Faculty Senate
Meeting of the Faculty Senate
May 19, 2000

Agenda:
1. Approval of minutes from May 5 meeting
2. Presentation by Tristy Rudebusch, DU Bookstore
3. Overview of University College-DCB realignment (Zaranka and Griesemer)
4. Follow-up to faculty vote on Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal
5. Report from Graduate Council
6. Recognition Awards
7. Brief meeting of the new Executive Committee

Guests: Tristy Rudebusch, Dean Jim Griesemer

Minutes: Minutes of 5/05/00 approved.

Presentation by Tristy Rudebusch, DU Bookstore. Arthur Best introduced Tristy Rudebusch of the DU Campus Bookstore, who introduced her staff. Earlier adoption dates for textbooks have been introduced. This will allow books bought back from students to be re-used more effectively. The bookstore Website was also introduced. The site contains instructions and deadlines, and is self-explanatory. In addition, Rudebusch explained that a new computer system will soon allow more interaction between faculty, staff, students, and the bookstore and will allow online shopping capabilities and direct shipping for students. She then discussed competition from online booksellers, indicating that the number of relevant titles available in the bookstore surpasses those available through the various .coms. She also claimed that the prices were comparable, at least in some cases. The bookstore, according to Rudebusch, is trying to be competitive in terms of prices and services, and is planning an aggressive marketing/promotion.

Les Goodchild asked about the markup of 25-30% that is routinely assessed to cover expenses related to publicity, etc., and indicated that a clear disclosure of policy might be useful for bookstore patrons.

Overview of University College-DCB realignment (Zaranka and Griesemer). A memorandum from the Provost was distributed for discussion. Zaranka gave a brief history of non-traditional and distance learning initiatives on campus, citing the growth of non-traditional students at DU and the university's success in un-marketed distance programs as reasons for pursuing the new venture. Griesemer gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Technology and Extended Learning at the University of Denver." In it, he emphasized the society-wide changes and new paradigms that are profoundly affecting higher education. He described the current competitive landscape of higher education, and outlined the options available to institutions like DU. According to Griesemer, the extended learning initiative is intended to develop a new platform for DU to compete effectively in the distance arena by strategically deploying the intellectual assets of the university world-wide. According to the new model, distance initiatives will be developed in partnership with DU colleges and divisions and outside partners. These initiatives will have to be of high quality, market sensitive, and fast moving. Content and delivery partnerships, must be developed, and distribution ownership negotiated.

Arthur Best did ask if it would be appropriate for the Academic Planning Committee to be involved in planning the initiative. Les Goodchild, mentioned that firms like E-College provide infrastructure support. He also questioned the implications of distance learning for faculty workloads. Bob Stencel asked if it would be appropriate to form a task force from the Senate to take a look at accreditation issues. Gerry Chapman questioned the validity of the organizational structure of the new division, indicating that "President" might not be an appropriate academic designation. Jack Donnelly asked how traditional units would be integrated into technology assisted learning on campus? Kathryn Potter indicated that financing such an expensive venture would require substantial funding up-front. Carol Naapholz asked what the planning implications are for migrating traditional undergraduate programming to non-traditional delivery. Greg Robbins asked if graduates of the ELD degrees would be employable? Would they be able to get into graduate programs?

Griesemer made an attempt to answer each of these questions. He indicated that any contracts with outside vendors needed to be analyzed carefully, lest DU give away its intellectual capital to a competitor. Faculty workload issues have not yet been determined. Nor have organizational structures or titles. When a model is assembled at it will be business-like in structure. On-campus integration will be accomplished by use of two distinct platforms: the old and the new. There will be expenses up-front, but DU is already spending its resources on this. If University College, the Graduate School of Social Work, etc., combine resources, there will be little need for up-front investment. Most of the schools playing in the distance arena are already accredited, and their graduates are being recognized by accrediting agencies. It is inconceivable that business won't hire ELD grads.

At this point, incoming President Susan Sadler took over the meeting. Bidding Arthur Best good-bye, he presented her with a gift box containing aspirin, whisky, and chocolates. Susan presented Arthur with a decorative plaque commemorating his service to the Senate.

Provost's Report. Zaranka reported that enrollment is up. Last year at this time 816 first-time students were enrolled. This year the university budgeted for 870. There has been a 10% increase in applications, and a 24% increase in deposits. As of May, 958 deposits had been received. Now this issue is how to control the size of the incoming class. Only ~900 new students can be handled effectively. In addition, international and minority student applications are also up. As of May, no further new students will be accepted. In addition, the quality of applying students is also up. In the past, DU has targeted students falling between 3-4 on a scale of 1-9, where 9 is low. This years applicants are being accepted at a range of 1-2. Last year 88 students fell into this range. This year, 152 have been accepted. Financially, these changes have implications for the budget. Whereas the projected discount rate was 32.5%, selectivity is now an option. Andre Kutateladze asked if it was true that the university was returning deposits. Zaranka indicated that this was true, except in areas where the university hoped to build, like among minority and international student populations.

Election Results. Sadler announced that Kathryn Potter has agreed to serve as Executive Secretary; Barbara Wilcots has been elected Member at Large to the Executive Committee; and Joseph Kraus has accepted another term as the editor of the Faculty Forum. Dean Saitta was elected Senate representative to FEAC.
Follow-up to faculty vote on Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal. A new count has been taken of the units involved in the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal, including the three that had remained outstanding at last meeting. Sadler summarized the Senate concerns, and opened the floor to discussion, before taking a vote on the Revised Notice of Motion from the Executive Committee.

She reminded Senate that it had been suggested that the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee be designated an *ex officio* member of the Faculty Senate. Jack Donnelly asked why DCB had voted against the Core Curriculum Proposal. Leon Giles indicated that those voting felt that the Core contained inadequate preparation in mathematics. Gordon von Stroh concurred, then asked how members of the Core Committee were to be selected: by election or appointment? He urged that Senate take a proactive stance in mediating Core concerns. Les Goodchild asked if, in the case of a tie, the Senate should do a follow-up vote, especially in matters pertaining to broad curricular reform. He then seconded the motion that the Senate should consider a vote of confidence for curricular decisions. Jack Donnelly moved to table the motion, saying that a “vote to table will allow us to vote, because the procedural issue was not resolved last time.” Arthur Best seconded Donnelly’s motion. 8 voted to table the motion; 10 voted to vote. Discussion followed on the importance of a vote of confidence. 13 voted in favor of Senate voting to affirm the Core Curriculum Proposal; 5 voted against. 23 voted for voicing support; 1 voted against; there were 6 abstentions. *The senators in the Faculty Senate support the vote of the faculty in regards to the Undergraduate Curriculum Proposal.*

**Report from Graduate Council.** Les Goodchild announced that the Graduate Council has approved a new Ph.D. in Engineering. Discussion will continue through the summer. Next meeting of the Graduate Council will be in Fall 2000.

**Recognition Awards.** Susan Sadler thanked her outgoing board, and gave gift certificates to outgoing members of the Executive Committee.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting of incoming Executive Committee convened.

Respectfully submitted, Deborah S. Grealy 8/15/00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHUM/SOCS/NSME</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSIS/DCB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>