Call to Order:

Kate Willink, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 12 PM. Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting from November 10, 2017 were approved.

Provost Search Update:

Terri Davis (member of Provost Search Committee and former Faculty Senator): In April of 2017 the Chancellor announced to the University of Denver community that Provost Gregg Kvistad would step down from his position as Provost at the end of the 2017-2018 academic year, after having served for 13 years. Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates was hired to conduct the search. Faculty Senate was involved in composing the committee, creating the most representative and diverse committee in University history. Search committee included:

- Deborah Avant, Professor and Sié Chéou-Kang Chair for International Security and Diplomacy, Josef Korbel School of International Studies
- Patience Crowder, Associate Professor of Law, Sturm College of Law
Everyone who was invited to serve committed to serve. Each meeting was facilitated by the Chancellor, and Board of Trustees chair-elect Denise O’Leary also attended. The first meeting was mid-May 2017. 10 candidates were invited for first-round interviews in early December. The committee identified four finalists by mid-December. The initial timeline outlined had the committee inviting finalists to campus in the second and third weeks of January - however, when the four finalists were informed of the on-campus interview, they informed the committee that they all were in active searches. The committee had to decide whether to keep the timeline or risk losing the top choices or move the timeline to be competitive. The committee unanimously moved up the timeline. The four candidates were interviewed on December 18, 19th, January 3rd, and January 4th. All of the candidates currently occupy high profile positions at current institutions. The search was confidential. There was a select group of faculty who met with the candidates. There was no student involvement due to the timing of the search. Each candidate met with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Business and Financial Affairs, the budget and planning staff, and the Provost’s Office staff, followed by a meeting with faculty. All of the Exec Committee were invited, as well as other faculty recommended by the current (Kate Willink) and incoming Senate president (Darrin Hicks), who also met privately with each candidate. The candidates also met with the Faculty of Color Association (FOCA), then Deans, Vice-Chancellors, and other Chancellor-level senior administrators. The candidates then met with the DU Trustees and again with the Chancellor, ending the day with dinner with the Trustees and the Chancellor. All dinners were held in the wine cellar in the Joy Burns Center at the Fritz Knobel School of Hospitality Management. The search committee met on January 5th to rank the four finalists. The committee was unanimous, the chancellor concurred, and an offer has been made. Dr. Davis said that it would be another week or two before details are finalized and an announcement is made.

Questions were mostly about the timeline of announcement. Is the role of that person/people to community, but also responsibilities of roles and responsibilities of people on university-wide committees and whether and how/what they communicate with their representative units and bodies.
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee Update (Kate Willink)

It has been a year since Faculty Senate approved the committee. Since that time, the committee sent out a university-wide survey, as well as collected promotion documentation from different units with non-tenure track faculty. John Tiedemann is the chair of the committee, and was ill and unable to give an update at this meeting, but if units or Senators have questions, he is the person to contact and we will hear from them next time.

Update on Policies and Procedures for Faculty Development, Job Responsibility Distributions, and Peer-to-Peer Conversations (PPFD+): We’re moving this from motion to action, and have actually begun to implement portions of this. The motion passed at the last Senate meeting leads to 2 actions, a Peer to Peer (P2P) conversations pilot, and a unit-level discussion about the “unsatisfactory performance” portion of the document. Both of these should be coming to your units soon, via deans and department chairs, so you can think about how to be involved in/comment on as both move forward.

“Unsatisfactory Performance” If there are no unit-level guidelines, there would need to be a unit-level opportunity to provide input on what those guidelines are. It will be made public to all faculty members in this unit. This is a 3-year trial program.

Language in the document as-is:

5. NOTICE OF UNSATISFACTORY JOB PERFORMANCE

Given past experience, relatively few faculty may be subject to notices of unsatisfactory job performance. Such notices will only be relevant to those faculty members whose performance is cited in an annual assessment as being significantly below expected standards.

5.2 The criteria for what qualifies as performance significantly below expected standards (and the issuance of 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. These guidelines will then be made public to all unit faculty members, after ample opportunity to provide substantive input.

Peer to Peer Conversation Pilot: It does not and shouldn’t take the place of other more informal conversations. It creates and supports community-building, renewal and growth, job satisfaction, create support networks, and foster a culture of community.

Early Adopters are Welcome!

