Faculty Senate Meeting  
Friday, February 16, 2018  
Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science Room 510

Senators (or proxies) present: Doug Allen (also proxy for Jeff Bowen), Lynn Baker, Linda Bensel-Meyers, Eric Boschmann, Daniel Brisson, Ryan Buller, John Campbell, Victor Castellani, Ruth Chao, Sara Chatfield, Frédérique Chevillot, Kate Crowe, David Daniels, Ron DeLyser, Peter Dobelis, Xin Fan, Patt Garriott, Brian Gearity, Kingshuk Ghosh, James Gilroy, Sarah Hart-Micke, Darrin Hicks, John Hill, Deborah Howard, Barbekka Hurtt, Scott Johns, Megan Kelly (proxy for Jared del Rosso), Cheyne Kirkpatrick (also proxy for Melanie Witt), Judy Kiyama, Michelle Knowles (proxy John Latham), Paul Kosempel, Christina Kreps, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Andrew Linshaw, Mario Lopez, Zulema Lopez, Kevin Lynch, Brian Majestic, Krystyna Matusiak, Julianne Mitchell, Ved Nanda, Kevin O’Brien, Ronnie Pavlov, Sarah Pessin, Carl Raschke, Chip Reichardt, Martin Rhodes, Jason Roney, David Schott, Jonathan Sciarcon (proxy Rafael Rossotto Ioris), Michael Siebecker, Derigan Silver (proxy for Carlos Jimenez Winter 2018 only), Amrik Singh, Shannon Sliva, Emily Sposeto, Mary Stansbury, Kate Stoker, Nicole Taylor (also proxy for Jamie Shapiro), Scott Toney, Armond Towns (proxy for Raul Perez and Aaron Schneider), Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Ann Vessels, Gwen Vogel Mitchell, Steven von Merz, Sarah Watamura, Annecoos Wiersma, Kate Willink.

Senate meeting was called to order at 12:02.

Faculty Senate/Undergraduate Student Government Collaboration
David Daniels gave an overview of the USG / Student Relations Sub-Committee, Morgan Smith (President), Daniel Kaelin (Arts and Humanities Senator), met and there was a conversation about interests and concerns of students and faculty senate. They held a listening session with about four Faculty Senators meet with 6 members of student government and they shared ideas, students did most of the talking. Out of the listening session there were some themes and topics that came up.

USG meets every week, and they only have 20 senators, so they have some internal committees and committee chairs. Daniel Is the Faculty and Academic Affairs chair, and the goal is to align the position with Student Relations in Faculty Senate. Daniel: We have a lot of power and voice on campus and can work closely together.
We then moved to brainstorming sessions on: “What are the pressing issues that affect both faculty and students and that faculty and students could work on together?”

Summary of the discussion at Kate Crowe’s table (Sarah Watamura, Morgan from USG, Kate Crowe, and several other Senators who joined us later): Mental health, inclusion, bookstore.

Sarah Watamura: They can do a lot of things in-house because they’re so large, but that may lead to a more insular department. She is curious about advising across the university and consistency across the majors. From FSEM there is a hand-off to general advising and then graduation. Also engagement with the community and meaningful exchanges and service learning voice development. Open Educational Resources, free textbooks. Morgan: Students and mental health and faculty support – and the resources that are known are over-taxed, and students may be less familiar with how to create less/informal structures.

In conclusion, Kate Willink also mentioned of Freedom of Speech committee as an example of faculty/student/staff collaboration, and encouraged us to think of other ways to collaborate.

**Introduction of Incoming Provost Dr. Jeremy Haefner**

The next time he comes there will be an open question and answer session, but this is just a brief introduction and overview from him. Kate brought up a slide of achievements as listed in his vita, which was shared. Dr. Haefner expressed his pride and thanks for his selection. He couldn’t be prouder to be joining DU, in specific to the “alternative to post-tenure review” and the other great things he’s heard about us. We want faculty to be able to be pre-eminent in their fields and grow is what the Provost should be doing, and the role he wants to play. He was excited to see the PPFD and the full document on freedom of expression – he has been already asked by Provosts at other institutions who want to know if they could utilize the document for their own institutions, and he is very pleased that the faculty have proactively advanced dialogue around free expression.

