**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**
**FACULTY SENATE**
Minutes
April 28, 2017
Room 510
Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science

**Senators (or proxies) present:**

Doug Allen (also proxy for Nancy Sampson), Alvaro Arias (proxy for Ronnie Pavlov), Lynn Baker, Davor Balzar (proxy for Kingshuk Ghosh), Jeff Bowen, Ryan Buller, Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Santhosh Chandrashekar (proxy for Armond Towns), Sara Chatfield (proxy for Joshua Wilson), Fred Cheever, Frédérique Chevillot, Kate Crowe, Jared Del Rosso (also proxy for Paul Colomy and Raúl Pérez), Ron DeLyser, Claude d'Estrée, Catherine Durso (proxy for Anneliese Armschler Andrews), Maha Foster, James Gilroy, Jennifer Greenfield (also proxy for Shannon Sliva), Sarah Hart-Micke, Cynthia Hazel, Annabeth Headrick, John Hill, Scott Howard, Barb Hurtt, Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Nadia Kaneva, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Paul Kosempel, Rick Leaman, Jing Li, Zulema Lopez, Brian Majestic, Don Mayer, Steven Mayer, Eleanor McNees, Laleh Mehran, Gloria Miller, Julianne Mitchell (also proxy for Stephen von Merz), Sarah Pessin, Amy Phillips, George Potts, Tom Quinn, Carl Raschke, Magdelana Red (proxy for Michelle Kruse-Croker), Chip Reichardt, Martin Rhodes, Jason Roney, Dale Rothman, Dean Saitta, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro (also proxy for Melanie Witt), Orna Shaughnessy, Derigan Silver, Dan Singer, Amrik Singh, Shannon Sliva, Mary Stansbury, Margareta Stefanovic, Kate Stoker, Billy J. Stratton, Matthew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, Ron Throupe (also proxy for Amrik Singh), John Tiedemann, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels (also proxy for John Campbell), Gwen Vogel Mitchell, and Kate Willink

**Call to Order & Approval of Minutes**

Kate Willink, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 12:00 PM.

A motion to approve the minutes from the March 31, 2017 meeting was seconded and approved.

**Annual Report from DU Athletics and Recreation**

President Willink then invited Stu Halsall, Associate Vice Chancellor for Recreation and Ritchie Center Operations, and Cindi Nagai, Associate Athletic Director for Diversity/Student Athlete Support Services/Community Relations, to provide the annual update on DU Athletics and Recreation.

Halsall began by updating the Senate on progress on the Denver Tennis Park, which is a three year partnership with Denver public schools and key foundations in town. The park, which is near Washington Park, is nearing completion of fundraising. The park will provide a home to DU's men's and women's tennis program. It will also engage Denver Public Schools to expose students to tennis and the educational opportunities tennis provides. He then informed the Senate

that clubs and intramural sports have grown tremendously over the past decade. The Alpine Club is full and DU Athletics and Recreation is looking for ways to expand that program.

Cindi Nagai then addressed the Faculty Senate. She began by thanking faculty for supporting student-athletes. Nagai briefly reviewed the athletic accomplishments from winter quarter, including the men's hockey team's national championship victory over University of Minnesota-Duluth. She also noted that DU student-athletes have a cumulative GPA of 3.639, which compares favorably to the student body as a whole.

Following the presentations, the Senate briefly opened for questions.

Senator d'Estrée: What is the timeline for completion of the Denver Tennis Park and who will be responsible for outreach?

Halsall: We're still completing fundraising, so that affects timing. But it's a fourteen month building cycle once fundraising is complete. The Denver Tennis Park is a 501(c)(3). DU has a board seat, the Walton family has a board seat, Denver Public Schools has a board seat. There will be someone hired by this organization to do outreach. We anticipate that being done halfway through the construction schedule.

Another senator asked Halsall who would have access to the park.

Halsall: We're still working through those issues, and, right now, we're just focusing on the building side. But there are one hundred thousand hours of programming time. The core uses requires fifty percent of that time. The rest is still under consideration. Because we sit on DPS property, we have to be cognizant of use.