There is a short guide (7 pages)
[https://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/p2pexecutivesummary.pdf](https://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/p2pexecutivesummary.pdf) and a longer (20-page) guide
[https://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/p2pconvenormanual.pdf](https://www.du.edu/facsen/media/documents/p2pconvenormanual.pdf) if you want to adopt early!
There will be a few trainings over the winter and spring quarter. Look at the Faculty Senate website. One of the central dimension is open-ended questions without an agenda. Part of the training is to allow us to practice some of the different ways of communicating with one another, work-life balance, etc. More documentation is available: [https://www.du.edu/facsen/professional-development/](https://www.du.edu/facsen/professional-development/)

Updates:
**Campus Master Plan:** AKA “Campus Framework” The Executive Committee was invited to a discussion on the master plan with Ayers Saint Gross, DU’s partner on the master plan. One of the topics that came up was that there have not be opportunities for the general faculty to give more involved, faculty-specific discussion of what we think of the idea of not having offices, get more open space, and what our needs are in terms of faculty housing. Vice-Chancellor for Institutional Partnerships, David Greenberg, added 3 more steps to the process to solicit more faculty involvement. The first was to work with the Registrar on all teaching space, how often, when it’s used and how, so they have a better idea of how spaces are now used for teaching. They came in for an additional week for deep dives with each unit as well, and each chair and director should have been asked to be involved. At least at a chair and director level, there should be more involvement and awareness of how faculty can give feedback and have input on this plan, which will affect many of us in years to come. Kate Willink: “Shared governance is achieved one meeting at a time.”

**2U:** Way back in November we talked about 2U and its implementation. The Executive Committee is thinking about how we might communicate as a faculty body about the expectations we have in terms of involvement and being apprised of what’s going on on our campus, especially in light of the massive changes this partnership portends for faculty culture on campus. There is an executive committee member at each table and we want to know your thoughts. We are trying to be very conscious – and making the chairs, directors, and deans aware and conscious – of how decisions made at a department level can have impacts not only on that department, but at a higher/more broad level.

**Shared Services: Amazon and Travel**

**Amazon:** The Amazon business accounts have been changed so that faculty can’t purchase items and have them sent to their homes, as they are not reimbursable. Since this impacts faculty and budget officers as well as Mail Services, faculty and staff need to have more of a voice in these kinds of decisions.

**Travel Management:** DU is thinking about using a travel management company to reduce costs and improve service. The University of Denver issued a request for proposals from travel management companies (TMC) in October 2017. Three vendors will be on campus to present travel solutions to the DU community at the following times:

- Christopherson Business Travel, **January 23rd** 9 a.m.-10 a.m., University Hall 306
- Anthony Travel, **January 24th** 9 a.m.-10 a.m., University Hall 306
- Short’s Travel Management, **January 30th** 9 a.m.-10 a.m., University Hall 306

Kate Willink: At a broad university level, this makes sense – think of how much the administrators travel. Faculty may still, however, want to continue to book the cheapest flight and an AirBnb. There will be 3 finalist companies, and to attend you do need to RSVP. Kate Willink will be there, representatives from Academic Planning and Financial Planning will also be there. Question (Nadia Kaneva): The understanding was that the meetings are to evaluate the finalists, not to give input on whether faculty are to be impacted by this decision – so, if we do want to give this input, how to do so? Kate Willink: Any feedback could be sent to Sarah Pessin (Academic Planning), Kate Willink, or Paul Kosempel (Financial), to give feedback in advance of that meeting.
Provost Gregg Kvistad: When the consultants started the process of unifying travel management 3 years ago, they told the administrators that if the faculty members aren’t supportive, it will fail. Right now, as we understand it, it should be fairly transactional and easy for budget officers, etc. to fit into this change. Before the faculty decide whether to support it, we need to ask what it is. If you have a Southwest account, can you still book Southwest, AirBnB, etc.? He said that he can’t imagine that it would be about limiting vendors, because it is first and foremost about reducing expense. The frame is not “this is terrible,” the sky is falling – we just don’t want something that seems to be administrivia that will have a major impact not be open to comment if it does turn out to have a real impact.

A faculty member asked how they can RSVP. Kate Willink had gotten the e-mail from her chair, but will included a link to RSVP in the faculty newsletter sometime next week.

