



University of Denver

FACULTY FORUM

Vo

we must aggressively encourage the creation and maintenance of the very highest standards for every one of our students, academic programs, and faculty. DU's future hinges on the excellence of our programs and our ability to communicate that story in the clearest, most coherent, and utterly compelling manner possible.

new ones that can propel us into the first rank of great

DU's LIS program is locally, regionally, and nationally known for graduating and placing students of exceptional caliber. Quality of professional programs is indicated by the following:

- Students know what to do and why they're doing it.
- They learn to challenge and change professional norms while they study them.
- They have the freedom and encouragement to go beyond the books they're reading.
- They learn to think critically about solving old problems with new solutions.
- They are successfully placed in positions where they can make a positive difference in the advancement of their profession.

More Thoughts on Academic Quality:

Transforming the Academy through Radical Inclusion
S. Lily Mendoza, Human Communications
(Excerpts from Keynote Address to Faculty and Graduate Students of Color, October 20, 2005)

We live in interesting times—they say this is actually a curse in Chinese when you're told, "May you live in interesting times!" Because what the phrase really means is, may you run into the most extraordinary challenges that will test your mettle, show the kind of gut you have. For sure, "interesting times" doesn't connote safety, or party time, but rather a bracing up for the difficult road that lies ahead.

They learn to think critically about soltraordinado am8)-5(Key3)-7()6(learn to)6(think cricad68TT1 1 TI 9ld)()01 TJ0nu[(mv

unravel the machinations of the will to power and to global domination must come from the margins, from the underclasses, from those for whom the dominant ideology doesn't work, who know in their gut its violence, deprivations, and ultimate consequences despite its glittering promises.

Let me make clear: I have no illusions about the academy having shown itself much to be such a place as would welcome, in the words of Foucault, the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges." My own despair at the academy is the contradiction inherent in its structure that seems to dictate that for one to have been given access to its hallowed halls is already, in effect, to step into privilege. This is the dilemma of the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire when asked whether his method of critical pedagogy—whose goal is societal transformation and the ending of oppression in all its forms—would work in the First World academy. He notes in an interview, "Obviously, a power elite [insofar as he sees first world academies as primarily elite institutions] will not enjoy putting in place and practicing a pedagogical form or expression that adds to the social contradictions which reveal the power of the elite classes. It would be naive to think that a power elite would reveal itself through a pedagogical process that, in the end, would work against the elite itself."

At the same time, to the extent that ideologies themselves are not seamless but themselves require tremendous labor of power to maintain their appearance of naturalness and legitimacy, I find hope in being able to find those places where I might insert myself, make visible their cracks and contradictions, and work to either transform or displace them.

Central to this task of transforming the academy is the achievement of diversity in higher education. And here, I'd like to share from the observations of Chicano anthropologist Renato Rosaldo in his volume, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* on what it takes to achieve diversity in higher education from his own 25-years of experience in working for radical inclusion in the academy.

Rosaldo identifies certain characteristic phases in processes of institutional change, e.g., initial efforts tended to concentrate on getting people in the door. He remarks, "Institutions of higher learning appeared to tell those previously excluded, 'Come in, sit down, shut up. You're welcome here as long as you conform with our norms.'" He calls this "the Green Card phase of short-term provisional admission in the name of increasing institutional inclusion and change."

Indeed, it is not unusual for an institution to pay homage to diversity as a value, but what is often not recognized are the kinds of changes needed to create an environment where difference is not only conceptually affirmed, but actually allowed to make a difference. It's been noted for example, that when all the material and symbolic representations around you

astonishingly graphic. More often they were downright crude, vulgar and demeaning.

Then one day the old boys' room was integrated. Both men and women began to hold their conversations there. The men had shockingly strong reactions. They felt uncomfortable; some said they were being silenced. One woman asked, "What exactly do you want to say about me? What have you become used to saying about me that you now feel inhibited about saying in my presence?"

The lesson of the story speaks for itself. Exclusionary environments foster a lack of accountability that in turn foments ignorance, prejudices, and the enjoying of privilege at the expense of others. And beyond political correctness, the struggle for justice and inclusion requires that we pay attention not to mere benevolent intentions but to the damaging *effects* that even the most benevolent of intentions can have.

Finally, the moment classrooms and institutions become diverse, change begins. There is no standing still. Rosaldo continues, "New students do not laugh at the old jokes. Even those teachers who do nothing to revise their yellowed sheets of lecture notes know that their words have taken on new meanings. New pedagogies begin.... Teachers find new ways to seek out pertinent works of high quality not only *about* people of color, women, gays, and lesbians but *by* them."

This is where change brought on by inclusion begins to entail pain and vulnerability and to demand as well a sharing of power. All of a sudden one can no longer be an expert in everything, one must rely on others, on one's students even, to teach one. "Instructors will probably find themselves listening to their students with the care and intensity that they once reserved for their own speech." The result is transformation. And for his money, Freire asserts, "Education is not the key to transformation, but transformation in itself is educational."

