

BACKGROUND
for
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, JOB
RESPONSIBILITY DISTRIBUTIONS, AND PEER-TO-PEER CONVERSATIONS

The present document is a good faith effort to provide an alternative to traditional post-tenure review at the University of Denver. A vote of the Faculty Senate in April 2016 established the guiding principles for the policies and procedures in the attached document. Those principles and the document itself are the result of three Senate votes and more than three years of significant work--reflecting, deliberating, and vetting--by over thirty faculty members in three Senate committees.

Over the years, interest in traditional post-tenure review had been building among some faculty members, chairs, deans, and trustees, both at DU and elsewhere. As a result of that interest, and based on the recommendation of the Senate's Post Tenure Review Exploration Committee, the Faculty Senate established the Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) committee in April 2014 to examine what post-tenure review might look like at DU. After extensive study, the TFPR committee decided not to recommend post-tenure review. Instead of post-tenure review, the TFPR committee recommended the University take steps to support faculty development for all faculty members throughout the full term of faculty members' careers. As a result of that recommendation, the Senate approved, in April 2016, the formation of a committee to establish Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development. The attached document is the work of that committee, based on the guiding principles approved by the Senate.

The present "Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development..." differ in important ways from traditional post-tenure reviews.

- The present policies and procedures **were developed by faculty at DU and are governed by the Faculty Senate**. Traditional post-tenure reviews consist of policies and procedures established by boards of trustees and regents.
- The present policies and procedures **entail no special committees and hence impose no additional evaluative burden** on faculty members. Traditional post-tenure reviews are conducted by committees of faculty members created specifically for the purposes of the reviews and thereby impose additional burdens on faculty members' service obligations.
- The present policies and procedures **involve no reviews other than the standard annual reviews**. Traditional post-tenure reviews are intensive, all-encompassing reviews, are conducted every three to five years, and are separate from annual reviews of job performance.
- The present policies and procedures contain provisions for faculty development that are independent of any review and that are **available to all faculty** and not just tenured faculty. Traditional post-tenure reviews contain no provisions for faculty development that are independent of the outcome of the reviews.
- The present policies and procedures **do not include the explicit threat of termination of employment**. Traditional post-tenure reviews include the explicit threat of termination of employment.

The present policies and procedures are based on both best practices for career development and desires expressed in a University of Denver faculty survey for additional developmental opportunities and academic career discussions. The intent of the policies and procedures is to provide opportunities for faculty development and academic career discussions that are transparent and equitable.

DRAFT

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, JOB RESPONSIBILITY DISTRIBUTIONS, AND PEER-TO-PEER CONVERSATIONS (May 14, 2017)

1. BACKGROUND SPECIFICATIONS

The following policies and procedures apply to all academic units¹ and all faculty members in all benefitted faculty series. Those include: tenure line Professorial Series, Professorial Series in University Libraries, Teaching Professorial Series, Clinical Professorial Series, Professors of the Practice Series, and Research Professorial Series. The University is encouraged to provide resources for chairs, directors, deans, and associate provosts to acquire the skills needed to implement the policies and procedures herein. Nothing in the present document substitutes for, or eliminates, policies and procedures in the University's "Policies and Procedures Relating to Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure" (the APT document).² For example, policies and procedures in the University's APT document regarding appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and non-continuation of contracts take precedence over policies and procedures herein.

The Faculty Senate is responsible for reviewing the policies and procedures herein. A committee designated by the Faculty Senate will revisit the policies and procedures in three years to assess how well they are operating and will report its findings to the Senate. Based on the report and its own deliberations, the Senate will decide to leave unchanged, revise, or discontinue the policies and procedures. If the decision is to revise the policies and procedures, the Senate will designate a committee to draft revisions to be presented to the Senate for a vote.

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Both faculty members and academic units can benefit when faculty members engage in professional development activities (both inside and outside the University). Professional development is expected to be an ongoing activity of faculty members yet has not been sufficiently supported and funded across campus as an opportunity available to all faculty members. The present policies and procedures are intended to support the expansion of financial resources for professional development beyond the existing support for attendance at disciplinary conferences.

