

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes

February 24, 2017

Room 510

Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering & Computer Science

Senators (or proxies) present:

Doug Allen, Anneliese Armschler Andrews, Alvaro Arias, Lynn Baker, Rick Barbour, Jeff Bowen, Ryan Buller, John Campbell (also proxy for Ann Vessels), Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Frédérique Chevillot (also proxy for Zulema Lopez), Paul Colomy, Kate Crowe, Jared Del Rosso, Ron DeLyser, Claude d'Estrée (also proxy for Martin Rhodes), Maha Foster, Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Sarah Hart-Micke, John Hill, Barb Hurtt, Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Nadia Kaneva, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Judy Kiyama, Paul Kosempel, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Jing Li, Roddy MacInnes (proxy for Annabeth Headrick and Shannon Sliva), Brian Majestic, Don Mayer, Steven Mayer, Eleanor McNeese, Laleh Mehran, Julianne Mitchell (also proxy for Jennifer Greenfield), Pallub Paul, Ronnie Pavlov, Raúl Pérez, Sarah Pessin, Amy Phillips, George Potts, Tom Quinn, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Jason Roney, Dale Rothman, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Orna Shaughnessy, Amrik Singh, Kate Stoker, Billy J. Stratton, John Tiedemann, Armond Towns, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels, Stephen von Merz, Gwen Vogel Mitchell (also proxy for Julianne Mitchell), Kate Willink, Joshua Wilson, and Melanie Witt-Wilson

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 January 27, 2017 meeting was seconded and approved.

Senate Announcements

President Willink then reviewed the Executive Committee's discussion with the Chancellor, Provost, and Craig Woody, Vice Chancellor of Business and Financial Affairs, about university contracts, such as those with the bookstore. As a result of the discussion, we're going to create and put a charge together for two committees. Both will work with Woody on issues related to contracts. One will address issues with the bookstore; the other will address issues with Activity Insights. President Willink invited senators interested in serving on either committee to let her know of their interest.

President Willink then told the Senate that we have a faculty spot on a food committee in the spring. Our faculty representative, Megan Kelly, cannot serve on the committee during the spring quarter due to teaching demands. President Willink invited Senator Kelly to describe the committee.

Senator Kelly: The Dining Advisory Committee has existed for a while, but it's been closed to faculty. This is our first year with faculty representation. The chair of the committee is Patrick "PC" Call, the Executive Director of Housing & Residential Education. The vision of the committee is to have the best dining services in the Front Range. The committee is reviewing affordability, sustainability, and access for faculty and students. The committee meets once a month, typically on the third Wednesday. This year, we're looking at a new food policy that the board would vote on. It's great to have continued faculty presence on this committee. If you're interested, let me know. (The faculty committee member gets a dining pass as a perk of being on the committee.)

Provost Report

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

Provost Kvistad: Kate has asked me to address three things. The first is an item on the agenda – the update on health care for 2017. We're negotiating with Kaiser and we're finishing that negotiation. Lloyd Moore, Director of Benefits, met with the chancellor and me this week. The negotiations look pretty good, but Lloyd wasn't ready to discuss these yet. He'll probably be ready to do so at the next meeting. I urge you to listen to that, and I've urged him to present in a manner that is evocative and inviting of feedback. There were major changes last year, some of which were pretty dramatic. We have interest in what these changes are.

Second, many of you know that the university has a new Vice Chancellor for Advancement, Armin Afsahi. Armin came from UC-San Diego and worked at Georgetown before that. He's been involved in a number of comprehensive campaigns. We will be embarking on one of those for the next few years; our campaign is directly connected to the strategic plan. The university hasn't really interacted with such a campaign in the past. Advancement was "over there," but wasn't a big part of the university. It needs to be, and it will be. We're looking at a substantial, comprehensive campaign. What that will do is diversify our revenue, which is, as you know, heavily dependent on tuition; seventy percent of our revenue, in fact, comes from tuition. That's high, higher than peer institutions. It constrains what we can do academically. Armin recently presented the campaign to the administrative counsel. I suggested to Kate that Armin come and tell the Senate about the campaign. We've never had a sophisticated fund raising machine at the university. A number of you will be involved with that, as the campaign hinges on connecting donors with you. They care about faculty, programs, and less so buildings. Armin gets that. He understands how important faculty are to the campaign. I hope you invite him. He's very, very effective. And we'll hear about the next steps.