**Second Reading of Constitutional & Bylaw Clean Up Motion & Vote**

President Willink then invited Senator John Hill, Chair of the Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee, to address the Senate on the Second Reading of Constitutional & Bylaw Clean Up Motion & Vote.

Senator Hill noted that the revisions that the Senate is voting on are intended to align the Constitution and Bylaws with actual practices, remove outdated language (such as references to buildings that no longer exist), adapt titles for faculty to the APT, clarify two year terms for At Large position, change the Faculty Forum Editor position to Communications Officer, and change the bulleted outlines to a numbered outline. There is no intention to materially change anything in Constitutions and Bylaws. In Fall 2017, however, the Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee will consider substantive changes to the documents, such as language around the Faculty Athletic Committee's constitution. The Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee will also want to clarify and strengthen language around faculty engagement with the Board of Trustees.

Following Senator Hill's presentation, the Senate opened for discussion of the revisions.

Senator Bowen: 4.3.2 in the document sets a quorum at 40% of Senate members; I find that surprisingly low. That then allows a simple majority to pass motions, which essentially means that 21% of the Senate can do an awful lot.

President Willink: This is worth talking about when we do a substantive revision of the Constitution; if you're looking for light reading before you go to bed, these documents are wonderful material. But this document, as impenetrable as it is, lays out how we operate, make decisions, and who makes decisions. Because we are the governing body of the faculty, this is important, which is why we'll look more deeply at substantive changes next year.

Senator Hill: I'd add that that's not a proposed change. And what we're voting on today requires a quorum of 75% and a two-thirds vote. We don't propose to change those.

There were no other questions about the revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws. The Senate then voted by paper ballot on the proposed amendments to the Senate Constitution and the Senate By Laws. Both amendments passed with 79 "yes" votes, 0 "no" votes, and 1 abstention.

**Policies and Procedures for Professional Development First Reading**

Following the vote on the revised Constitution and Bylaws, President Willink introduced the first reading of the Policies and Procedures for Professional Development (hereafter "Policies and Procedures"). President Willink began by providing historical context for the Policies and Procedures document.

> The document is a result of a four year process, beginning in 2013-14 when the Senate created a Post Tenure Review Exploration Committee. This, in fact, grew out of Spring 2013, open campus discussions of Promotion and Tenure, as well as the Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure (APT) Committee discussions.

> The Faculty Senate established the Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) Committee (April 2014). This committee sought to create an alternative to the post-tenure review frame and strongly advocated for a developmental approach and one that applies and is equitable to all faculty.

> The belief is that a developmental approach can benefit all faculty in ways that post-tenure review cannot. Additionally, we have a lot of non-tenure track faculty and we wanted to create something that all can benefit all faculty.

> The Senate approved, in April 2016, the formation of a committee to establish Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development. This includes the creation of opportunities for faculty development, and also common sense policy recommendations that ensures accountability for performance, with generous opportunity for constructive mediation and ample protections via professional development opportunities, peer-to-peer conversations, and review.

> Note the new title. This is not a post-tenure review. And the Board is on board.

During the 2014-15, the Faculty Senate conducted a full faculty survey to get a sense of faculty members' interest in their careers, professional lifespan, and the developmental approach. We had a response rate of about 50-54%, which is substantially higher than the 8-10% response rate on most university surveys.

President Willink then presented the survey results on three questions.

Question 1: I would like the option to negotiate a shift in allocation of job responsibilities (from a traditional 40% research, scholarship, and creative activities, 40% teaching, and 20% service) after tenure.

Answer 1: Sixty-three percent of tenure-line faculty members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Question 2: I would like to receive direct professional development feedback not associated with pay, promotion, or contract.

Answer 2: Fifty-three percent of tenure line faculty members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Seventy-percent of non-tenure line faculty members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement

Question 3: Faculty members should be reviewed to identify unsatisfactory performance and determine whether remedial measures are necessary.

