

**UNIVERSITY OF DENVER**

**FACULTY SENATE**

Minutes

March 31, 2017

Room 510

Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering & Computer Science

**Senators (or proxies) present:**

Doug Allen, Anneliese Armschler Andrews, Lynn Baker, Rick Barbour, Jeff Bowen, Ryan Buller, Ruth Chao, Frédérique Chevillot (also proxy for Zulema Lopez), Paul Colomy, Kate Crowe, Jared Del Rosso (also proxy for Raúl Pérez), Ron DeLyser, Maha Foster, Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Kathy Green, Sarah Hart-Micke, Cynthia Hazel, John Hill, Scott Howard, Barb Hurtt, Meg Jackson (proxy for Annabeth Headrick), Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Nadia Kaneva, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirkpatrick, Judy Kiyama, Paul Kosempel, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Jing Li, Zulema Lopez, Brian Majestic, Don Mayer, Steven Mayer, Eleanor McNees, Laleh Mehran, Gloria Miller, Ved Nanda, Sarah Pessin, Amy Phillips, Tom Quinn, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Martin Rhodes, Jason Roney, Dean Saitta, Nancy Sampson, Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Orna Shaughnessy, Dan Singer, Amrik Singh, Shannon Sliva, Mary Stansbury, Margareta Sefanovic, Kate Stoker, Billy J. Stratton, Matthew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, John Tiedemann, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Gwen Vogel Mitchell, Kate Willink, Joshua Wilson, and Melanie Witt-Wilson, Duan Zhang

**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 February 24, 2017 meeting was seconded and approved.

**Introductions of Discussion and Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development**

**Discussion**

President Willink began by briefly outlining the plan for the first hour of the Senate meeting. She then invited Paul Michalec, Clinical Professor in the Curriculum and Instruction and Teacher Education Program at Morgridge College of Education, to address the Senate.

Kate asked me to spend time talking about norms of conversations. These are norms I'm very familiar with from work that I do with a range of professionals. The intention here is to shift post tenure conversation to something that is more developmental. To that end, it is useful to have some markers or guidelines to keep us headed in right direction. That's what these norms are for. They are more developmental and less evaluative.

The norms are grounded in the assumption of wholeness, in the assumption that we are already whole. So we don't need to spend time fixing or advising people during our conversations. Instead, we need to create space so people can speak of their current states.

Michalec then discussed four norms: space for silence, embracing differences, agree to disagree, and return to wonder.

*Space for Silence.* Silence is that time when the inner voice of the teacher, scholar, student, or learner can come to the surface. When it's a noisy, crowded, crazy space that inner wisdom disappears into the background. We'll be providing and creating space for silence.

*Embracing Differences.* This is about inviting others into the conversations. "Others" has multiple meanings. One of the best ways that I've found to invite people into conversations is to avoid the "we" language that speaks for others. Instead, use "I" language that speaks for oneself. Allows others to come into the conversation in a meaningful, purposeful way.

*Agree to Disagree,* but remain connected. Disagreement is valuable. But sometimes "agree to disagree" leaves us in our own corner. We're all in this together.

*Return to Wonder.* These are not easy conversations. We'll try to remain open to others' truths. Doing so can lead to disagreement. But instead of turning to disagreement, turn to wonder—"I wonder why she thinks this way...?"

Senator Chip Reichardt, who is chairing the Faculty Development Committees, then addressed the Senate, to introduce the work of the Policies & Procedures for Faculty Development Committee.

Over the years, interest in post-tenure review had been building among some faculty members, chairs, deans, and trustees. As a result of that interest, the Faculty Senate established the Tenured Faculty Performance Review committee in April 2014 to investigate what post-tenure review might look like at DU. After extensive study, the TFPR committee concluded that post-tenure review was not warranted at the present time. Instead of post-tenure review, the TFPR committee recommended the university take steps to support faculty development over their career. 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 policies and procedures apply to all faculty members in all benefitted faculty series:

- Tenure-line Professorial Series
- Professorial Series in University Libraries
- Teaching Professorial Series
- Clinical Professorial Series
- Professors of the Practice Series
- Research Professorial Series

Following Senator Reichardt's presentation, President Willink offered a few, additional words before Senators began their small group discussions.

Thank you to 12 committee members who are currently working on the Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development and the 12 who did the previous work of creating the framework last year.

The reason we're having this meeting is to shift how we do business in the Senate. Often, these committees do a lot of work and for years the Senate doesn't know what's going on. Then the committees bring their work to the Senate and we do a great job at line editing documents and imagining worst case scenario. You'll get your chance, in about a month, to line edit. But at this point it's really about informing the Senate of what this work is about and to provide an opportunity for you to have a voice now while we're still creating the documents.

And I want to recognize that it was a major accomplishment of the first committee to shift our work from post tenure review to a more developmental approach. I imagine that over 90% of faculty would benefit significantly from developmental approach and never need to experience any type of more remedial development. In other words for almost all faculty I think they will benefit from the developmental nature of this document.

Lynn Schofield Clark, chair of the Job Responsibility Discussions Subcommittee, then presented on the work of the subcommittee.