Finally, the implantation of the strategic plan is ongoing. We're not in a silent phase, but we also don't have a lot of announcements about the plan or implementations. Clusters are working on this; they're generating proposals for pilot programs. This is essentially what we're doing for implementation – asking clusters to come up with pilot programs that are connected to or bridge initiatives in the strategic plan. So how do proposals get selected as a pilot? We have a steering committee that includes cluster leaders, who the chancellor chose. We also have a Strategy Executive Committee made up of the chancellor, Armin, Renell Wynn, the Vice Chancellor of Communications & Marketing, Ed Rowe from the Chancellor's Office, and me. We will review those proposals and work with cluster leaders to shape those into workable proposals. We have one time money available for these. The folks who choose are those folks in the Strategy Executive Committee, because there needs to be some correlation between the pilot programs and our strategic directions, which the chancellor is responsible for. There will be a bunch of town halls. We had one on the public good a few days ago. Three faculty members presented. Another one coming up is on the Institution for Social Policy Research. That is in a week or two. Those are town halls to solicit feedback for directions.

Second Reading of Motion for Ad Hoc Committee for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Following the Provost's update, the Senate considered the Motion for an Ad Hoc Committee for Non-Tenure Track Faculty. President Willink began by reminding Senators of the process for vote. First, the Senate would hear from Senator John Tiedemann. Following his presentation, we'd open for comments or discussion on the motion, which is revised since the last meeting. If we exhaust conversation, we'll move to a vote. If we go on and on, someone can raise a motion for a vote to vote; that initial vote would require two-thirds support to pass. If we don't get there by 1:00, we'll table the motion and return to it at the next meeting.

You'll notice that the motion has been revised to address concerns, expressed at the previous meeting, around Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Tenure-Track Faculty involvement in the committee. Questions were also raised, during our first reading of the motion, about the diversity of the committee. This was a real learning moment for the Executive Committee, especially Art and me, who helped craft the Inclusive Excellence Hiring Committee. Inclusive excellence is a process, and it's sometimes easy to miss these things as we move forward in building committees. And this is also one consequence of not knowing who makes up our Non-Tenure Track faculty.

Following President Willink's introduction to the second reading, Senator Tiedemann addressed the Senate on the revised motion.

Senator Tiedemann: I want to draw your attention to some of the changes we made to the motion. The second paragraph of the motion is new. It's about clarifying and framing the work of the committee.

Senator Tiedemann then read the second paragraph of the motion to the Senate:

Practices for appointing and promoting Non-Tenure-Track faculty have significance for the faculty as a whole. The primary purpose of this Committee is therefore to *listen*: i.e., to reach out to faculty across campus (Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track alike), gather information, and record ideas about best practices and problem areas. By examining current implementation policies, holding listening sessions, and conducting interviews and surveys, the Committee will compile a report intended to provide the entire faculty, as represented by the Senate, with the information that it needs to assess present practices and make recommendations for the future.

Senator Tiedemann: The point of this is that this committee isn't a policy-making group. It's a study group or information gathering group. It's a group charged with listening to and reporting what folks all across campus are thinking and doing about this. While this group is for Non-Tenure Track faculty, these issues are important to all faculty, Non-Tenure and Tenure Faculty alike.

One of the things we're concerned to do – because the Executive Committee has heard a lot on this – is reach out across campus to find committee members, rather than tapping those who are regularly asked to do committee work. Knowing we have Non-Tenure Track faculty across campus and in different positions, we reached out to ask for recommendations for folks who would be good on this committee. As Kate mentioned, we also don't know who Non-Tenure Track faculty are. So we received recommendations for committee members, and we wanted representation across units. We also strove to have representation from the different teaching series across the university. Since our purpose is to gather info it makes sense to have folks on the committee who know these positions. And we want folks to be committed to work on the committee. The only series that we don't have representation from is research professor, as they work independently from the university in ways other Non-Tenure Track faculty don't. We also haven't received recommendations from Lamont, though we've reached out to them. We have two open spots, which we'll use to address that and achieve compositional diversity.