Answer 3: Seventy percent of tenure line faculty members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Eighty-four percent of non-tenure line faculty members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

President Willink then provided an overview of the implementation process, should the Senate approve the Policies and Procedures document.

June 2017: Board of Trustees would vote on whether to affirm (rather than approve) the document. All faculty voted on the APT and, in that case, the Board voted to approve it; this is because the APT is a shared document and they have shared ownership of it with us. The vote to affirm these Policies and Procedures means that the Board supports but does not have ownership of the document.

September 2017: Begin Peer-to-Peer Program.

September 2017: Job Responsibility Discussions begin for faculty who choose to initiate process.

Goal: Implementation work to be completed by May 2017 for end of Willink Presidency & Provost Kvistad's term.

January 2018: Begin Professional Development Discussion Program administered by mini CCESL-like program; estimated budget of $600,000 per year to allow all faculty to participate on a 3 year cycle for $2,000 funding (non-competitive application process). This proposed budget would cover all faculty, if all were to take advantage of this opportunity once over three years. This funding differs from existing streams. It is non-competitive; you'd still have to put together a limited application to make sure your use of funding is appropriate. But there would be sufficient funds for everyone.

Fall 2018: Implementation of Evaluation Into Annual Review.

President Willink then reviewed the Pilot Review Plans.

Most pilots turn into policies; I'm not aware of any Senate pilot program that has stayed under Senate control. This one would. Part of shared governance is coming up with norms and expectations for ourselves and judging whether this is working

Fall 2018: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will solicit and review faculty feedback on implementation & share findings with Senate

Fall 2019: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will solicit and review faculty feedback on this implementation & share findings with Senate

Fall 2020: Formal Pilot 3-Year Review-Senate Executive Committee and the Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development Committee will reconvene to consider the results of implementation, solicit feedback across campus, and make any necessary revisions to the document. This, then, will be reviewed by Faculty Senate

Fall 2023: If the program is continued in 2020, Review-Senate Executive Committee and the Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development Committee will reconvene to consider the results of implementation, solicit feedback across campus, and make any necessary revisions to the document. This, then, will be reviewed by Faculty Senate, which will allow for data and feedback on any cases involving negative or unanticipated consequences. We could also have data from the FRC appeals.

Finally, President Willink addressed concerns that the vote on the Policies and Procedures document is "coming very fast." She asked the Senate to consider how we can make sure that a "four year initiative with multiple votes doesn't then feel like it came out of nowhere. For instance, we voted on this last year, including the consequential elements." She continued,

So some of you may talk to colleagues; I circulate info in my newsletter; we've had previous meetings and discussions; but others aren't hearing this and are feeling like information is coming fast. Where are we having communication breakdowns and what can we do about it? Perhaps Senators aren't reporting back to their units and/or aren't

given time at meetings to talk about it. I think one problem is that there's a view that the Senate doesn't do anything. But now we're doing this and it seems like it comes as a shock. But we've voted at least three times; there have been multiple all university committees. Do folks have any thoughts on what can we do to improve communication?

The Senate then opened for a brief discussion of communication issues around the Policies and Procedures document.

Senator Sciarcon: In my department, we were caught off guard. While we've talked a lot about the document, we still weren't sure when we'd vote on it. And the document showed up in a Chairs and Directors meeting before it got to Senators.

President Willink: We can try to be clear on an ETA for a vote; but we can't always know in advance because the Executive Committee creates the agenda as we go. In terms of Chairs and Directors, we were trying to be inclusive and open to feedback across the university. Our hope was that feedback could be given along the way, rather than when this document is fully formed. We can be better about letting others know about this as we do it.

Senator d'Estree: This probably has to do with individual unit governance. But until I was joined by two colleagues as Senators, there wasn't any time put aside during unit meetings at Korbel to report about Senate. Now there's time to report, but there isn't time for discussion; there may be five minutes for me or Dale Rothman to report what happened at a Senate meeting. And this only started this year. It meant that my ability to capture colleagues in hallways was the limit of my ability to pass on what happens in the Senate. There's no surprise, then, when there's shock when a document like this is put together. We may need to encourage processes of governance across units so there's time for all units to learn about Senate issues.