Think back to your time as an assistant professor, when you envisioned how your job would develop. Did it develop how you expected? Perhaps not. I want to build on what Kate has said about development. That's what these discussions are about, to get people talking about what the job was years prior and what it is today.

*So what are Job Responsibility Discussions?*

They are conversations between a faculty member and the head of her administrative unit (Chair, Director). The conversation centers on changing the distribution of job

responsibilities around teaching, scholarship/creative activities, service, and administrative activities.

Job Responsibility Discussions allow faculty the opportunity to renegotiate these distributions, recognizing that the interests and abilities of faculty members can change as they progress through their careers, and that the de facto distribution of job responsibilities may change over the course of a career, as well.

*How do discussions work?*

- They can take place when faculty want them to.
- They will feed into, but are separate from, merit discussions.
- Negotiations will be rooted in the overall best interests of the School, department, and unit.

Following Schofield Clark's presentation, Senator Eleanor McNees presented on the work of the Professional Development Discussions Subcommittee. She began by acknowledging the work of the other subcommittee members, Ann Petrilá (GSSW), Ron Rizzuto (Finance), and Matthew Taylor (Geography). She then highlighted the subcommittee's charge to:

Create a document outlining procedures for faculty development separate from current annual university and divisional funding for conference travel, research, and pedagogy.

What it means: We're trying to look at areas for which current existing funds are not available. If you were particularly keen to develop an area you've not developed, for instance, you would have support. For instance, say you want to move on to administration, but don't have experience. Perhaps you'd want to go to some sort of conference or seminar.

Members of the subcommittee all read *A Guide to Faculty Development*, which includes a chapter by Frank Tuitt. One chapter in this book addresses faculty development over all stages.

Senator McNees then provided an overview of the subcommittee's work, which included:

- A survey of faculty development programs at peer institutions.
- Discussion of *A Guide to Faculty Development* ed. by Gillespie, Robertson (Josey-Bass, 2010).
- Discussion of professional development as *intentional growth opportunities* over course of academic career.

- Emphasis on mutual negotiation between chair/unit head and faculty member.

“The word intentional,” Senator McNees told the Senate,

is important; we want to imagine how we might push ourselves to further growth. Finally, Chip reminded me that this could be a two way street. As point 3.3 of our guidelines indicates, faculty can request a conversation but the dean or department chair could request it; this is not meant to be punitive but they may think one would benefit from it.

Following Senator McNees presentation, President Willink added,

Part of intentionality is not to grow for others sake but to think about how what one wants to learn or shift to do things at different points in one’s career. This not a quality management strategy. If you’re moving on fine and you have no interest in further development, you don’t necessarily need to request these funds.

President Willink then invited Nancy Sasaki to provide an overview of the work of the Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Conversations Subcommittee.

*What are P2P conversation?*

- A P2P conversation is a conversation of a faculty member with a small number of peers.
- The discussion focuses on a problem, issue, or question in the faculty member’s professional life as a way to promote innovative practices among faculty members
- End goal of continual renewal and improvement

The P2P conversations can promote faculty growth over one’s career. One might want to hold one of these conversations to decide what professional development opportunities you want to pursue.

What would the conversations look like? You would invite 3 to 4 other faculty members to have a discussion around professional development. The end goal is the continual renewal of faculty spirit and improvement of clarity about where you want to go or what will happen over your career.

*Why does P2P matter to me?*

- The P2p conversations are a means of acquiring resources and ideas for solving professional challenges that matter to you here at DU

- ▶ They are also a way to promote growth over your faculty career
- ▶ They can help you build and become part of a vibrant campus network
- ▶ Finally, they help us develop an interactive culture and climate across the University

*How does P2P work?*

- ▶ The P2P conversations meet the faculty where they are
- ▶ Can be pre-tenure, post-tenure, promotion to Professor
- ▶ Question, problem or issue is determined by the faculty convener at that point in time of their career
- ▶ Meets the faculty who they are
- ▶ Three versions of instructions on how to host a P2P conversation
- ▶ Model A for those responsive to questions of the heart, head and hand.
- ▶ Model B for those more inclined to a pragmatic view of faculty responsibilities.
- ▶ Model C for those who use efficiency as their driving force of faculty development.

*When are the P2P conversations happening?*

Conversations should take place throughout your academic career but are specifically recommended:

- ▶ 3 years after first appointed to DU
- ▶ Within 3 years after promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor
- ▶ Within 3 years after promotion from Associate to Full Professor
- ▶ Any time after a change of duty assignment (Director, Dean, Provost)

Following Nancy Sasaki's presentation, President Willink added,

Intentionality is important. According to national research, associate professors are the least happy people on campus. And I've heard from full faculty who feel a bit lost, as they're at the end of the promotion series. So it's important to think about development over time. In P2P conversations full professor might ask questions such as, "Is this all there is?" And it allows you to learn from people who perhaps have done it well.

Senator Reichardt then summarized the three presentations.

**Job Responsibility Discussions:** One part of this is that some faculty members don't understand this distribution of responsibilities; discussions can help clarify this. And faculty members can have discussions over their careers to address these distributions and potentially change.

