

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

Minutes

November 4, 2016

Room 510

Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering & Computer Science

**Senators (or proxies) present:**

Lynn Baker, Rick Barbour, Jeff Bowen, Ryan Buller (proxy for Kate Crowe), John Campbell, Victor Castellani, Frédérique Chevillot, Jared Del Rosso (proxy for Paul Colomy and Raúl Pérez), Ron DeLyser, Claude d'Estrée, Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Kathy Green, Sarah Hart-Micke, Cynthia Hazel, John Hill, Deborah Howard, Barb Hurtt, Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Nadia Kaneva, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Luis Leon, Jing Li, Zulema Lopez, Brian Majestic, Eleanor McNees, Laleh Mehran, Gloria Miller, Ved Nanda, Amy Phillips, George Potts, Chip Reichardt, Jason Roney, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Dan Singer, Mary Stansbury, Margareta Stefanovic, Kate Stoker, Jing Sun (proxy for Joshua Wilson), Matthew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, Ron Throupe, John Tiedemann, Armond Towns, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Gwen Vogel Mitchell, Kate Willink, Melanie Witt

**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 October 21, 2016 meeting was seconded and approved.

President Willink then invited the Provost, Gregg Kvistad, to address the Faculty Senate.

**Provost Report**

First, Provost Kvistad updated the Faculty Senate on the status of DU Impact 2025. The update focused on the status of the clusters involved in the implementation of the strategic plan. The clusters, Provost Kvistad said, are meeting; they are making differential progress on implementation, depending on their charters and the nature of their work.

Provost Kvistad then encouraged senators to attend the next town hall on the implementation of the strategic plan. The town hall will involve a deep dive into the clusters, broad enough to elicit feedback. It will also give attendees an idea of what's transpiring.

The Provost wants to make sure that faculty and staff have a voice in this process. He told us that the clusters are quite small, and what we need is people injecting ideas and challenging those that clusters develop. The natural thing clusters do, Provost Kvistad said, is decide on their own to run with their own ideas. So he implored us to come up with ideas and get them out to clusters—

and to encourage our colleagues to do the same. While the implementation process isn't going to be perfectly inclusive, Provost Kvistad said that he wants to make it as much so as possible.

Provost Kvistad also updated the Senate about a recent steering committee meeting to discuss how to generate awareness of, excitement for, and engagement in the strategic plan among community members. The committee recognized that this takes a certain type of complicated communication, especially since we and our students are not reading emails. So, Provost Kvistad asked, how do we do this?

One idea is to develop a dashboard that communicates the progress that the clusters are making. Community members will be able to go to a webpage and see that clusters are moving along. Some of the data will be quantitative, but the dashboard will also include a narrative – “we're meeting, we have this pilot that will be up and running in six months.”

Another effort, the Provost continued, aims at generating enthusiasm in the donor community. Some of what the university wants to do can be funded internally. But to implement much of the strategic plan, the university will need support from donors. The big ideas are those that the administration wants to bring out to the community to generate excitement. Faculty will be a big part of that. Advancement staff put meetings together, but they don't attend those meetings. Instead, it is faculty and deans who attend those meetings, bringing their ideas with them. On the other hand, the university needs to have a communication tool that engages with the strategic plan and makes it available to the donor community. Faculty, the Provost said, don't always know how to do this, but the advancement staff does. We have a new Vice Chancellor of University Advancement, Armin Afsahi, who has been part of many higher education institutions and does a very good job.

## **Faculty Senate Update**

Following the Provost's update, President Willink updated the Faculty Senate on several ongoing projects and issues. She began by inviting Senator John Tiedemann to speak about the work of the Freedom of Expression Ad Hoc Committee.

### *Freedom of Expression Ad Hoc Committee Update*

Senator Tiedemann began by telling the Faculty Senate that he was presenting “not new news, but ongoing news.” The Committee, he reminded us, formed at the end of last year, when the Chancellor and Provost spoke with then-President Art Jones and then-President-elect Kate Willink about the need to have a DU-specific statement on the value of freedom of expression. The Ad Hoc Committee is chaired by Alan Chen of Sturm Law School; the complete list of members appears below.