President Willink: And I'm committed to talking to Deans, because I think messaging has to come across multiple sources. Some deans communicate that Senate is important; others describe it as a free lunch. So if you're a junior faculty and don't have the support that this is important, you may not have time to communicate to others about the Senate's work.

Senator Raschke: I'm new to Senate. I avoided being in Senate for three decades until word got out that things are happening here. But when I brought this to my department two weeks ago, I was amazed at the prejudice that this document is something that the Board has thrust upon us. One problem is that we are overwhelmed with messages. I can't even read my emails. Back in the old days, when it was a "do nothing" Senate, the Faculty Forum was a useful, centralized source of information. If we want faculty to take us seriously we need a strategy of communication, because trickle down communication doesn't work these days.

President Willink: We're working on this with our newsletter and with the news section of the website.

Senator Rhodes: When we considered the APT document, someone from the Senate came around departments and talked about this. It bypassed deans. This is so important. Professional development relies on faculty initiation. This has to be explained; I can talk to faculty but I can't explain that.

President Willink: That's true. This is complex.

Senator Kaneva: There is a distinction between knowledge of the process and faculty seeing a draft. I knew about the draft, but at every point I encountered a version of the document I was told it was a draft. So I refrained from sharing it because I thought the document was in flux. In reality, we didn't have a draft to discuss until Sunday.

President Willink: That's why we had that meeting in March to discuss this, but, yes, you didn't have a document until recently. There was an inordinate amount of work involved in creating that document, and we try to be consultative. Some of this was voted on last year. That said, we'll try to do better, but we've met what the Constitution requires. I think we need to spread the word that we are doing consequential work and we'd want the Senate to do consequential things. I hope we can find multiple ways to get word out.

I've found document to be a Rorschach test; we all see different things in it. Because we are a mid-sized institution that is highly complex, it becomes difficult to discuss how this impacts the whole campus. There's also the challenge about who we represent; many of us know our own ecosystems but what of others?

I can tell you some read the document in light of "worst case scenarios." Others say there are opportunities for development over a lifespan, sign me up. We should acknowledge these interpretations are effected by local environment. But some of the issues raised in response to the Policies and Procedures can't be addressed in the documents. These include:

- Distrust of chairs / perceived abuses of power by chairs / unit heads

- Inadequacy of Teaching Evaluations to Measure Teaching Performance. We've done a lot of work on this. So have units. This year we convened a committee to discuss this with the Office of Teaching and Learning and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. I expect in fall quarter we'll hear more about this.

- Challenges of Retaining Faculty

- Inequitable Teaching Load Distribution Across Departments / Units.

- Faculty Perceptions that Teaching & Service are undervalued at DU. There is a perception that teaching and service are undervalued. We've heard this from several places; part of our hope is that the Policies and Procedures document can shift that. But if you look back at your time at DU and that's your experience, I can understand this concern. We as a Senate should be talking about this—what do we value, how do we align our values with the university's values; and, in light of DU Impact 2025, which proposes some alternate values, how do we do this.

- Lack of Trust. This document raises issues of trust—in chairs, our units, and the administration broadly. I think that informs how we hear and read this document. I'd say these power structures exist already. But because of the uncertainty and distrust some find this document challenging.

President Willink then addressed the relative concern some faculty for the punitive aspects of the Policies and Procedures document and the relative concern others have for the developmental aspects.

> For some folks, the consequential aspects are the only thing that matters; it is the foreground. For others, myself included, the developmental aspects are the foreground. I want to change how we do development at this university. For others, the death star lurks behind the curtain. I want to acknowledge these other perceptions.

President Willink then reviewed the purpose and format of the meeting.

- Purpose for Committee: To gather feedback from Faculty Senators for the Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Committee to consider as it makes any revisions in preparation for the second meeting and vote (May 19).

