

Faculty Senate President's Report
Academic Year 2014-2015
Prepared for the June 5, 2015 Meeting of the Board of Trustees

Arthur C. Jones

We organized the work of the Faculty Senate this year around our guiding theme, “Transcending Our Silos.” Key to the successes we achieved was the active involvement and leadership of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We aimed to increase the overall level of active engagement on the part of faculty senators, and we hoped for a beginning transformation in the culture of the senate, in parallel with the campus-wide work that is occurring in the “Imagine DU” phase of the Chancellor’s strategic planning initiative. At the beginning of the year, we outlined five subthemes to guide our work:

1. Stepping Up to Shared Governance and Faculty-Staff-Student Collaboration

An encouraging tone was set early in the fall quarter with the final phase in the passage of the revised Appointments, Promotion and Tenure document. With genuinely active engagement by senate leaders, senate membership at large, the Provost and the Faculty and Educational Affairs Committee (FEAC) of the Board of Trustees, the revised document was passed during the Winter Break by electronic vote, with support of 90 percent of voting senators (65 percent “turn-out”) and 88 percent of faculty members who voted (56 percent “turn-out”). Highlights of the final document included a clearer framework for academic freedom, a provision for multi-year contracts along with guidelines for promotion for non tenure-line appointed faculty members, and a change in title for “lecturers” to “teaching professors.”

Approved by the Board of Trustees in January, the 2015 APT document has attracted attention nationally and is considered by some academic leaders, including leaders of the American Association of University Professors, to be a national trendsetter in a number of respects. Most notable is the framework for increased job security for all appointed faculty members, with the anticipation of increased levels of faculty engagement in the institution. This is a significant achievement for us at DU. The quality of the document we have produced is the result of active engagement by multiple university stakeholders.

At the end of AY 2013-2014 an ad hoc committee was formed to explore possible models of post-tenure review for tenure-line faculty. This was an issue that was pulled out of the APT revision because it is complex and potentially controversial, and risked delaying the implementation of other new APT policies, which had relatively more broad places of consent, even in the initial discussions. The work of the ad hoc committee is still underway. A summary of the year's work and upcoming plans is included at the end of this report, in the appendix.

Another opportunity for shared governance has been provided by initial conversations between Faculty Senate leaders and the Provost and Chancellor concerning the appointment of faculty members to university-wide committees. While faculty members serve actively on both Board of Trustee committees and other university committees, there is considerable untapped talent among the faculty, and we look forward to further conversations aimed at incorporating a wider array of faculty talent in the conceptualization and implementation of university-wide initiatives.

Current structures in place, including regular meetings involving Faculty Senate leaders and the Chancellor and the Provost, provide fertile ground for expanding opportunities for shared governance.

With respect to faculty-staff-student collaboration, we made some beginning progress this year, and we hope to do more in the coming year. Faculty, staff and student leaders began meetings early in the fall to talk about shared goals. Throughout the year, staff, student and faculty organizational leaders kept in touch. Additionally, The Staff Advisory Council President and Faculty Senate President included each other in their respective organizations' listserv announcements so that they could keep abreast of the weekly work of both organizations.

For the annual DU Diversity Summit held in January, representatives from Faculty Senate, Staff Advisory Council, Undergraduate Student Government, and Graduate Student Government organized a forum to discuss inclusive excellence initiatives being forged by all four groups and to solicit input from Summit participants. The session was well attended. Survey results from the forum suggested that the session was also informative and helpful to Summit participants. Participants from all of the participating organizations experienced their work together on this event as an important preview of future collaborative projects.

2. Championing Safety, Access, and an Actively Inclusive Campus Culture

At the first Faculty Senate meeting in the fall, we welcomed Kathryn Grove, acting Title IX coordinator, to debrief senators in the wake of the extensive press coverage during Summer 2014 about DU's inclusion on the list of campuses who are under investigation by the Title IX Office of Civil Rights. Ms. Grove cleared up confusion about what this means (the fact that a complaint has been filed, and not that DU has been found to have been in violation of Title IX policies). Beyond this, she

invited senators to be involved in ongoing efforts at DU to create a safe campus for both women and men. She especially encouraged unique contributions that faculty members can bring to the table, including the design and implementation of scholarly projects focused on Title IX issues. This is ripe for follow-up, as there was surprisingly little discussion in response to Ms. Grove's appeal.

An invitation was extended to all faculty members to participate in sessions scheduled for faculty interviews with finalists for the newly created full-time Title IX Coordinator position. Although only a handful of faculty members (including the Faculty Senate President) participated, those who did attend the faculty sessions with the finalists were successful in bringing unique faculty perspectives to the process. Faculty participants also provided feedback to the search committee on each candidate (all were strong!), and were very pleased with the appointment of Jean McAllister to the position.

We have considerable work to do to engage faculty members more fully in the multi-layered issues surrounding Title IX. At the end of the academic year, a link to an initial online Title IX training module, required by the federal government, was distributed to all faculty members. Early in the coming academic year we will ask Jean McAllister to help us brainstorm ways to bring the Faculty Senate into active leadership in this arena.