Senator Tiedemann then told the Senate that the Ad Hoc Committee's statement on freedom of expression awaits composition. The Committee's members have met several times to review and discuss similar statements from other universities; they've discussed what those statements offer that might work for DU. But the Committee is also attune to how freedom of expression can be articulated to comport with DU's values.

The Committee, Senator Tiedemann explained, is thinking a lot about how its statement comports with other similar documents that have bearing on the issue of expression, such as the Honor Code and the APT. The Committee wants to ensure that their document is consistent with these and other ones. The Committee will be looking at these other documents at a meeting next week. And they hope to have a document prepared for the Senate to discuss during the winter quarter.

Senator Tiedemann's hope is that the document is pedagogical, rather than bureaucratic. Although it may provide guidelines, it won't be about regulating behavior, as other university documents, such as those governing catering or parking, are. As we have been reminded over the past few weeks, Senator Tiedemann continued, this issue affects the campus as a whole. So the statement needs to speak to a faculty member doing research, a faculty member teaching, and a student walking across the quad. The Committee hopes that faculty, staff, and students alike can understand and appreciate the statement and see their concerns reflected in it. The statement also needs to provide the university with a vocabulary for talking about these issues. This is why, Senator Tiedemann said, "I say it needs to be a pedagogical document. It's not just about informing, but about providing a framework and vocabulary for talking about and sustaining conversations about expression. This is not the sort of thing we decide once and for all. It needs to be a conversational document."

Next quarter, the provost reception will be turned over to this issue. We'll also have a Senate meeting to talk about the document, since what will happen is the document will come to the Senate and if we vote to endorse the document, it will then go to the full faculty for a vote of approval. If the full faculty votes to approve the document, it will then go to the Board. The Board will then vote on whether to affirm it. There will likely be some negotiation and back and forth until all the parties can come together around this document. This is important because the Committee and, so, the Senate is not just asking people to say nay or yay, but to affirm our central values.

#### Members of the Ad-Hoc Faculty Senate Freedom of Expression Committee

- Alan K. Chen, Chair (Professor, Law)
- Terri M. Davis (Associate Professor, GSPP)
- Darrin Hicks (Associate Professor, Communication Studies)
- Greg Robbins (Associate Professor, Religious Studies)
- Derigan Silver (Associate Professor, Media, Film & Journalism Studies)
- John Tiedemann (Teaching Associate Professor, Writing Program)

#### *Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Committee*

Following Senator Tiedemann's presentation, President Willink expressed her gratitude to the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Expression and introduced the Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Subcommittee. She reminded senators that, last year, the Senate founded a faculty development committee, chaired by Chip Reichardt, with three subcommittees. Over the next two years, the Senate will program time into meetings to update senators on the work of these committees, so that senators can share their thoughts and considerations. To this end, she

invited Juli Parrish, Director of the Writing Center, to update the Senate on the work of the Peer-to-Peer Conversations Subcommittee.

Dr. Parrish began by explaining that the subcommittee's work is to develop policies and procedures that structure, enable, and offer opportunities to allow people at different stages of their careers to have meaningful conversations. She highlighted a portion of the subcommittee's charter that explains that peer-to-peer conversations are "intended to encourage a culture of faculty collaboration, interdisciplinary exchange (when appropriate), and intentional faculty development over a faculty member's career."

These conversations, Dr. Parrish continued, are intended to remain confidential; they are not, in other words, about oversight. The subcommittee is thinking about all of the ways that a conversation pre- and post-tenure may help faculty move forward in their careers. So the conversations may not just focus on scholarship and teaching, but also on managing childcare, planning for retirement, etc. The subcommittee is trying intentionally to have conversations that are like those it's hoping to encourage

Dr. Parrish then explained that the subcommittee is looking at how other universities do this and examining the existing models for peer-to-peer mentoring. The subcommittee is especially looking for models meant to be generative. The conversations that they imagine happening will occur once every three years or so. And while those conversations may take many forms, they remain confidential. Any reporting is simply "the conversation happened."