2.1 A faculty member may apply for additional resources for professional development activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service.

2.2 The administrative head of an academic unit may suggest that a faculty member engage in appropriate professional development activities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service. Except under circumstances specified in Section 5, such professional development activities (and resources for such activities) must be mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the administrative head of the academic unit.

¹ "Academic unit" is the smallest unit, such as center, department, division, school, or college, to which a faculty member is appointed.

² The APT document can currently be found at: <http://www.du.edu/facsen/documents>

3. DISTRIBUTION OF JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

The academic interests and abilities of faculty members are likely to vary over time as they progress through their careers. For example, faculty members might seek to increase their teaching loads if, toward the end of their careers, they become less interested in scholarship. Alternatively, faculty members might wish to decrease their teaching loads to take on more service work (such as assuming a significant administrative role) or because they are awarded a research grant. Faculty members should be given the opportunity to negotiate changes in their job responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service. Service entails many activities including administrative activities, such as serving as the chair of an academic unit.

All faculty members are permitted--indeed, encouraged--to initiate negotiations for changes in job responsibilities in response to significant career opportunities or academic career changes with the goal that faculty members be evaluated and valued for their specific contributions and achievements.

3.1 All faculty members are entitled to receive a written annual review report from the administrative head of their academic unit.

3.2 The annual review report will include an assessment of the faculty member's job performance in each of the faculty member's areas of job responsibility (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service) for the prior academic year with a justification for each assessment.

3.3 The annual review report will also include an overall assessment of job performance for the prior academic year with a justification for the assessment.

3.4 Faculty members may request a change in their job responsibilities in a written communication to the administrative head of the academic unit. Any such request must be negotiated with the administrative head of the academic unit and must receive the approval of the dean.³ Both the request and its approval must take into consideration the impact of such a change on the academic unit and the broader University.

4. FACULTY-INITIATED PEER-TO-PEER (P2P) CONVERSATIONS

Conversations among faculty peers can take many forms. As defined herein, a faculty-initiated peer-to-peer (P2P) conversation entails a deliberate conversation, such as around professional development, career changes, and work-life balance, and is not intended to be the same as or a replacement for any other forms of conversations with peers. Section 4 applies only to this particular type of P2P conversations. Suggested policies and procedures for P2P conversations are posted on the Faculty Senate web site <http://www.du.edu/facsen>.

A peer-to-peer (P2P) conversation is initiated by a faculty member who invites a limited number of faculty members, staff, and/or administrators to be a part of the conversation. Such intentional peer-to-peer (P2P) conversations are meant to focus on a challenge, issue, or question

³ The designation dean will be used throughout this document to designate either a dean or an associate provost if there is no dean. In some instances, the administrative head and the dean are the same person.

related to a faculty member's professional experiences to support renewal and growth across the academic career. Intentional discussions around career and life trajectories can also promote greater faculty success and a sense of belonging. P2P conversations were conceived of and designed by DU faculty members--our colleagues--and are based on research on career development and job satisfaction among faculty.

4.1 Each academic unit will establish policies and procedures for convening P2P conversations that are best suited to their faculty members with the approval of the dean.

4.2 Suggested practice is that all faculty members convene a peer-to-peer conversation at least once every three years.

4.3 A P2P conversation is to remain non-evaluative. P2P conversations are to be private and the contents of the conversations may not be disclosed except as required by law and/or University policies and procedures, such as regarding harassment and discrimination. The fact of a faculty member's participation in and the content of a P2P conversation may not be used in personnel decisions, including those related to pay or job responsibilities.

4.4 The faculty member who initiates, and is the focus of, a P2P conversation is designated the "faculty convener." So that P2P conversations remain non-evaluative, faculty conveners will not report participation in P2P conversations in their annual summaries of professional activities.