With respect to broader issues of inclusive excellence, the scope of our possible areas of focus is unlimited (and potentially overwhelming). This year we chose to focus on three circumscribed but significant issues: course evaluations, implicit bias, and faculty hiring. These issues overlap in many ways but are also distinct in other respects and are all critical elements in the immensely complex task of creating an inclusive campus culture.

We worked with Associate Provost Jennifer Karas to include two questions in all First Year Seminar course evaluations, to assess the extent to which students experienced the seminars as intellectually inclusive and as providing an inclusive learning environment. The two questions were:

- 1) The course experience provided an inclusive environment for learning.
- 2) The course experience enhanced my respect for multiple perspectives.

On a 6-point Likert scale, the average (mean) student ratings for these two questions were 5.3 and 5.4 respectively, comparable to the generally high ratings in response to all of the course evaluation questions for First Year Seminars. We are planning follow-up meetings to discuss the results from this pilot experiment, refine the questions, and consider expanding evaluations into courses in the common curriculum.

In Winter Quarter 2015 we invited Dr. Patricia ("Patty") Powell, Associate Dean of Student Affairs at the DU Sturm College of Law, to do a presentation on the concept of implicit bias. Dr. Powell is known

for her engaging and effective presentation style, and her comprehensive knowledge of the research on implicit bias, which is an unconscious but very real phenomenon, in which we *all* can perceive members of historically marginalized groups through a negative lens, even we are consciously trying to avoid this kind of bias. This, in turn, influences our judgments of the talents and abilities of prospective campus community members. Dr. Powell's presentation was well received by senators, and paved the way for the next issue on the year's agenda, which was the crafting of a resolution to jump-start a process aimed ultimately at significantly increasing the compositional and intellectual diversity of our faculty.

A faculty hiring resolution was crafted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, with input from the Provost, the Chancellor, the Associate Provost for Inclusive Excellence and the Director of Diversity Recruiting. After gathering all the input, an initial draft of the resolution was brought to the Senate and circulated to the deans. Predictably, it generated considerable discussion, including concerns about the legality of a proposal to work towards establishing as an institutional norm (with appropriate training and support) the practice of including in each finalist pool at least one candidate who broadens compositional diversity for the hiring discipline conducting the search.

After two rounds (two meetings) of discussions, in-person and electronic feedback from senators, and revisions in wording based on feedback received, the following resolution was passed at the May 22nd Faculty Senate meeting, with 84 percent "yes" votes:

- a) In all faculty searches, the interview process will include at least one question that asks candidates about their demonstrated accomplishments and experience as they relate to diversity and inclusive excellence (e.g., accomplishments and experience working in or with diverse communities, accomplishments and experience with classroom pedagogies that successfully impart to students an understanding of the nature, sources, and value of diversity, etc.).
- b) Finalist campus interview pools should include at least one candidate who broadens compositional diversity for the hiring discipline involved, in keeping with the best practices and procedures outlined by DU's Office of Equal Opportunity.
- c) The Faculty Senate goes on record as advocating for the creation of a clear and defined process of training, support and accountability for deans and faculty search committees to establish the above two steps as legally sound norms for faculty searches at the University of Denver, drawing on the resources and expertise of Human Resources; the Diversity Council; the Office of the Senior Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity and Inclusive Excellence; University Counsel; and the strong leadership and support of the Provost and Chancellor.

The passing of this resolution is simply the *beginning* of an effort to develop a culture in which multiple campus stakeholders embrace increased faculty diversity as one element in DU's increasingly strong commitment to principles of inclusive excellence as institutional imperatives.

Beginning in Fall Quarter 2014 we also hosted at Faculty Senate meetings a two-part discussion of final reports of work by scholars at both DU and Northwestern University focused on the Sand Creek Massacre. We anticipate coordinating with the work of DU the ad hoc committee on Sand Creek, organized by the Provost and Chancellor, to formulate a set of recommendations to enrich campus-wide inclusive excellence initiatives.

3 & 4. Exploring Global Models of Community Engagement, Civic Responsibility, and Public Good; Visioning New Channels for Encouraging and Supporting Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research

Prof. Anne DePrince, Faculty Director of the DU Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (CCESL), came to the Senate during the fall quarter to lead us in a discussion of community-engaged scholarship, teaching and service learning and to encourage senators to brainstorm ways in which they can lead discussions in their units focused on community-engaged work, in the spirit of DU's stated identity as "a great private university dedicated to the public good."

In Winter Quarter, CCESL hosted a breakfast meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Dr. Barbara Holland, a national expert on community-engaged scholarship, scheduled in conjunction with Dr. Holland's visit and talk to the campus community.

These beginning explorations will which help pave the way for the Senate's coordination with the Chancellor's strategic planning initiative, which has included, in the "Imagine DU" phase, an examination of DU's relationship to Denver and the wider national and global community.