The subcommittee is also thinking about why people want to be part of this conversation and what individual motives may be. They're considering this not just from the perspective of those who need a peer mentor, but those who can serve as peer mentors.

Following this presentation, Dr. Parrish opened for questions.

Former-Senate President Art Jones: Can you clarify how these conversations apply to non-tenure lines?

Dr. Parrish: The subcommittee is thinking about these conversations as something everyone would do. So it would involve all lines, not just tenure-track ones.

Senator d'Estrée: In the non-tenure line, there's always a process of review. Contracts need to be renewed (every three, five, or seven years). But tenure track lines don't have this. My next review will be in 7 years. I have to submit a whole package that includes some of this [material that would likely be discussed during a peer-to-peer conversation]. I think one of the issues is that once you reach a certain status as a tenure track person you don't have the opportunity to reflect on your career with anyone. There's no process set up institutionally for a review or even to have conversations with your colleagues on what you hope to be doing. So while Art raises a good question, [peer-to-peer feedback] is already built in to non-tenure lines. And I suspect like everything else...all divisions will do this differently.

Dr. Parrish: Yes, I think that's so.

President Willink: When we surveyed all faculty, one question was “would you like to receive feedback on your professional development separate from merit review?” A majority of both lines said yes, even more so for non-tenure track faculty.

Senator Gilroy: Would this be a mutual exchange of advice?

Dr. Parrish: Ideally yes. But we’re still thinking about the extent to which this subcommittee will give recommendations on how conversations should happen.

Senator Bowen: From a structure standpoint—are these one-on-one conversations or can they include more participants?

Dr. Parrish: We’re talking about that. Different universities have different formats. I’m not sure that we’ve really decided on this. Do you think larger is more productive?

Senator Bowen: All I was thinking is sometimes my department has larger conversations that could be useful.

Senator Chevillot: These aren’t compulsory?

Dr. Parrish: The word we’re using is “encouraged.” It may take time for people to want to be encouraged to participate.

Senator Chevillot: To what extent is it part of the annual review? Would it be encouraged?

Dr. Parrish: If anything went into Activity Insight [the university’s current interface for tracking faculty members’ annual performances], it would be “these people met.”

Senator Reichardt: We’re leaving this to the departments and divisions. Our job is to encourage that these things exist. We’re not imposing.

Senator McNees: Is this rank-to-rank, or across ranks? Is the committee working on this?

Dr. Parrish: We haven’t spoken about this, but we may at the next meeting.

Senator McNees: Maybe it’s left to the departments.

Senator Reichardt: Or the individual.

Senator McNees: Or the individual.

Senator Tiedemann: These conversations aren’t necessarily those that we’re already having (e.g., retirement). Have you been thinking about what mechanisms are needed to better educate people on how to have these conversations? Is there a way to do this?

Dr. Parrish: There may be. Other universities have some guides that provide structure. This is something we should think about. Again not to impose, but to provide opportunities for structure.

President Willink: Paul Michalec is on our subcommittee and he does a wonderful job of being intentional about how we choreograph and create models for how to do this. We don't want to prescribe, but take faculty energy and that sense that we don't have enough time to connect...and use that to make sure that over our career folks are intentional about feeling connected and supported.

Provost Kvistad: Keep in mind that this is not a post-tenure process. We made clear to the Board that we're not interested in that. They're skeptical, because there are other boards and regents that just install this sort of program at their universities. They don't want to do that, but they want to see structure. I think it will be good to show them that this is really about helping faculty make good choices about their research, teaching, and, frankly, retirement.

Senator Matthew Taylor: I agree, Greg, just not with the peer-to-peer conversation. For these, we need to maintain flexibility. In the larger sense, professional development needs structure, but I'd say it's not needed at this level.

Dr. Parrish: We'll take this back and consider all ideas.

Senator Gilroy: I can't support Eleanor's idea about crossing ranks enough.

Senator McNees: I wasn't really supporting it, just asking about it.