Senator Tiedemann concluded by reaffirming that the purpose of the committee is to listen and collect information.

President Willink: One of the exigencies of the committee is that other institutions are interested in the changes we made to the APT and positions at the university. It's important for us, as senate and author of the APT, to understand what's going on across campus. We need to understand the many different practices for promotion

across campus. Some folks have a one page document explaining promotion while others have 125 pages. So how are we able to learn and make sure best practices are realized across campus?

Senator Tiedemann: What will come out of the committee is a report, which includes the info that Kate described. How are divisions approaching the Non-Tenure Track positions? We'll be canvassing best practices and looking also for problem areas. The committee's report will address the four topics described in the motion and will provide the Executive Committee a report. The report should inform the committee how to best respond from there, but that's a separate step. It's not the purpose of this committee to write policy, but to provide the Executive Committee with information about how to write policy.

President Willink: As a tenured faculty member, I also want to ask that tenured and tenure-track faculty consider what it would be like going up for promotion and only having one year of practice, expertise and experience to rely on. Our hope is to collect information on this to make sure we learn from this.

Senator Kaneva: What's the timeline for the work of the committee?

Senator Tiedemann, after directing the Senate to the second page of the motion, repeated that the committee would gather information through the summer and present a report in Fall 2017.

Senator Urquhart: Could you go over what the report will contain? Is it mainly descriptive, but with some policy recommendations?

Senator Tiedemann: It would describe what people report. To the extent that there is prescriptive material, it will be what comes back from those we survey. It won't be produced by those on the committee.

President Willink: If we wanted to move forward with anything on this report, we'd need to constitute a new committee with a new charge. What we want to do is make sure this committee meets its charge and be clear what that charge is. We would, if we wanted to move forward, be clear that that is a new committee with a different charge and that charge would include making policy.

Senator d'Estrée: I recall a fifth issue on governance, and that paucity of Non-Tenure Track faculty governance? It's not included here.

President Willink: Short of language, I think that would be discussed under question three. I think that'd be appropriate to the committees work on that question, and we'd get that communicated.

Senator Towns: Once this is given to the Executive Committee, what is the committee's hope? Will there be a standardization of promotion?

Senator Tiedemann: Part of the committee's work would be to figure out what info needs to be disseminated. There's a lot that we just don't know right now How are people being appointed and promoted – in the Writing Program vs. in the library, for instance? We just don't know. We need to gather that info and develop a sense of what people think are best practices. A later committee may decide which of those practices the Senate might want to endorse. But that really depends on what comes back.

President Willink: My thought is we'll share it widely, with the Senate, Provost, Chancellor, and probably with deans. I think there will be interest in the work of this committee. It's the first comprehensive self-study. If nothing else, the Executive Committee will share it widely. And some of the best practices may have to come

through the Senate, some might not. For instance, let's consider creating networks for affiliation (question 4). Perhaps the Senate is a conduit to building networks, but perhaps there are other options. Maybe there's a technological option—an email list, for instance. We want to figure out what can be done.

Senator d'Estrée: Before this was put together, I was putting together a survey to track the first cohort of Non-Tenure Track faculty who went through the promotion process. One purpose was to create a longitudinal study, though small, to collect info about this. This is fairly unique in the U.S. Another purpose was also to inform others who are beginning to look into how we structure positions. I think this committee serves multiple needs. I would hope this would contain a longitudinal piece so we can learn over time, especially as things change and people move through these processes. We already know the promotional process is dramatically different by units. While I don't expect that we'll ever have a "unified field theory" of promotion, we can learn a lot from each other for cross fertilization.

Senator Pérez: It seems that one purpose of this is for greater equity and transparency, especially in the promotion process. On that, what is going to be asked for in terms of making this more transparent? Will the committee pursue what promotion looks like – benefits, salaries, etc.? Coming from a public university, these are all public. But I don't know about here. I see the value in having that, however.

