeholders.

To help with prioritization and phasing, some categories have been proposed for initiatives:

1. Foundational initiatives – immediate and direct importance; well understood in community, supported widely, little question about their importance. E.g. financial aid for students. Affordability access has been seen for years one of our largest impediments.
2. Signature initiatives – build on a strength we already have but that is perhaps dispersed, not coordinated, in pockets throughout the university. Things that exemplify DU like Inclusive Excellence. IE is seen as an important "identifier."
3. Aspirational initiatives – potentially of national significance, may overlap with others but could differentiate us from other Universities. Perhaps knowledge bridges, or interdisciplinarity/multidisciplinarity, which we could do differently here, especially with our professional programs.
4. Emergent initiatives –not less important but less developed ideas that would involve more thinking and collaboration, frequently with partners outside of the university. E.g. the DU District, which would involve conversations in the neighborhood as well as with the city and developers about making this feel like a campus neighborhood.

Gregg expects pilot testing to start in the spring and expects it will involve both experimentation and discipline at the same time. We need to embrace a new kind of fluid experimentation that is not usually part of higher education: if something is not working, we can shut it down and go on to the next thing or think differently.

Gregg then called for questions from the floor, but no questions were raised. He thanked Keith Miller for bringing the textbook issue to the attention of the faculty.

Student Relations Committee update – John Tiedemann

John reported that Inclusive Excellence and matters of diversity, broadly construed, have been the committee's focus throughout fall. They have been looking for ways faculty can become very directly involved in those efforts and for things that can be done right now. The committee has met with people across campus including Frank Tuitt, Patti Helton, Susan Zvacek, and Tom Romero. At this point, the committee is split on whether to do something right now, do something in the classroom, or do institutional research on the problems with the First Year Experience. One idea is to have faculty make a voluntary commitment to integrate the public good into their courses, to bring diversity to the fore in what they teach as well as creating programming around the pedagogy of Inclusive Excellence. Next week a group including representatives from CME and OTL will meet with the Student Relations committee to plan next steps and keep this an active project.

Freedom of Expression Discussion

Art introduced the Freedom of Expression discussion by stating that there is a lot going on around the country and it's better to be proactive than reactive in stating what our institution stands for when it comes to Freedom of Expression. The Executive Committee has already asked an ad hoc committee to draft a DU-specific statement that Senate and FEAC (Board of Trustees Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee) can grapple with. Art noted that while it might be easy to borrow another institution's statement and adapt it, we need to create something that represents us and who we are as a university.

Art then asked members to discuss the following issues at their tables:

- What are the essentials? What must a statement include?
- What are the boundaries of what would be tolerated?
- What, specifically, should be included that reflects who we are as the University of Denver?

Ved Nanda commented from the floor that Freedom of Expression is the same everywhere and that we aren't going to come up with something new or unique because it's the same for all people everywhere. Art responded that yes, Freedom of Expression is the same everywhere, but how it's worded is important and can include examples from our own history, as the University of Chicago has done with their statement.

After a discussion, representatives from each table reported to the group (points made by three or more tables are in bold):

- Recommended for inclusion in our statement:
 - **Some idea of our history, including an acknowledgement of our institution's history with the Native American community and our historical lack of diversity**
 - Our value that all students, staff feel a sense of belonging in our community, that they feel safe and included
 - **Connection to our Honor Code and the core values expressed there**
 - More specificity (DU examples) than seen in the example Freedom of Expression statements shared for review
 - Legal boundaries/definitions
 - Academic freedom vs. Freedom of Expression
 - Difference between behavior vs. speech
 - What is violence-inciting language?
 - **Difference in venue (e.g. classroom v. large public space)**
 - Being able to *not* give one's opinion or not speak
 - Personally directed vs. generally directed speech
 - Want to have vibrant free speech but not encourage hate speech
 - People who speak less popular ideas shouldn't fear retaliation
 - **We encouraging civility and social discourse**
 - **Civility and tolerance are hallmarks of educated men and women, what is our role as faculty in establishing that in class?**
 - **Retaliation on YouTube or YikYak – we can't stop that but can state that in a civilized/educated society this is not what we do**
 - Don't want to limit academic community in any way
- Issues to consider
 - Social media (e.g. Yik Yak, Facebook) including social media in classes (e.g. mandatory, students chatting during class), and cyberbullying
 - Emails
 - Confidentiality
 - Is this to be just a faculty statement or an opportunity for student and staff contributions?
 - Need statement for faculty, students, and University Administration
 - Students may be immature and have to let them do things we don't [encourage]
 - **Power relationships**
 - **Professors, students might misconstrue [one another's speech] or be considered different legally**
 - **Acknowledge issues of vulnerability and power within Freedom of Expression spaces. What about feeling unable to respond freely in a classroom setting?**

- Two tables noted that the example from Delaware merits examination. In it, members of faculty have a major role in condemning intolerance.
- Classifying speech as “high value” and “low value” or creating speech codes could be perilous.
- Avoid inconsistencies in languages such as using the phrase “absolute freedom” but then listing limits to that freedom.
- We can put limits of freedom on what limits the universities business and can actually expel members of this community for any reason.
- Inflammatory invited speakers (e.g. Dick Lamm, cowboy and Indian frat parties, GW Bush visit) might create a diverse campus culture so we might not shut that down but we might call [them] out as not affirming campus values

Art asked that the notes be sent to him for the ad hoc committee.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35p.m.

Minutes prepared and submitted by

Erin Meyer
Faculty Senate Secretary