Senator Gilroy: Well in any case, I really support it no matter whose idea it was.

Senator McNees: It's a new idea, and I've been thinking about it.

Senator Gilroy: Well I can think of faculty in my department who are adjunct who I'd really benefit from talking with.

President Willink: Thank you. This is really about inviting ideas to ensure heterogeneity of ideas and perspectives in the subcommittee work.

### **Updates on Senate Activity**

Following the question-and-answer with Dr. Parrish, President Willink then updated the Faculty Senate on three additional projects.

#### *University Committee Initiative*

There has been some progress on the University Committee Initiative that Faculty Senate is engaged in. The hope is to create a mechanism through PioneerWeb [the university's primary online interface for faculty, staff, and students] to allow faculty to indicate their willingness to serve on committees and identify their expertise. This will be an opt-in model. The goal is to

broaden the group of faculty available for university committee work, apprise faculty of expectations of that work, and identify faculty expertise and interests. But faculty aren't limited to only serving on committees closely related to their expertise. Again, it's an opt-in model, so you can indicate your preference for serving on committees in certain subject areas.

This initiative is also about managing expectations. There's a lot that goes into forming these committees. But one step is to build a more extensive list of faculty members who are willing to serve, understand expectations, and have expertise. We hope to be able to use this next quarter.

You can think of this as jury duty and a dating profile combined. At any time, you can change your profile or opt-out if you need to.

### *Letter in Response to Student Letter to Faculty Senate*

During our October 26 meeting, Ontario Duley (Co-President of the Native Student Alliance and member of the Black Student Alliance), Makia Jones (President of the Black Student Alliance), and Tashan Montgomery (Vice President of the Black Student Alliance) presented the Senate with a list of demands. The executive committee of the Senate is working with President Willink to craft a response. Members of the Senate are encouraged to contribute ideas or provide input. One thing we're going to do is commit the Student Relations Committee to meet with students to discuss these issues.

Senator Chevillot: There's an article in the *Clarion* about the demands that I'd like to invite everyone to read.

President Willink: I haven't read it, but my hope is that by end of the year – since there's continuing incidents – to increase communication to faculty on these issues.

Senator M. Taylor: Can you tell us what the article is about?

Senator Chevillot: There's an issue of defacement on the document and resistance to it seems to be increasing.

[The article to which Senator Chevillot referred is included in the Appendix at the end of these minutes. The letter of demands is available in the Appendix at the end of the October 21, 2016 minutes.]

President Willink: Several months ago I committed the Senate to run a panel at the IE Summit to talk about faculty experiences as they relate to this.

Senator Towns: Some of the things changed in the letter included changing “Black history month” to “gorilla history crap.” Asian History and LGBT pride months were also changed to “crap.” If the Senate doesn't speak out, we're complicit.

Senator M. Taylor: How was this changed?

Senator Towns: The document was initially a Google document for the community to sign. But it was instead changed and anonymously so.

Vice Chancellor Amy King (Human Resources): We're aware of these events and Laura Maresca (Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity) is starting the investigative process. We will be at a Dean's meeting and will reach out to Kate to help the community know where the processes are and what the resources are so folks can report it. A lot of recent things haven't been reported, which delays the investigatory process. Please know we stand ready and these are being looked into appropriately.

President Willink: In that regard, it may be useful for all of us to go through our unopened emails. There's info there about these events and the investigatory processes. We'll have someone speak to the Senate, but we already have this info. This is obviously an ongoing issue, but we need immediacy in responding to and honoring student voices.

### *Missing Multiple Senate Meetings*

The Senate Constitution says that regular attendance is required of senators; failure to attend three straight meetings without a proxy can lead to a senator losing his or her position. While the Senate is not about to enforce a "three strikes and you're out" policy, it's important to remember that each senators represents ten faculty members. Please keep in mind your underlying motives for participating. And make sure you sign in and look for your name in the draft minutes.

### *Bookstore Survey Draft*

The executive committee has some notes on our "issues page" that people are having difficulties with the bookstore. We are going to put together a brief, anonymous Qualtrics survey about the challenges and patterns of working with bookstore. We'll also try to capture what is working well in that survey (below).