**Professional Development Discussions:** This subcommittee is about making sure opportunities and resources are available for continued faculty development over their careers.

Finally, the P2P conversations, which is another idea for faculty development. Maybe you have a problem or conundrum to meet with peers to discuss the problem or conundrum.

Committees have also decided that there should be a bare minimum with annual review. Right now, there's much variety across university; they need to have an assessment of research, teaching, and service, with a justification of each.

Senator Reichardt added that the criteria will be decided by academic units, but the Committee recommends the following few standards.

- 5.1 In accordance with the distribution of job responsibility percentages, the annual review report will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance in each of the following areas:
  - Teaching
  - Scholarship/Creative Activities
  - Service
  - Administrative Activities
  - Overall Performance
- with a justification for each assessment.
- 5.2 Based on the assessments of job performance, a faculty member may be given a warning of unsatisfactory job performance.
- 5.3 The criteria for assessments of job performance (including warnings of unsatisfactory job performance) will be determined by the academic unit.

Assessments, Senator Reichardt added, will have the following consequences.

- If a faculty member receives a warning of unsatisfactory job performance of the same kind (i.e., in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service, administrative activities, or overall performance) for three out of five years, the administrative head may mandate that the faculty member:
  - change the distribution of his or her job responsibility percentages  
and/or
  - engage in professional development activities to improve performance.

Finally, the Provost, Gregg Kvistad, offered some remarks.

You're on a really tight schedule, but I want to say something briefly. Thank you for doing this. The response to post tenure review is something that a lot of institutions have had to do. This is especially so among public schools dealing with legislators and regents. Post-tenure review came up with our Board. You pushed back. The chancellor and I pushed back. The board is at a good space with this right now. Not many institutions do this and at least not this intentionally. I know there's interest from other institutions about this. I'm leaving because this is your work.

### **Presentations from Subcommittees**

From about 12:30 – 1:10, the Faculty Senate engaged in small group discussions with the three subcommittees. Each small group spent about fifteen minutes with each committee. Following the discussion, President Willink briefly concluded the discussion.

All groups had someone taking notes, so this will go back to the subcommittees. We did this in the small group format to bring more voices into play. You can expect on the senate's website by the end of next week we'll have all of these documents and more (in the case of the P2P conversations). Go talk to your colleagues and let them know who they can talk to.

### **Constitutional & Bylaw Clean Up Motion Reading 1**

President Willink then invited Senator John Hill, chair of the Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee, to speak about some proposed changes to the Senate Constitutions and By Laws.

Senator Hill: The Nominations, Credentials and Rules Committee proposes these amendments and changes to the Senate Constitution and By Laws.

The changes are intended to better align Senate practices with the Constitution and By Laws, and to remove outdated language.

They are not intended to materially alter Senate practices or authorities.

The proposed changes include:

- Align faculty titles with new APT
- Align language with established Senate practices
- Specify two-year terms for At-Large members to Executive Committee and stagger their terms
- Change “Faculty Forum Editor” to “Communications Office” to more accurately characterize the duties actually performed; specify a two-year term.
- Standing Committee description changes were approved by the relevant committees.
- Clarify election processes for non-Officer positions
- Replace By Laws “bullet” lists with an outline numbering scheme
- Correct errors in the Constitution Outline numbering scheme

To Senator Hill’s presentation, President Willink instructed the Senate to review the relevant documents, as the Senate would like to approve these in advance of the May 19 meeting for the election. The Senate then opened for discussion.

One senator asked a question about responsibilities for Senators, as the Constitution does not seem to define these.

President Willink: We noticed this. There aren’t norms around Senators and committee chairs. To partially address this, we have a new orientation document on the web page for new senators. But we’re aware of this.

Senator Hill: You’re right about this, except for a statement on attendance – showing up and having lunch – there’s nothing in this.

Senator Matthew Taylor: Why only two at large senators?

Senator Hill: There are six, and we’re not changing that. But there are two to the executive committee. And we’re staggering them.

Senator Kosempel: It seems odd in the Student Relations Committee charter to mention buildings.

President Willink: One thing I'll add to this—there's now a "Student Learning Spaces" discussion. It will enlist faculty, discussing how we use learning spaces on campus and create norms and uses. It could be one avenue in which the Student Relations Committee is indeed addressing buildings.

Senator Hill: I made a note of this and we'll discuss it with the committee chair. Maybe we want to change it. Maybe we want to hold off. Just for the record, would someone second a motion to accept these?

Senator Leaman made a motion to accept the revised changes.

Senator Hill: And we'll have a vote on these in our second April meeting. We will be, early next week, contact units to organize elections for new Senators. Approximately one third of the Senate will expire in May of each year. Those will be going on this year.

### **Adjourn**

President Willink: Is there a motion to adjourn?

Senator Leaman: So moved!

The motion to adjourn was seconded and, at 1:30 PM, the Faculty Senate adjourned.

### **Prepared and submitted by**

Jared Del Rosso  
Faculty Senate Secretary