The projects he’s found most rewarding are where the Provost has provided support so that the faculty can be successful in research and also in teaching. He talked about the changes in the promotion and tenure process at his previous institution which was a teaching institution, not a research institution. The cultural changes needed were immense to begin to move this forward. The Senate at his previous institution did not have a mid-tenure review process. In addition, there was no cultural acceptance of external letter validation for tenure packages, which is critical to recruitment of the best faculty and enhance that teacher-scholar mode that they wanted to evolve into. He attended the committee that implemented those changes and put those into place in his first year as Provost. The Graduate Education Initiative established a new set of quality metrics for grad education, which was different at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) because the ratios were different. Early on, he talked about the importance of building graduate programs, because he also knew that would be a driver for their research success. They are now in the process of going from 3,000 to 7-8,000 graduate students. They identified what programs had a high demand, and new programs to add – PhD programs, masters research programs, balancing out the portfolio. The mix of undergrad, grad, and faculty is really important to a vibrant campus. The last point, academic program review, has maybe some of the same connotations as post-tenure review, but he has used the same frame, of
empowerment of faculty. If you give faculty the data and key metrics agreed upon, they will take that data and help to evolve the program to be more successful. He used the Craft programs as an example, which were individual degrees (glass blowing, jewelry making, etc.). They took the data from the program, which is dwindling, and he presented this data to the faculty, and asked them what to do with about the metrics and turned the process of evolving the programs over to the faculty. They’ve really thought about integrating the curriculum to bring the program up to 21st century students’ desires and expectations.

After the speech we moved into a brief Q&A with Kate Willink:

Kate: How did you work with the Faculty Senate at RIT and how do you see that working at DU? Haefner: Faculty governance is critical to success as Provost and the university’s overall success. It’s where policy is germinated, where faculty can see how they fit into a larger organization, and is critical to shared governance. He will be deeply engaged working with the leadership of Senate, he will attend on a regular basis, and participate in committees as it’s possible. It’s a partnership he’d like to extend and would like to know more about what the Senate would like to see from the Provost. From what he can see it’s been a healthy relationship and he looks forward to supporting it and making it flourish.

Kate: Communication with faculty broadly: How do you work to develop communication lines – at RIT and how do you plan to do this at DU? Haefner: I see the position as Provost as the opportunity to be a convener, that’s something the Provost can do – bring people together horizontally. If we don’t pull together and convene across units (interdisciplinary research, or joint programs across colleges) that’s a problem. Prior to him coming to RIT, the chairs at RIT never came together as a group. They created a council of chairs, guided by a steering committee, there would be a dean on the table, but this was often about topics that transcended individual units and how the chairs could contribute to where the university was going across disciplines and units. A piece of that has been really listening to the faculty and making sure the chairs are developing a welcoming environment. At RIT they are a member of the Collaborative for Academic Careers in Higher Ed out of the Harvard Grad School (COACH), it is originated by faculty for faculty, which provided key information to the institution about how faculty felt they were supported, if they were engaged, etc. Ask the deans, chairs how they would make improvements on core areas where they were not doing as well. He’d like to see more of these collaborations at the University of Denver.

Kate: RIT has a unique initiative focused on the needs of deaf and hard of hearing students. What lessons have you learned and how will this kind of work go forward at DU? Haefner: RIT was one of the first universities to support the deaf and hard of hearing, working with Gallaudet University they also have the Technical Institute for the Deaf, which is federally funded and they provide access to higher ed in technical fields for 1300-1400 deaf and hard of hearing students. That’s an important part of the mission of the university, access to higher ed for all. Also, RIT’s students who have full range of hearing benefit far more from deaf and hard of hearing students than in the reverse. There is not a single classroom that doesn’t have an ASL
interpreter in the room or a note-taker or closed captioning. Deaf and hard of hearing students are fully integrated into all of the academic degree programs. Students with a full range of hearing are living and learning with a population that is different from the majority. One of the programs he struggled with as provost was to offer enough sections of ASL so hearing students could learn to communicate with deaf and hard of hearing students. He would submit that the RIT students without hearing loss, because of their unique experience working with a large population of deaf and hard of hearing students, means they are graduating with empathy skills which will serve them well in a diverse work environment. He’s not sure every university can say that their students are graduating with that kind of skillset, which is translatable, not just directed to deaf and hard of hearing. He is also aware of how hard it is for faculty to support students in fully inclusive ways. Mandating or really strongly encouraging that faculty closed caption all the videos was really important and making sure that faculty had the support to do so, as well as other programs to support students with this specific set of disabilities.

Kate: What do you want faculty to know about you?
Haefner: First, he hopes he comes across as very approachable. He wants people to feel comfortable coming up to him and sharing, because that’s the only way he’ll learn what really matters to the faculty. He will work hard to communicate what DU is doing, sharing information as much as he can. Some of that is in that horizontal binding that he’ll do through town hall meetings, or whatever makes the most sense in this institutional culture.