### Draft Survey Slide 1

In light of concerns we have heard from some faculty and implications for new federal regulations, we invite you to share any thoughts and concerns about your experiences working with the bookstore to order books/ materials for your courses.

### Challenges with Bookstore

What kinds of challenges are you having with the bookstore (choose as many as apply):

- Communication
- Providing the specific book you want
- Timeline issues
- Cost
- None
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe in a level of detail that allows us to understand problems and patterns in relation to faculty issues with the bookstore (Please note the goal of this question is to help us understand the nature of existing problems in order to address faculty concerns with the bookstore):

## Draft Survey Slide 2

What is working in your interactions with the bookstore (choose as many as apply):

- Communication
- Timeline issues
- None
- Providing the specific book you want
- Cost
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe in a level of detail that allows us to understand patterns of what is working in relation to faculty interactions with the bookstore:

Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Thanks for taking the time to answer this survey. Your responses will help us represent faculty concerns.

## Discussion of Draft Survey

Senator Tiedemann: Can you say more about timeline issues. I may have this, but I'm not sure.

President Willink: We just received an email that because of federal regulations, the timeline for ordering and acquiring books has shifted. We may see this cause problems in the future.

Senator Tiedemann: So I guess my issue is that they won't order all the books at once, they order a fraction. Though I understand why, you can't have students without books.

President Willink: So maybe something about supply.

Senator Urquhart: This might not fit in, but I imagine everyone has had this experience since the book store was sold: bureaucratic rigidity. Things are now more difficult. This is not the fault of staff, who I always found extra nice and helpful. But they're stuck with these systems because they are a profit driven organization.

Subsequently, a few additional problems were identified.

- Lack of proactive communication (Senator Bowen),
- Lack of clarity and collective understanding about the regulations (Senator M. Taylor),
- Website portal problems (Former-Senate President Art Jones)
- The use of alternative retailers (Senator Mary Stansbury)

President Willink: The executive committee is thinking of asking the bookstore manager to come and speak with the full Senate at a future meeting.

Senator Shapiro: So what I think all the complaints are about is the process of ordering. Like I always use the same book but can't auto-order and have to instead look up the ISBN each time.

Senator Singer: Could we add something about helpful staff in the portion of the survey on what's working?

## **Faculty Senate Accomplishments**

Following the discussion of the draft bookstore survey, President Willink then reviewed some of the Faculty Senate's major accomplishments under the last six presidents. She focused on accomplishments around inclusive hiring and learning environments, as well as those around the APT and the creation of teaching track positions. Doing so, President Willink hoped, would allow senators, particularly newer ones, to see how some of the major initiatives at the university are emanating out of the Faculty Senate.

### *Inclusive Hiring and Learning Environments*

In 2014-16 the student relations committee asked, "What is one thing we could do in response to calls nationally and on campus from students to create more inclusive classrooms?" So the Committee created the Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative. Since then, we've had the Provosts Reception supporting the Initiative and the world café. Given the things that are unfolding on our campus, we're trying to get this going in the next several months.

President Willink then reviewed the Faculty Senate's accomplishments on these issues since 2006, under the leadership of the past five Senate presidents.

- 2006-2008, Senate President: Dean Saitta
  - Faculty Senate Luncheon Presentation at 2008 Diversity Summit
  - October 2008 Faculty Forum dedicated to Perspectives on Inclusive Excellence
- 2008-2010, Senate President: Michael Levine-Clark
- 2010-2012, Senate President: Don McCubbrey
- 2012-2014, Senate President: Scott Leutenegger
  - 2013-2014: Senate Executive Committee Drafts Inclusive Hiring Initiative
- 2014-2016, Senate President: Art Jones
  - 2015-2015: Inclusive Hiring Motion
  - 2015-2016: Provost Establishes Faculty Hiring Guide Committee chaired by Dr. Frank Tuitt, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Provost and Diversity and Inclusion
  - Fall 2015: Student Relations Committee creates the Inclusive Learning Environment Initiative (ILEI) in collaboration with ODI, IRISE, and OTL
  - Spring 2016: Senate passes ILEI
- 2016-2018, Senate President: Kate Willink
  - Fall 2016: Faculty Hiring Guide formally adopted across campus for all new faculty hires
  - Fall 2016: Provost Reception on Fostering Inclusive Learning Environments & Senate World Cafe

Senator M. Taylor: We're hiring two new faculty and the Inclusive Hiring Initiative is working so well.