- Purpose for Senators: To share their thoughts about the document, attain a deeper understanding of the document, and come away well-informed of its purpose and history.

  To this end, there is a 2 minute time limit (per comment). Ideas will be recorded for the Policies and Procedures for Professional Development Committee to consider in revisions. And we hope to foster the sharing of as many ideas as possible and create room for the greatest diversity of voices to participate in the discussion

Senator Reichardt then made a motion that the Senate approve the Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development Document.

Senator Stansbury: During an earlier discussion, I made a comment that the way the document is structured, it's not easy to say how a unit would accommodate percent of time faculty members spend on program development beyond service (e.g. strategic planning). Maybe the committee can add a footnote on the 40/40/20 distribution that acknowledges that program admin is different than service.

Senator Rhodes: I still don't understand how this happens in a given unit. Imagine I'm a second year, untenured, assistant professor. Is it up to me to convene a Peer-to-Peer conversation? Or is it someone in the unit who convenes it? How does it happen? Much of the document is non-evaluative. Then it leaps to evaluation. How do these work together? And why would you have a Peer-to-Peer Conversations if it's non-evaluative?

Senator Foster: How do we measure job responsibility distributions? Also, I find the lingo somewhat punitive. For someone who does not meet expectations, what are the steps to be taken on the part of administrators to help someone develop? Is it "go take a workshop?" Is it "go assign a tutor?" What are the steps to help this person develop and us to retain them?

Lisa Conant: I agree that the language is somewhat ambiguous. It may be well-intentioned, but it is ambiguous language, and it raises an important question: Do associate professors think they can decrease teaching loads and increase research? Or is it really about allowing faculty, post-tenure, to reduce research, increase teaching, and not be evaluated on research? Can we clarify

this throughout? Also, can the title be clarified? It may be signaling to the Board that this is about faculty development. But when we see the stuff about evaluation it's really about review and changes to job responsibilities,

Senator Kaneva: I want to follow up on Lisa's points. This treats faculty as individuals rather than as part of series. If faculty can negotiate individual change, imagine what happens as they go up for promotion, which involves review and evaluation by peers. This negotiation process conflicts with a standardized sort of peer review. Imagine two people going up for full professor. Do they have to 'admit' negotiations or do we lose these standardized formulas, because we're now not treating people as members of a series rather than members of corporate model?

Following this round of remarks, Senator Reichardt and President Willink responded.

Senator Reichardt: To Nadia—you've raised this issue about people having different standards. That happens now. One of the advantages of this document is that we now have to put this in writing so it's in the annual review. And we still need to take that into consideration during promotion. This makes it concrete so a committee can consider this.

The point on job responsibility distribution: it's not time based. When you're evaluated on promotion, these are the weights that are put on these job responsibilities. With a 40/40/20 distribution, research and teaching count twice as much as service and are weighted equally. Some faculty don't have a sense of this; this document tries to help it make concrete. At one point we had four categories for the job distribution, but it confused people. We could add a footnote.

Mary: Email me the ambiguous language. I appreciate that.

President Willink: Back to Martin Rhodes on the Peer-to-Peer conversations. It's supposed to be horizontal. There are two assumptions. One is that these are intentional conversations actually helping folks chart career paths and build network across campus. Also, Peer-to-Peer is not administered. A lot comes from you've said—some faculty don't trust chairs or units. We have tried to make the Peer-to-Peer a developmental option that faculty can do without relying on a chair. We don't want everything to go through chairs.

On other issues…we have job responsibility discussions and differential treatment already. But they're not equally available to everyone and that process is not transparent. One goal is to make access to resources equitable, so it's not just friends of chairs and top researchers who gain. And this would also invite DU to be flexible and not just in special circumstances

The Senate then opened for further discussion of the Policies and Procedures document.

Senator Cheever: With Martin, I'm stuck on sections 4 and 5. I assume assessment, as referenced here, is part of the traditional assessment practice and is unlinked to Peer-to-Peer conversations. If so, perhaps that could be made clear. Also, has this gone to university counsel because it changes the conditions of employment?