Which brings us back to the question of how now to articulate the concern for radical inclusion to that other sphere that we've mentioned at the beginning. If the academy were to be more than an institution of, by, and for, the ruling elite, what is to be our alternative vision for ourselves as its privileged members? Ultimately, what is the polity or community that we are wanting to be included in? Is it a vision of a global good where no one is excluded and no one has to suffer deprivation? Or is it ultimately to become

honorary members of the same ruling class that only earlier on had excluded us? As one astute black student says tongue-in-cheek, "I'm only after the right to oppress others as I have been oppressed. What's

In the end, the deep test of our struggle to transform the academy so that it includes all kinds of voices must finally be held accountable to a much deeper question of inclusivity, and that is, whether we can hold ourselves accountable to the kind of transformation that would allow us to be included as friend and ally in all of the communities that will never be part of the academy.

Information on the Faculty Review Committee (Input Requested):

What is FRC? When you as a faculty member feel you have a serious grievance -- unfairly denied tenure, systematically unfairly underpaid, saddled with impossible working conditions, or a similar problem -- there is a standard route for appeals; first to the head of your academic unit, then to the dean, then to the provost. If these appeals are denied, and you still believe you are right, you head for the last appeal within the University, a committee composed of your faculty peers. This is the Faculty Review Committee (FRC).

How does it work? The FRC is a committee of about ten members, chartered under the Faculty Senate Constitution. It works as an Advisory Committee to the Senate, but operates independently; it reports to the Senate on general concerns, but to the provost on each individual case. It may recommend remedies to the provost, if it finds inequities, injustices, or just procedural faults. How it is constituted and how it functions are detailed in the Senate Constitution, Art. VI, sec. A, available through the Senate Web site (from DU homepage, click on Faculty and Staff, scroll down to the bottom of the left menu to click on Faculty Senate).

What's up now? Some time ago, Faculty Review Committee requested instruction from the Faculty Senate on its mode of operation. In response, Nominations, Credentials & Rules Committee has drafted the By-law given below. Before we present the By-Law to the Senate for action, it will be scrutinized by University Counsel, and changes will probably be required. But first, before these negotiations begin, NCR wishes to present the draft to the faculty.

What you can do. Please look over the proposed By-law. Are there provisions you would like to change or add? Are there other problems you think we should address?

Please report your concerns to Nominations, Credentials & Rules c/o its co-chairs, Deb Grealy (dgrealy@du.edu) or Dennis Barrett (dbarrett@du.edu) before July 1.

Proposed Addition to By-laws of the Faculty Senate

IV. Operations of Faculty Review Committee

A. Prerequisites for Faculty Review Committee Action. The Faculty Review Committee shall consider grievances regarding administrative process, and complaints respecting faculty status, working conditions, or appointments. The Committee may review, investigate, evaluate and report, when:

1. the faculty member involved has made a written request to the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) of his or her academic unit to resolve the concern; and

2. the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) has responded, or has failed to respond within 30 days of receipt of the faculty member's request; and

3. the faculty member has made a written request to the Provost to resolve the perceived problem, within 14 days of receipt of a response from the Dean (or other highest administrative officer) or, if there is no response from that officer, 14 days after the 30-day period allowed for such a response in paragraph 2 above; and

4. the Provost has responded, or has failed to respond within 45 days of receipt of the faculty member's request; and

5. the faculty member has made a written request to the chair of the Faculty Review Committee to review, investigate, evaluate and report on the concern, within 14 days of receipt of a response from the Provost or, if there is no response from the Provost, within 14 days of the expiration of the 45-day period allowed for such a response in paragraph 4 above. This request shall include a concise statement of the problem, the appeals procedures already taken and the results thereof, a narrative of pertinent facts and circumstances surrounding the problem, and the relief sought.

B. Procedures for Action.

- a. Timing. Within 30 days of receiving a written request for review, investigation,

evaluation and report, the Faculty Review Committee shall make a written report to the Provost, to the faculty member, and to any administrative officers who have previously considered the problem.

- b. Investigation. The Committee shall investigate the facts alleged, and determine the position of the person or unit against whom the complaint is directed. Employees and/or administrators may be called to appear before the Committee. The Committee shall be granted access to any documents it deems pertinent to the case.
- c. Report. The report shall evaluate the administrative response to the faculty member's concern in the contexts of procedural fairness, academic freedom, and fidelity to the University's statement of vision, values, mission and goals, as adopted by the Board of Trustees. It may recommend remedies either for procedural inadequacies or for inequities or injustices. However, if the Faculty Review Committee determines that the prerequisites described in section A above have not been met, its report shall be limited to a statement and explanation

C. Informal Consultation. A potential complainant is advised to seek informal consultation with the Committee chair before a formal request is filed, concerning such items as the procedures and criteria the committee uses.

Margaret Whitt, Editor, *Faculty Forum*

Faculty Senate Website: www.du.edu/facsen