President Willink: Art, Amy, and I were on that committee and so much work was done in that committee to make sure this worked.

Past-President Jones: I want to affirm what Kate is saying about looking at the big picture. We get frustrated about the slowness of progress, but this is a democratic process and it does take time.

### *APT and the Creation of the Teaching Track Lines*

President Willink then reviewed the Senate's accomplishments related to the APT and the creation of the teaching track lines. This work began under Michael Levine, who, as Senate President, asked questions about what contingency among our faculty was doing to the university.

- 2006-2008, Senate President: Dean Saitta
- 2008-2010, Senate President: Michael Levine-Clark
  - Discussion of teaching track/contingent faculty
- 2010-2012, Senate President: Don McCubbrey
  - Personnel Committee begins APT revision process for first time since 2001
- 2012-2014, Senate President: Scott Leutenegger
  - Lecturers → Teaching Track Faculty; multi-year contracts for non-tenure line faculty
  - Ad Hoc Committee for Tenured Faculty Performance Review formed
- 2014-2016, Senate President: Art Jones
  - Board approval of APT revisions (January 2015); Implementation of Teaching Track lines 2015
  - 2015-2016: first promotion cycle for Teaching Track faculty
  - Spring 2016: Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Committee approved by Senate
- 2016-2018, Senate President: Kate Willink
  - Teaching Track Pathways to Promotion Event
  - Assessment for first cycle of Teaching Track promotions begins (in collaboration with Linda Kosten and HR)
  - Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ad Hoc Committee Exploration
  - Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Subcommittees begin work

As part of our APT revisions, which created the teaching track lines, the Board started asking about post-tenure review. The Senate separated this issue from the APT revisions, so we could deal with each on its own terms. And the way that we've dealt with post-tenure review is to move away from a punitive model to one that emphasizes faculty development over the life cycle. To do this well, it takes time. But if we do it well, it will change fabric of the institution, potentially in positive ways if we learn from our peers.

President Willink then opened for comments and discussion.

Senator M. Taylor: Given the demands and the pace of change, what can we do to address students' demands quickly?

President Willink: I'll say something from the edges of my own thoughts. The demands challenge us to think about our response-ability and our responsibility. As an executive committee even to write this letter is a challenge, because we work deliberately and slowly. If we were student activists—and the committee acknowledged this in our discussion of the letter—we would think nothing is happening. So how to do we honor these experiences, while also maintaining our process so as to effect the campus in a deliberative way? This is a real tension. Even if I had a letter for the Senate to sign onto, we would have a first reading, I would have needed a letter last week, and we'd have to reconsider it in January.

Senator Saitta: We can move quickly when it comes to things like diversity hiring. We tried in anthropology a few years ago. We identified a candidate who met all the criteria for an opportunity hire, who fit our department mission, and who had the unanimous support of our faculty. We ran afoul of hiring ideologies at higher administrative levels which say that all searches must be open, national searches. If we want to move quickly to diversify the faculty we must change our thinking about opportunity hires.

President Willink: These issues are part of the ongoing work of the campus and of the Senate. The university has relied on a non-activist student body and faculty body during our recent history. And so we are only now asking, “what would it mean to respond quickly to student activist and engagement?”

### **Discussion of Senate Committee for Non-Tenure Line Faculty**

The Senate then moved on to a discussion about creating an ad hoc committee related to non-tenure line professorial appointments. “We created these lines,” President Willink said, “so it should be the Senate that makes sure that as we move this policy into the lived fabric of the university, we do so intentionally, in smart ways, and as part of the whole.”