Senator Hazel: Can you really renegotiate any of these things? If I perform badly at service, can I really negotiate this? Also, there appears to be an assumption that tenure track faculty can renegotiate less research and more teaching. It gives a bad message about teaching. This is implied because when we look at the Non-Tenure Track Faculty salary report, we see Non-Tenure Track Faculty get paid less. But if a full professor can teach more and get paid the same, that really burns.

Senator Steven Mayer: On trust. There are different types of unit heads. Some are elected by faculty and rotate. But then there are the ones not elected and are instead appointed. The former unit head of mine served twenty-three years and was appointed. These unit heads do not operate with the assumption that they will return to teaching and be judged by peers. They are immune to the pressure of the consequences of their decisions.

Alvaro Arias: There are practical implications for job negotiations. If an associate professor negotiates to teach more, this can't be a decision to give up on promotion to full professor, despite the standard of international recognition of work.

Senator Singer: On 2.6—"Faculty members may request a change or agree to a change in the distribution of their job responsibilities and their job responsibility percentages. Any such request or agreement must be negotiated with the administrative head of the academic unit and must receive the approval of the Dean. Both the request and its approval must take into consideration the impact of such a change on the academic unit and the broader University."

I'd like clarification on what that means procedurally. Does this means that I submit a document with that section in it, or is it more general? How do we have this process that doesn't depend on exist relational between faculty and a chair?

On 2.7—I'm struggling to come up with a reasonable argument for the secrecy this allows. How does this not allow continued inequity?

I'm concerned that if this is a developmental document, why have adjunct faculty between excluded? If they're not in this document, it suggests that they're not "real" faculty.

Senator Kosempel: One question concerns Visiting Assistant Professors. Is this too onerous? And how are they included?

Also, why would this be affirmed and not approved by Board, and why is it not blended into the APT? Why are they separate documents? They might better fit together.

Following Senator Kosempel's comment, Senator Reichardt and President Willink responded.

Senator Reichardt: The Peer-to-Peer conversations are non-evaluative; they are completely separate from the annual reports. I won't do justice to all the questions, so please feel free to email me.

President Willink: And all notes will be sent back to the subcommittees.

Senator Reichardt: Faculty can indeed renegotiate any area. So, yes. But focus on *renegotiate*. Faculty have to take account of the needs of departments and units, presumably with chair and deans.

As for salary and teaching: that's an interesting point. We have to take that into consideration.

On the grievance process: there is a process already and anyone can make a grievance. And that can go to a committee of your peers.

On the APT: It does take precedence. You'd have to take that into account when you renegotiate; it could constrain your negotiations.

On the secrecy on 2.7: that's been controversial. Some want to know; some want no one to know. The language there is a compromise.

As for adjunct faculty, they're not included in the APT. Visiting Assistant Professors aren't either. We had to start somewhere and we started with APT.

President Willink: I agree with Dan Singer on transparency; the intention of the document is that if people will do job responsibility renegotiations, people in their departments should know. But it's a unit decision; unit would have to create their own policies. And faculty would have to vote on this.

I have a comment on this sounding corporate. We're doing a connection committee in AHSS. My colleagues don't see this as corporate. But the status quo is corporate. And we're trying to create new ways to build community across campus. These policies and procedures allow us to ask questions across campus, learn from others, and I'd argue that this is a shift.

Post-tenure review:  If you look at the APT, it says there should be no new forms of assessment. We're staying within the constraints of that.

Following President Willink's comments, the Senate opened for a final round of feedback.

Senator Greenfield: This is said to be all about negotiation, but there is a place in the document that allows the unit head or dean to simply mandate changes. That's where my concerns come in especially where we're just beginning to think about teaching evaluations. We know there are systematic problems for women and faculty of color. How does that intervene in all of this?

President Willink: Many units have research on this and about how we take into consideration documented bias in the evaluation process. We'd want to add a footnote to recognize this.