Interdisciplinary scholarship and research, while connected implicitly to community-engaged work, is a separate arena that we did not explore in any depth this year. Since it is another area embedded in the work of all three subgroups in the work of the "Imagine DU" phase of the Chancellor's strategic planning initiative ("Shape of Knowledge", "the Student Experience," and "Denver and Beyond"), we look forward to our engagement with the next phase of strategic planning that will begin this summer and continue into next academic year.

5. Forging Communication Across Faculty Senate Administrations

This year we have re-established a "Presidents' Council," something that was in place in some past Faculty Senate administrations. Past presidents Scott Leutenegger, Don McCubbrey, Michael Levine-Clark and Dean Saitta have been available in person and electronically for periodic conversation and

consultation, and we will continue in the next year with quarterly meetings to review the work of the Senate and discuss ways in which previously incomplete initiatives can be continued. We all agree that a two-year Faculty Senate term, while realistic in terms of multiple other faculty responsibilities and commitments, is also a short time frame for working on substantive projects. The Presidents' Council provides a creative way to maximize continuity.

Faculty Senate Elections

At the last meeting of the academic year on May 22nd, Kate Willink, Associate Professor, Department of Communication Studies, was elected to the position of President-Elect. She will serve as on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as President-Elect for one year and will begin a two-year term as Faculty Senate President on June 1, 2016.

The following candidates were elected to two-year terms as Faculty Senate officers:

Secretary: Erin Meyer, Assistant Professor, University Libraries

Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee Chair: John Hill

Finance Committee Chair: Ron Throupe, Associate Professor, Daniels College of Business (Real Estate Construction and Management)

Faculty Forum Editor: Megan Kelly, Lecturer, Writing Program (re-elected)

Executive Committee Members-at-Large:

Scott Johns, Senior Lecturer and Director of the Bar Pass Program, Sturm College of Law

Rick Leaman, Professor, Daniels College of Business (Accountancy)

Remarkably, there were 18 active candidates for six open senator-at-large seats. The following colleagues were elected:

Frédérique Chevillot, Associate Professor, Department of Languages and Literature

Michelle Hanna, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work

Ginni Ishimatsu, Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies

Judy Kiyama, Assistant Professor, Morgridge College of Education

Eleanor McNees, Professor, Department of English

After re-assessing her dual responsibilities as faculty member and associate dean, Michelle Hanna resigned from her newly elected position. Victor Castellani, Associate Professor in the Department of

Languages and Literature, the next highest vote getter, was then appointed to a two-year term as senator-at-large.

APPENDIX

Report to the Board of Trustees on Post-Tenure Review

May 28, 2015

Faculty Senate's Investigation of Post Tenure Review (June 2014-May 2015)

June 2014

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) committee convenes and elects Chip Reichardt and Kate Willink co-chairs. Three working subcommittees are created: 1) External Research (responsible for collecting and analyzing peer-reviewed research and information on other institutions' practices); 2) Internal Research (responsible for interviewing and surveying stakeholders within the University of Denver); and 3) Communication with the Faculty (responsible for communicating with faculty members).

Fall 2014

External Research Committee gathers information on Post-Tenure Review policies and procedures at other institutions (presented below). Internal Research Committee prepares interview protocols.

January 2015

TFPR committee co-chairs make a presentation to FEAC on the External Research subcommittee's preliminary findings and discuss the Internal Research subcommittee's questions concerning post tenure review in order to gather initial responses from FEAC members.

Winter 2015

The Internal Research Subcommittee meets with Provost Kvistad, Chancellor Chopp, and the Dean's Council to understand their concerns about tenured faculty performance review.

Spring 2015

The Committee begins to consider possible models for Post Tenure Review, including: 1) Enhanced Annual Review; 2) Triggered Consequential Performance Review, 3) and Comprehensive Periodic Reviews as part of a larger faculty development approach. The committee will continue to study these options over the summer.

The Enhanced Annual Review model extends the current annual reviews by adding developmental opportunities and an evaluation mechanism that could initiate a Triggered Consequential Performance Review. In a Triggered Consequential Performance Review only selected faculty members are reviewed, triggered by a series of unsatisfactory annual reviews and improvement plans are developed, as appropriate. Support for professional development is also provided, as appropriate. Progress is assessed and sanctions can be applied when progress is unsatisfactory. Part of a post tenure development model, a Comprehensive Periodic Review uses periodic reviews (every 5 to 7 years) as a lifecycle approach to faculty development, career planning, and assessment of both retrospective and prospective contributions and goals. Such a model requires concomitant developmental support from the university to create an environment conducive to career long faculty growth and development.

Summer 2015

The Communication subcommittee will survey DU faculty concerning Post Tenure Review using Qualtrics survey and analyze data. The Internal Research subcommittee will survey Deans and conduct individual interviews with Deans concerning Post Tenure Review. The External Research subcommittee will research best practices for post tenure development.