President Willink then reviewed some important components of this discussion and the potential work of the ad hoc committee.

- We are not rewriting APT or mandating university-wide policy change.
- We acknowledge that we have created a complicated system with far reaching consequences.
- As authors of the revised APT, Senate is the appropriate venue to make sense of the campus layout in regards to non-tenure-line professorial appointments.
- Our goal is to create an Ad Hoc Committee for Non-Tenure-Line Professorial Appointments to lead, steward, and inform conversations on campus and make those conversations more productive.

She then noted that this is a “complicated process with unintended consequence” and so it “would behoove us to be intentional and thoughtful partners so that all faculty have ways to feel valued and have systems set up to respond to the policies we created.”

President Willink then reviewed the five positions that constitute the non-tenure track lines. Doing so, she acknowledged that “non-tenure” is not a great name, since it defines the lines by what they are not (“tenure track”). She invited feedback for a better, catchall name.

- Professorial Series in University Libraries
- Teaching Professorial Series
- Clinical Professorial Series
- Professors of the Practice Series
- Visiting Professorial Series and Research Professorial Series

There are, President Willink told the Senate, several possible topics that an ad hoc committee would address.

- Gathering and disseminating best practices for evaluation & promotion—from guidelines to committee constitution

Right now for non-tenure line faculty who want to be promoted, there is only a single cohort that precedes them. During the promotional pathways for non-tenure track panel, it was obvious that we need more information and knowledge of best practices for evaluation and promotion, as there’s a lot of heterogeneity across campus.

- Assessing promotion experience of non-tenure-line professorial appointments

Lots of people are contacting DU about our experience with non-tenure-line professorial appointments. But we’re not being intentional about collecting information about how the promotion process is playing out. We need to do this.

- Creating opportunities for faculty in the same track to connect

We need to occasion events or create opportunities for folks in this track to get to know each other and work together on shared interests. Right now, there is no way for teaching track faculty to connect in formal, institutional ways; there is not even a list-serve.

Before breaking for discussion, President Willink reminded senators that it’s week eight and they may be feeling “rough around edges.” She acknowledged that she is inviting us into a conversation that has a history of tension, some of which senators may be aware of and some of which they may not. At the pathways to promotions panel, President Willink said she was made aware of the ways that some faculty are feeling marginalized. And this may touch some department, while not touching others. “So hit pause before you say something that may be hurtful...,” President Willink requested of senators.

The ensuing discussion involved two questions:

1. Discuss how you and your departments/units have (or have not) addressed the question raised by the creation of non-tenure line faculty lines.

2. Are there other topics of concern for non-tenure line faculty that an Ad-Hoc committee should address?

Senators broke into pairs to discuss these issues. Following their discussion, Senators wrote their ideas and arguments on the two whiteboards at the front of Room 510 in the Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering & Computer Science.

1. Discuss how you and your departments/units have (or have not) addressed the question raised by the creation of non-tenure line faculty lines.

Senators raised issues that clustered into three main themes – clarity of the promotion process, governance, and hierarchy (at the university). The following specific issues were raised:

- The university has not figured out how to evaluate teaching beyond student evaluations,
- The new APT rules, concerning non-tenure lines, were simply incorporated into existing promotion and tenure guidelines, which pertain to tenure track faculty,
- It is not clear how valued university service work is for non-tenure track faculty, and
- Inclusivity at the departmental level matters; without it, hierarchies form.

A few comments addressed the experience of individual departments or units.

- There is a smooth process for promotion in the library.
- The Lamont School of Music has encouraged movement to these lines by many faculty members who are critical in the recruiting and teaching of the students who constitute the school.