Senator Silver: To echo Lisa's point, the document is called "faculty development" and that's great. But I think it is disingenuous to deny negative consequences; I'd prefer two separate documents but we may not be able to do this. I'd like this to be very clear…and this should be narrowly defined and clear, if even harsh.

One sentence in document has nothing to do with consequence positive or negative: "The needs of a faculty member's academic unit can also change over time." These are forces out of our control and raises questions about what we do and what freedom we have.

I have concerns over employment law. I'm not sure if we can do this; we probably should talk to Paul Chan.

I also see the value of a sunset clause in this document; but I think the clause should have us vote to affirm again, not revisit.

Senator Headrick: I have concerns that it is not appropriate to require a Peer-to-Peer conversation, and there is a lot of confusion around this. There seems to be confusion over who was driving this Peer-to-Peer and this whole professional development idea. Are individual faculty choosing to drive their own professional development? Does that feed into overall assessment over time? If faculty choose not to participate in this, will that negative affect them in yearly assessment? So then the question becomes, why do this with everything else going on?

President Willink: One thing on the Peer-to-Peer conversations. We had folks from that committee talk to us in fall quarter. There needs to be an answer than just more communication. We've done more communication on this document than anything but the APT.

Senator Tiedemann: I'm thinking of this issue of foreground and background. There are a couple things I want to bring into foreground. I really like the combination of Peer-to-Peer conversations and a "mini-CCESL," which allows faculty to take charge of professional development. It wouldn't be something administered, but something we do ourselves. That combination of things is really very positive. What this document does is really allow us to take responsibility for our own development and for one another. Part of what I see happening is an effort to create structures through which a community of that sort invents itself.

Now on communication, no matter how much, we still need to look at info and think about being responsible for it. You're not just informed, but you own it. There all kinds of reasons one might not feel that way, but this is an effort to cultivate that responsibility. I appreciate this effort.

Senator Rothman: I want to return to whether this is obligatory. Much of this reads very much like its motivated by individual faculty members (especially the Peer-to-Peer Conversations). What if other faculty don't have time for this? I've had issues with lacking proper mentorship in my unit. Now, on the communication side, there's no discussion at the beginning providing an overview of the document. It almost jumps into the distribution of job responsibilities.

President Willink: We make time for MA students, dissertation defenses. We create these platforms and schedule them out. One reason for making this an institutional norm is that so you don't have to feel that you're asking so much when you ask two or three hours of someone's time every thousand days.

Lisa Conant: The APT says that we shouldn't have additional reviews. But this document says 3 out of 5 years… that seems like a very scheduled system.

President Willink: The APT says we can't have additional reviews that end in termination. For professional development, if you've been reviewed as unsatisfactory three out of five years, you go to a workshop. You get to choose. The chair doesn't get to impose a type of workshop. Same with the job responsibility discussions, though there's a different consequence.

Senator Rhodes: This is sort of utopian. We haven't had annual reviews in my unit in a decade. Is this a set of resources that you can have access to if you want or is it obligatory? And does this prevent units from developing their own post-tenure review?

President Willink: I think this prevents the Board from doing anything else, but I don't think that's why we should do it.

**Important upcoming events**

Following the first reading of the Policies and Procedures document, President Willink reviewed important upcoming events.

- Our final Senate meeting of the quarter is on May 19th and will last for 2 hours, from noon - 2:00 PM. Please plan accordingly.
    - At this meeting we will hold Senate Elections, do a Second Reading of the Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Committee Document and Votes on this & the Freedom of Expression Motion.
- Freedom of Expression (FOE) All Campus Meetings
    - Monday May 8th 12-2 AAC; Thursday May 11 7-9 Craig Hall.
    - DU Debate Team Forum on FOE Document Wednesday May 17 7:30-9:30 Driscoll Ball Room

**Adjourn**

President Willink thanked Senators. She then requested a motion to adjourn, which was quickly made and seconded from the floor. And so, at 1:30 PM, President Willink adjourned the meeting.

**Prepared and submitted by**

     Jared Del Rosso
Faculty Senate Secretary