Question: Campus master plan (Barbekka Hurtt): Are they looking at pedagogical changes – are the consultants making sure that the re-envisioned campus supports active learning, educational strategies now and 20 years in the future? Kate: They are thinking things like “does it work for a lab, does it work for discussion,” and in terms of talking with the deans, they are trying to gather what kinds of teaching spaces faculty are looking for now and in the future. She doesn’t have the answer, but will look into it.

Provost Kvistad: They haven’t broken it down to that level of granularity and probably should. They have looked at every single room on the campus in terms of square footage, use, and to some degree layout. Every teaching space, every office, is categorized; they have the “classrooms” the “research spaces” and then “hybrid spaces.” They have the utilization by hour every day for these spaces. But they are not getting into the pedagogy issue – that should be our deal. They have some of that data, but we need to inform this with our decision-making. We should be thinking, now, how do we communicate the pedagogical needs of the faculty to the Master Plan consultants and to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Partnerships, David Greenberg.

Question (Martin Rhodes): Is there a committee in Faculty Senate that deals with this specifically? Additionally, he noted that the Korbel School had had multiple issues with this new system for international travel and visitors. Kate Willink: Apropos of this exact topic, this quarter’s Executive Committee lunch with the Chancellor is “shared services,” and it is March 6, 2018. We would love to know issues like this to bring up at the lunch. There could be 2 more committees that would be standing – something like shared governance, as well as communication issues to make sure that we have the pulse of the faculty as a whole. What can we do to make communication better, etc. These are maybe somewhat boring issues, but they do have real impacts.

**Senate Constitution Discussion**

- How do we as a Faculty Senate use the Senate constitution to maximize our ability to act and make change on campus?
- Related question: As senators-- stewards of this responsibility for 800+ faculty, how do we make these decisions about the constitution within the context of changes in higher education and a changing university?
Motivation to Action Summary: Enacting shared governance, all of which are ways to be involved in mid-level decision-making in meaningful, systematic ways. Some are temporary, some are permanent. Not all standing, but all ways that we enact shared governance.

**House-Cleaning:** Constitutional revision-aligning policies and practices, aligning best practices. The three that we are going to address today are:

- size of the Senate
- size of committees
- who serves as chairs on standing committees

As a frame, there is a basic tension between representation and responsiveness. How do we best balance representation – we have a Senate when, fully seated, is more like a House of Representatives. At this size, it can be frustrating to try to move from motion to action. We need 2 readings per motion, and often we deal with important issues with breadth rather than depth. Also, how do you coordinate a large body with a relatively limited amount of meeting times. There is also the tension between what we would want in principle and in practice. In principle, I might think some things are great, but in practice they may be a total bear to administer or enact. In principle, we want every area represented. In practice, getting a schedule for 12 people is quite hard, and 6 people is more effective but less representative.

None of these votes are binding, they are just straw poll votes for the purpose of discussion. For those who are proxies, take this back to your unit and your Senator. As a point of contrast, American University has a Senate comprised of 16 faculty. When you think about power and the ability to move quickly, this size is far more effective – but far less representative. You could argue – it should take time, it should be deliberative. Question: Could we have both? A smaller and a bigger body? Maybe this is just the Senate as-is, and the Executive Committee has more power/authority.

**Vote:** A. A smaller senate could be a more effective senate, so I support considering a smaller sized senate (e.g., 60 Senators). 50% (23 votes)

B. Prefer to keep the Senate as it is--a larger, more representative Senate. 50% (23 votes)

46 votes total

**Vote:** A. All senators should be required to serve on a committee, resulting in large committees. 22% (11 votes)

B. Senate committees should be smaller, e.g., eight members and a chair; meaning not all senators are required to serve on a committee. 78% (39 votes)

53 votes total.

**Vote:** A. Committee chairs (who are also Senate Executive Committee Members) should be elected amongst the entire Senate. 59.18% (29 votes)

B. Committee chairs (Senate Executive Committee Members) should be elected amongst the entire faculty. 4.08% (2 votes)
C. Committees should elect their chairs, as is the current practice. 36.73% (18 votes) 

49 votes total.

The Senate then broke into small group discussion, with each table facilitated by an Executive Committee member, about the pros and cons of potential changes that we could make to the constitution or to our practices, to ensure that the Faculty Senate as a body is thoughtfully constituted, and that the processes reflect how we, as faculty, would like to enact shared governance.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 PM.