2. Are there other topics of concern for non-tenure line faculty that an Ad-Hoc Committee should address?

Senators raised issues that clustered into four main themes – the appeal process, development, promotion guidelines, feelings of and actual practice promoting instability. Discussants believe the following, specific issues need to be addressed by an Ad-Hoc Committee:

- transparency and clarity about the differences between the five non-tenure track lines (e.g., is the raise and promotion process the same across lines),
- setting a foundation for the units who are already doing well to continue doing so,
- the fact that Assistant Teaching Professors are encouraged not to do multi-year contracts, so that departments can maintain what they see as a flexible budget and avoid the 6 year review,
- assessment of non-tenure faculty experiences and endeavors,
- service expectations,
- pay issues between non-tenure and tenure track lines, and
- inter-unit communication for guidance and advice.

During the closing discussion, Senator d'Estrée noted one problem with the non-tenure track lines: some department looks at funding for non-tenure track positions as “flexible budget,” hiring year-to-year to avoid promotion.

### **Adjourn**

President Willink 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

## Appendix.

### “DU student demands anonymously altered.”

By Grace Carson

*DU Clarion*

October 30, 2016

- institutional budget for heritage/history crap programs and events by the end of the 2017-2018 academic year.
- b. With preference for the following craps:
- i. February - Gorilla History crap
  - ii. March - Women's History crap
  - iii. May - Asian/Pacific American Heritage crap
  - iiii. June - LGBT Pride crap
  - v. September – Latinx Heritage crap
  - vi. October - White History crap
  - vii. November - Native American Indian/Alaska Native Heritage crap
  - viii. December - Elder God Heritage crap
2. **Strictly prohibit organizations with foundations, principles, or affiliations that do not align with the university's current values from existing and becoming a recognized organization on DU's campus.**
- a. Remove existing campus affiliated organizations with foundations and/or principles that do not align with the University of Denver's current values and commitment to inclusive excellence by Fall 2017
- b. Basically just get rid of anyone we disagree with because we have no real problems.
3. **Mandate Inclusive Excellence workshops, similar to the B.O.S.S. training program.**
- a. Require all Greek and Non-Greek student organizations on campus to participate in the Inclusive Excellence workshop(s)

Photo by Grace Carson | *Clarion*

### DU student demands anonymously altered

After multiple incidents of defacement of the Free Speech Wall occurred throughout the beginning of fall quarter, a group of students of color united to make a list of demands for the university on a shared Google Doc. Demands included making an institutional commitment to cultural heritage programming, mandating inclusive excellence workshops similar to the current B.O.S.S. training program, eliminating DU's former mascot Boone's presence at DU events and more. Students were able to sign their name at the bottom of the document, meaning that the editing option was turned on for the document.

The document and its demands were edited multiple times throughout the morning of Oct. 21, starting around 4:00 a.m. and ending at 6:57 a.m. All edits were done anonymously.

The anonymous editor replaced “LGBT+ history month” with “white history month” and replaced all instances of the word “Black” or “African American” with the word “gorilla.” Additionally, the anonymous person wrote that the authors of the document, who were all people of color, were the “weakest members of their gene pool,” calling the vice president of the Black Student Alliance (BSA), Tashan Montgomery, “president of the gorilla student alliance” and more.

The defaced document also included several paragraphs about how the anonymous individual felt regarding the demands. Under the demand for a more representative mascot that celebrates inclusion and diversity while also acknowledging the history of the university’s part in violence against Native Americans, the anonymous individual wrote, “The mascot basically needs to look like a giant stereotype somehow without all of us deciding it offends groups who don’t care. We [the authors of the demands] didn’t actually ask any Natives about this, but we felt comfortable assuming it.”

Additionally, sarcastic comments were implemented regarding the courses and programs the document proposes to draw awareness and sensitivity to the issue, stating, “Force students to take brainwashing courses that teach the white devil what a monster his race has been, and by extension what a monster he is, and teach men they are horrible for being men.”

“The person really just tried to belittle our demands, even though we’re just trying to uphold the university to their own standards and values,” said Makia Jones, president of the Black Student Alliance, in an interview with the Clarion. “This once again reflects an issue on campus that we are trying to solve, and it is making it more blatantly obvious for those who continue to tell us that it is not a problem.”

Jones said that there is a current investigation through the Office of Equal Opportunity of this event. The office is currently unaware of who the editor is but is working hard to gather as much evidence as possible.