Coronavirus: President Kennedy discusses the steps underway at CU[1]

Coronavirus pandemic prompts commencement cancellations[2]

The public health crisis brought about by the spread of COVID-19, or the new coronavirus, continues to present ramifications across the University of Colorado system, where leaders are monitoring and assessing the situation.

Recent event cancellations include spring commencement ceremonies at all four campuses and CU Boulder’s Conference on World Affairs.

To minimize the potential spread of coronavirus, events or face-to-face meetings (on-site and off-site events sponsored by the university) should be avoided. Meetings should be virtual, when feasible.

Ongoing identification of COVID-19 testing and results are being tracked across the CU system. Health resources, including those for mental health, remain available through each campus.

Campus and system administration emergency operations committees continue to meet and communicate daily to address emerging issues and ongoing planning brought about by the coronavirus pandemic. Matters continuing to be monitored and addressed include:
- remote working
- remote learning and teaching
- research and lab continuity
- facility (classroom, library, dining/housing, library, etc.) closures across the system
- continuity of operations planning
- travel restrictions

For the most up-to-date, campus-specific information, please refer to these resources:
- CU Boulder: https://www.colorado.edu/coronavirus
- UCCS: https://covid19.uccs.edu
- CU Denver: https://www1.ucdenver.edu/coronavirus
- CU Anschutz Medical Campus: https://www.cuanschutz.edu/coronavirus
- CU system administration: https://www.cu.edu/coronavirus

CU names finalists for Denver campus chancellor[10]

Harness the potential of LinkedIn Learning at online link-ups[11]

In a rapidly changing world, the University of Colorado wants to prepare employees for the path ahead. That’s why the university offers no-cost access to LinkedIn Learning[13], an online learning library, featuring options from 5-minute videos to comprehensive learning paths on leading industry topics. With so much to choose from, it can be difficult to decide what is best for your career goals.
That’s why Learning Link-up virtual workshops are being held April 6-8: We’ll help you harness the full potential of this CU professional growth resource. This hourlong workshop explores how to use LinkedIn Learning to keep your skills fresh.

Participants will:
Identify LinkedIn Learning resources to keep their skills up-to-date, learn new skills or easily maintain and prepare for professional certifications. Use LinkedIn Learning resources to create or update your LinkedIn profile. Review best practices for establishing privacy and security settings on LinkedIn.
Register today for an online session:
April 6, Noon-1 p.m.
Register: http://www.cvent.com/d/1nqx5l
April 7, 9-10 a.m.
Register: http://www.cvent.com/d/7nqsbg
April 7, 12:30-1:30 p.m.
Register: http://www.cvent.com/d/7nqx50
April 8, 10-11 a.m.
Register: http://www.cvent.com/d/znqx5w

CU Faculty Voices: The time has come to stop supporting for-profit journals

Editor’s note: This is one in a series of commentaries by CU faculty, presented by the Faculty Council Communications Committee and CU Connections. Learn more here and submit your own column pitch.

By Christopher Bell

Let’s not beat around the bush: The for-profit academic journal system is a flawed scam, and as a university, we need to stop treating it like the end all, be all of publishing, particularly for emerging and early career scholars.

So much of the progress of scholarship that “counts” toward promotion and tenure is tied to publication in so-called “top-tier journals.” But make no mistake: Those journals are at the center of a completely corrupt system by which those who are exploited in the process are forced to beg to be a part of the process, complicit in their own degradation.

In no other enterprise are people asked to volunteer the products of their labor, which are then distributed by a volunteer to other volunteers for critique, then returned to the originator for more labor, which is then taken – for free – by a corporate entity that packages said labor product for distribution behind paywalls and subscriptions, the gains from which the originator of the labor will not see a single red cent. And we, in academia, force (through peer pressure and, at times, contractual obligation) scholars into participation in this system, because those publications “count” for more.

The value of peer review is didactically deemed as “worth” the exploitation of the process itself (although the intrinsic value of peer review in the first place is a constant source of debate; Richard Smith wrote quite an astounding piece in The Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine in April 2006 that castigates the entire flawed enterprise. Download it and read it; I am sure you are savvy enough to gain access beyond its paywall.). A new scholar who questions the relative value of peer review and for-profit journals, and pushes for distribution through alternate venues and practices, is often treated as though their work is empirically worse – even though such categorization is patently ridiculous.

One of my key research agendas, my most closely held platform, is that of knowledge democracy. The body of knowledge generated at universities in academia should not belong to, nor should it be solely distributed among, other
academics. Every person in society should be free to learn, and the knowledge we generate in the university should be (in a perfect world) freely available to the citizenry. Every ounce of knowledge produced by the university that is hoarded behind an academic journal paywall is an affront to the very idea and mission of the university.

That is not to say that a scholar should always give away their intellectual property for free; only to say that under the current system, scholars are already pressured to give their intellectual property away for free, yet the knowledge is being given for free to a corporation who is then going to sell it, often to a marketplace in which many developing scholars are financially unable to purchase it.

When one submits the products of one’s labor to a for-profit academic journal, one is allowing a middleman to charge exorbitant fees for access to knowledge itself. Producing research is hard work; quality research takes hours and hours of study, writing, revision, editing and crafting. The business model of for-profit academic journals has quite literally no right to enclose and distribute the knowledge generated through that process without taking into account the labor involved in its creation. The article you have written is the direct product of actual work. You, as the author, deserve compensation for your labor. It can cost upwards of $50 for someone not affiliated with a university to download and read a journal article – how much of that $50 is paid to the author? To the editors? To the peer reviewers?

This business model also limits the access to knowledge to those in relatively wealthy communities that can afford journal access. For those scholars in less-developed countries, or in communities where scholarship is neither funded nor valued, they can be effectively locked out of learning by journal paywalls. It is completely unethical and undemocratic by design.