4.5 Persons invited by the faculty convener to participate in a P2P conversation are designated "committee members." At their discretion, committee members may record, in their annual summaries of professional activities, their participation as committee members in P2P conversations and the academic terms in which P2P conversations took place. But committee members may not identify the faculty convener or other committee members nor record anything about the content of P2P conversations. The University is encouraged to view participation by committee members in P2P conversations as part of service for the purposes of annual reviews. However, the intent of P2P conversations is to create support-networks and foster a culture of community-building and greater collegial engagement on our campus. P2P conversations provide countless immediate and long-term benefits to faculty members and to the faculty as a whole. So the purpose of P2P conversations is intended to go beyond service credit.

5. NOTICE OF UNSATISFACTORY JOB PERFORMANCE

Notices of unsatisfactory job performance are not meant to apply to most faculty members. Instead, notices of unsatisfactory job performance are relevant only to those relatively few faculty members whose performance is significantly below expected standards.

5.1 Based on assessments of job performance, a faculty member who performs significantly below expected standards will be given notice of unsatisfactory job performance in one or more categories of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service. If a notice is issued, it must be recorded explicitly in the annual review report

using the label of “notice of unsatisfactory job performance” with a justification for the notice. If issued, a notice must specify whether the notice is for unsatisfactory performance in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service. The first time a notice is issued, the administrative head of the academic unit must give the faculty member the opportunity to meet with the administrative head to respond to the notice. After each subsequent notice in the same category of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service, the faculty member must meet with the administrative head and the dean.

5.2 The criteria for what qualifies as performance significantly below expected standards (and hence the criteria for issuing a notice of unsatisfactory job performance) will be determined and approved by the deliberation of the faculty of the academic unit with the approval of the dean and will be made public to all unit faculty members. All faculty members will be given an opportunity to provide input.

5.3 If a faculty member receives a notice of unsatisfactory job performance in any of the three job responsibility categories (of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service), the annual review report will describe what the faculty member can do to avoid a similar assessment in subsequent years. After receiving an annual review report containing a notice of unsatisfactory job performance, a faculty member is required to file a response to the administrative head, specifying what actions will be undertaken to avoid such a notice in subsequent years. A timeline for undertaking and completing specified actions must be a part of the response. The faculty member must specify the actions taken in the subsequent annual summary of professional activities.

5.4 If a faculty member receives a notice of unsatisfactory job performance of the same kind (i.e., in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service) for three out of five years, the administrative head may mandate that the faculty member engage in professional development activities to improve job performance and/or change job responsibilities. If job performance remains unsatisfactory in the subsequent year, another round of negotiated and/or mandated changes may be initiated.

5.5 Before mandating participation in professional development activities and/or a change in job responsibilities, the administrative head must attempt to negotiate with the faculty member changes in the distribution of job responsibilities and/or participation in development activities that are mutually agreeable. If a resolution cannot be reached after negotiation, the administrative head may mandate participation in professional development activities and/or specific changes in job responsibilities. Both a faculty member and an academic head may, in addition to themselves, have a representative or observer present during negotiations or during discussions in which changes or actions are mandated. Faculty members retain the right to request a subsequent change in their job responsibilities in a written communication in accordance with Section 3.4.

5.6 If professional development activities are negotiated, the activities shall be specified in a written plan and approved by the faculty member, the administrative head, and the dean. If professional development activities are mandated, the activities shall be specified

by the administrative head in a written plan. This plan must be approved by the dean and provided with adequate support. The written plans must include timelines for the accomplishment of professional development activities. A faculty member must file a written report (to be included in the faculty member's annual summary of professional activities) in which the faculty member documents and describes participation in the professional development activities and how such activities led to enhancements in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and/or service.

5.7 Negotiated changes in job responsibilities must be specified in a written plan and approved by the faculty member, the administrative head, and the dean. Mandated changes in job responsibilities must be specified by the administrative head in a written plan, and approved by the dean. The written plans must state when the changes are to take place.

5.8 The equity and integrity of the implementation of mandated developmental activities and/or job responsibility redistributions are of utmost importance. Among other things, equity and integrity mean there are safeguards against inappropriate assignment of development activities and job responsibilities.⁴ In a dispute over assigned professional development activities or the redistribution of job responsibilities, a faculty member must be given a fair hearing.

⁴ Administrative actions may be grieved following the University's Employee Grievance Process which can be found at: <http://www.du.edu/facsen/documents>