Senator Tiedemann: This question would concern changes to policy, which this committee wouldn't decide now. What we'd be doing is studying and understanding how things are happening unit by unit and whether greater transparency of the sort you describe is necessary.

Provost Kvistad: This is an important question. There is a salary bump for promotion for Non-Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty. It's the same across the entire university. That's already in place. What this raises for me is the debate between a decentralized promotion process vs. a centralized one. We don't have a university committee for tenure and promotion; instead, evaluation of promotion stops at the units. For better or worse, I am that committee. I've brought it to deans, asking them if it's time to think differently about that, given the push to break down traditional structures and pursue interdisciplinary work. We haven't gone there. This may be an opportunity to ask this question again. But maybe like the semester system, it's something we should look at. With teaching at least there would be arguably some uniformity relative to research and creative work, which really varies by unit.

President Willink: The charge of the committee is embedded in the motion. Now it may be within the universe of possibility that some of the issues we're discussing come up. But I don't want us to think this committee will be deciding whether there should be a university promotion committee. For this motion, it's these four questions, it's this charge, it's a report we will create. The committee's report may open us to really interesting discussions – and we should follow those and address the universe of possibilities that this perhaps raises.

Senator Tiedemann: I want to point out that what is raised now, in a way, is an example of the listening communities that would go into this motion. That's how we gather this info, through discussions like these.

Senator d'Estrée: I want to raise that the salary bump is not the same across the Non-Tenure track and Tenure track lines.

Provost Kvistad: Yes, that's correct.

Senator d'Estrée: I just wanted to be clear that there is not equity with promotion raises between the two lines.

Provost Kvistad: And there's not equity across the lines in terms of salary.

Senator Castellani: What about Visiting Assistant Professors? How do these positions fit into this?

Senator Tiedemann: While Visiting Assistant Professors are not part of the committee and, so, not doing the fact finding, they're people from whom we might gather information. We didn't have any Visiting Assistant Professors recommended to us as we put together the committee, and we didn't specifically search any out. But we could certainly get info from them.

President Willink: The Executive Committee discussed this. Visiting Assistant Professor positions are unlike the other lines; they have a different structural position. It's the same with adjuncts. Now the purview of this committee could go wider and wider and one could argue that it should. It's certainly something to keep discussing.

Senator Castellani: Some visiting professors would like to be permanent.

President Willink: I certainly see the value in that, and they are welcome to be part of the discussion.

Senator Kaneva: I'd like some clarity about that. I don't see Visiting Assistant Professor positions in here. I want to be clear that this isn't part of this. And they're not up for tenure or promotion.

President Willink: And that's what the Executive Committee discussed; their positions are not the same as those this motion addresses.

Senator Kaneva: And I don't know how you could impose obligations on Visiting Assistant Professors when they have nothing to gain from the committee. As for the promotion bump, there's none for Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Is that wrong?

President Willink: Both Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure Track faculty receive a tenure and promotion bump. It's not the same in dollar amount, but there is one.

Senator Saitta: I'm still thinking about governance. I think you're right that it may be addressed under question three; question two, which mentions services, may also partially address it. I still think a focus on governance could be sharpened. The AAUP has recently released a statement on the role of Non-Tenure Track faculty in governance. I think it would be wise to incorporate this issue in a clearer way, so that governance is explicitly articulated, perhaps in reference to the AAUP's position. I think there's wide variation across universities on issues of governance.

President Willink: There are two ways to do this. One would be that you propose a friendly amendment to address governance. Or we could commit to communicating this issue to the committee. John Tiedemann would be chair of the committee. It would be useful to share existing practices, such as those articulated by the AAUP. The committee doesn't need to act as if nothing already exists. Would you be okay with that?

Senator Saitta: Sure.

Senator Tiedemann: And I'll be clear that I commit to bringing these issues to the committee.

Senator Hurtt: Question three about fair and respectful relationships between the two lines: Is this about the distribution of opportunities between the two lines – for instance, professional development opportunities? Or is it about interpersonal issues and interactions?

Senator Tiedemann: I don't think these will be mutually exclusive. I think we'll be surfacing particular questions like this one about those relationships. Are they fair, equitable, and so on? This manifests in many ways, such as in research and also in subtler things, like what sort of opportunities are available. The idea is to surface those issues.