Although there has been a rise in alternative scholarship distribution venues – open-access journals, for example – those have been greeted with mistrust and condescension within many academic circles. Those journals lack so-called “impact factor,” an arbitrary measure of the reach of one’s academic work (a study in the biological sciences deemed impact factor to be “widely acknowledged [as] a poor indicator of the quality of individual papers, [although] it is used routinely to evaluate research and researchers” (Lariviere et. al. 2016).)

In the digital age, podcasting is easier to produce and more accessible than many venues for academic scholarship; distributing one’s work via podcast is often termed “creative work” rather than “scholarly activity.” According to multiple studies, the last person to read an academic journal article is often the editor who accepted it for publication. Podcasting gives instant, up-to-the-minute statistics of downloads and listens. In January alone, over 3,000 people downloaded and listened to episodes of my academic podcast, The Deconstruction Workers. How many people accessed and read your academic journal article last month? How would you even know?

Breaking the back of this unethical system will be neither easy nor quick. It relies on that most uncommon of virtues: a willingness to refuse to haze others in the way one has been hazed. It requires those of us who are established scholars (read: tenured) to say, “Enough is enough. We will not require new scholars to give their labor to corporations for free, even though that’s how we got tenure.” It will require established scholars to support alternative scholarship distribution, through open-access journals, podcasts, YouTube channels (watch three Lindsay Ellis videos and tell me she isn’t a “real scholar”) and the like. It will require us to rewrite our scholarship criteria for promotion and tenure in ways that no longer preference “top tier journals” that are exploitative by nature and design. Most of all, it requires established scholars to stop the practice of saying things like, “I did it this way. Why can’t you?”

Your own complicit exploitation should be no justification for encouraging others to allow themselves to be exploited.

When a new scholar asks where to publish a piece, instead of defaulting to The Journal of This is Where You Have to Publish to be Taken Seriously, encourage that scholar to publish as a book chapter – or, even better, to expand the work to a monograph so that they can be justly compensated. Encourage that scholar to speak rather than to wait for three other arbitrarily assigned “reviewers” to give them “permission” to speak. Encourage them to present that research at conferences, where reviewers are forced to give their feedback without the comfortable anonymity of “blind review” and have to say it to the scholar’s face. Then back that scholar when s/he includes the work on CVs, and in promotion and tenure documents, and on annual reviews.

There is an intrinsic asymmetrical power relationship in the world of academic publishing between those who produce
labor and those who reap financial reward for that labor. In no other profession would one be expected to give 100% of one’s labor for zero compensation, as historically, that practice has been rightfully termed “slavery.” Although I, too, once subjected myself to this practice, I have not submitted to a for-profit journal in years – and have (now publicly) refused to ever do so again, regardless of what imaginary, so-called “tier” the journal exists in.

But that’s easy for me to say; I have tenure, and there are dozens of early career scholars in the University of Colorado system who do not. The most significant contribution that I can make to the academic profession is to use my position of relative privilege to attempt to dismantle the system of exploitation from the inside. We should not be beholden to the naked corporate self-interest of for-profit academic journal publishers, and we should protect our pre-tenure scholars from the idea that these types of journals are the only scholarship distribution venues that matter. Whether we have the nerve and the will to take up the challenge remains to be seen.

Christopher Bell, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Media Studies in the Department of Communication at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. He specializes in the study of popular culture, focusing on the ways in which race, class and gender intersect in different forms of children’s media. Recognized nationally for his expertise in the area of children’s culture, he teaches both theory and methodology courses in critical analysis of popular culture, rhetorical theory, representation theory and the history of mass media. Bell is a TED speaker, a diversity and inclusiveness consultant for Pixar Animation Studios, a 2017 David Letterman Award winning media scholar, and the 2017 Denver Comic-Con Popular Culture Educator of the Year.
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**Staff Council moves professional development event to fall.**[27]

Because of concerns about the coronavirus outbreak, the University of Colorado Staff Council’s (UCSC) Professional Development Day and Recognition Lunch, originally set for April, has been postponed until later in the year.

The annual event, which honors university staff members who have “gone above and beyond their job duties and who have surpassed expectations,” has been rescheduled for Sept. 25.

“Like many who have had their plans upended by the current pandemic, we struggled with this decision, but felt it was the most responsible course of action given the circumstances,” said UCSC Chair Ryan Untisz. “Staff Council is ready to do our part in keeping staff and the community safe.”

**Uncertainty looms over state budget, higher ed funding.**[28]
In an unprecedented move during unprecedented times, the Colorado state Capitol Democratic and Republican legislators voted to recess the 2020 legislative session because of COVID-19.

Our government affairs and budget teams are working with the Joint Budget Committee and other legislative leaders to determine what funding for higher education will look like with the dramatic decline in the revenue forecasts issued on Monday by both Legislative Council and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. There is nearly $1 billion less revenue available compared to what had been projected in December.

“We’re doing everything we can to minimize the long-term economic impact of this global pandemic and ensure that Colorado is prepared to come back stronger than before when this crisis is over,” Gov. Jared Polis said in a statement.

Our CU government affairs lobbying team advocated a 7% state funding increase for higher education, which was approved by the JBC on March 10. This decision would have resulted in CU receiving a state funding increase of about 6%. The JBC also approved tuition rate authority of up to 3% for governing boards around the state.

These JBC decisions will now be revisited because of how the coronavirus is forecasted to impact state revenues. Higher education will not be alone: All of the JBC’s prior decisions will now be reconsidered. The Legislature is expected to reconvene on March 30, however given the recent closures, we anticipate they could push that date back.
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Coats credits post-graduate certificate with where she is today

Silva joins Finance and Business Strategy as assistant vice chancellor for business strategy
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