President Willink: Jared is dutifully taking notes, and this conversation has been really useful to keep this discussion going. We want to keep the work of this committee open at this point. This is what academics do well. Probably no one in the room has all the answers at this point. So it's important to keep this open for discovery. Does anyone object, before we move to the roundtable at 1:00, to moving to vote?

No objections were raised.

President Willink: Okay, we're going to move to vote. We'll be conducting it by paper ballot.

The Senate voted, by paper ballot, on the motion, which passed.

Yes - 65

No - 0

Abstain - 1

Chancellor's Roundtable

At 1:00 PM, President Willink welcomed Chancellor Rebecca Chopp and Douglas G. Scrivner, Chair of the university's Board of Trustees, to the Senate meeting. From 1:00 – 1:30 PM, the Senate participated in the Chancellor's Roundtable.

Adjourn

President Willink thanked Senators for their participation in the meeting and the first half of the Chancellor's roundtable. 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

Appendix

Motion to Create an Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

The 2015 Policies and Procedures Relating to Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) document sought to establish a more equitable and sustainable system of appointment and promotion for the approximately one third of DU faculty who are not tenure-line.¹ In order to ensure the success of this system, it is necessary to examine how it is being embodied in practice across campus and to develop fair and practical implementation guidelines. To that end, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves to create an Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.

Practices for appointing and promoting Non-Tenure-Track faculty have significance for the faculty as a whole. The primary purpose of this Committee is therefore to *listen*: i.e., to reach out to faculty across campus (Tenure-Track and Non-Tenure-Track alike), gather information, and record ideas about best practices and problem areas. By examining current implementation policies, holding listening sessions, and conducting interviews and surveys, the Committee will compile a report intended to provide the entire faculty, as represented by the Senate, with the information that it needs to assess present practices and make recommendations for the future.

The Committee will address four key issues. These are:

1. What are the processes of hiring and promotion for Non-Tenure-Track faculty in units across campus? How can we promote best practices across divisions and series?
2. What is the distribution of labor for Non-Tenure-Track faculty in units across campus, particularly with respect to the requirements for teaching, scholarship/research/creative activity, and service? From the variety of models that have been tried, what lessons can we learn that can inform future practice?
3. How can we ensure that relationships between TT and NTT faculty are fair, respectful, and mutually beneficial?
4. Given how new this system and some of these series are on our campus, how can we help Non-Tenure-Track faculty to affiliate and communicate?

Committee Membership

- Robert Anderson (Lawyering Process Professor, Sturm College of Law)
- David Cox (Teaching Professor, Daniels College of Business)
- Claude d'Estrée (Teaching Professor, Korbel School of International Studies)
- Mike Goss (Teaching Associate Professor, Ritchie School of Engineering & Computer Science)
- Pat Greer (Teaching Assistant Professor, University College)
- Jacob Hyde (Clinical Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Professional Psychology)
- Peggy Keeran (Professor, University Libraries)
- Aimee Reichmann-Decker (Teaching Associate Professor, Psychology)
- Kate Ross (Associate Professor of the Practice of Social Work, Graduate School of Social Work)
- Blake Sanz (Teaching Associate Professor, University Writing Program)
- Nancy Sasaki (Teaching Associate Professor, Biology; Associate Dean, NSM)
- Laura Sponsler (Clinical Assistant Professor, Morgridge College of Education)
- John Tiedemann (Chair) (Teaching Associate Professor, University Writing Program)
- Melanie Witt-Wilson (Teaching Assistant Professor, English Language Center)
- Terri Woellner (Teaching Professor, French)
- TBD (at large)
- TBD (at large)

¹ Non-Tenure-Track faculty includes members of the Teaching Professorial Series, Clinical Professorial Series, Research Professorial Series, Professors of the Practice Series, and Professorial Series in University Libraries.

The Senate Executive Committee is empowered to fill the remaining seats on the committee and to replace members if vacancies arise.

The Ad Hoc Committee will conduct its study during the winter and spring of 2017 and present a report to the Senate Executive Committee in the fall of 2017.