Rapid fire Q&A:

1. What book or books have you gifted the most to other people? Haefner: Team of Rivals by Doris Kearns Goodwin. He’s a huge Lincoln fan. Now Walter Isaacson Leonardo da Vinci.
2. When you think of the word success, who do you think of and why? Haefner: Torn between Lincoln and Haefner’s father and mother. They were two different individuals, his father was academic and taught in school of ed and implanted the “public good” gene. He was always out in the school districts, supervising student teachers, also in the lab school and made such an impression on the senior class in the Plato’s Republic class, the students gave him an all-expense paid trip to Greece so he could see it. His mother was the creative one, she would always be the one to come up with a solution.
3. What passions do you explore on evenings or weekends? Haefner: When it isn’t sitting in front of a fireplace with his wife and a glass of wine, reflecting on podcasts, he has a penchant for athleticism and exercise. He derives a lot of pleasure and balance in running, swimming, and biking, as they all allow him to shake off the stress of the day and free-form think.
4. What advice would you give your 21-year-old self? Haefner: Don’t give up being curious. He sees has a lot of hope for the generation coming to universities now because they still have this sense of curiosity and they can fulfill that sense, it’s not like a 10-year-old who keeps asking the questions and the parent who’s frustrated – they have other ways of exploring. We as educators need to focus on supporting that curiosity and not diminishing that desire.
Senate Committee Size Discussion

Kate urges us to begin with the question: “How do we as a Faculty Senate think about our constitution and practices to maximize our ability to act and make change on campus?”

The last time we talked, the area where we had the most consensus was the size of committees. 20% of senators thought all senators should serve on committees. 80% thought committees should be smaller, and not all senators would need to serve.

Proposed change in practice: Substantially reduce the size of the standing Senate committees (now averaging between 12 and 20 senators per committee) to a range of no fewer than 3 and no more than 8 Senators (plus a chair).

What we’re thinking through in these discussions is – are we working to maximize the impact of committees?

Disadvantages: Equity of workload, not enough people/people feel excluded by smaller committees.
Advantages: More effective, more nimble, easier to set meetings, and higher level of commitment.

Issues we will work on regardless:
- Messaging around committee work at divisional level
- Aligning committee work with Senate president/Exec Committee vision for greater impact
- Clearly communicating the committee agenda before Senators opt in to committee (do senators understand not only the charge, but the agenda for that year)
- Recognizing differentiated service levels of Senators
- Creating a pool of people willing to serve even if they are not on a committee
- Staffing subcommittees with senators or other faculty for core decision-making functions of Senate: sabbatical requests, FRF grants, and faculty awards. This could disaggregate the function from committee structure and potentially even Senate.

We then reviewed the results for survey from committee chairs where they asked for the measure of commitment from active to medium to low (and then quite a few of people who haven’t yet responded). They haven’t yet taken the data to see if the non-respondents are also the ones who aren’t attending/able to attend.

Questions were:
A (coded as “ACTIVE”): I commit to be very actively involved in committee activities, attending meetings, volunteer to do work needed and helping to accomplish tasks.
B (coded as “MEDIUM”): I can commit to come to most meetings and when I have time would be willing to do select assignments as needed but couldn’t commit to active involvement at this point.

C (coded as “LOW’): Of course, I support the committee’s purpose and work. But given my personal circumstances, I would be unable to commit to being on a committee at this time.

D. I would never want to serve on a committee.

Academic Planning: Total # of responses: 8. Active: 3, Medium: 5, Low: 1
Student Relations: Total # of responses: 14. Active: 6, Medium: 4, Low: 2
NCR: Total # of responses: 5. Active: 2, Medium: 2, Low: 0.
Total # of responses for all: 59.

We ended with table discussion. Summary of Kate Crowe’s table:
Based on this, our question is: Should we make a change in practice to make committee participation non-mandatory and shrink the size? Doug Allen: This response is a great outcome, and the survey profile is a pretty good profile for a senate. The question to discuss should be, how do we facilitate that in a positive way to support that participation and desire to be involved? One point would be to be authentic about how to best draw upon all those commitments given the size of the overall Senate. Sarah Watamura: Yes, this should put us in awareness that the response and engagement of Senators would change over time and we’d need to keep an eye on it.

Non-Binding Clicker Vote:
I support the proposed change in practice to substantially reduce the size of standing committees and making them not mandatory.

Question from the audience: Is there a reason to not have more committees? Kate: on different topics or more? She reminded us that we’ve also discussed having a committee on shared governance and a communications committee. There are more ways to think about what committees we have and need! We would though need to change the constitution, which would also change the size of the Executive Committee. Armond: If we were to change the size of the committees, what would be the role of the “extra” Senators be? Kate: great question. If we align practice, what we’re currently doing wouldn’t truly change a lot because there are a number of Senators “on” a committee who aren’t actively participating. The challenge with group dynamics is what is it like to be on a committee of 22 when only 7 people come every time and they’re different people. Senators would continue to vote and come to full Senate meetings. There is never a shortage of service for senators. Each person would be a standing senator, but there would be a change in practice for Faculty Senate committee service. Sarah Watamura: We need to ensure that unit representation would be possible in committees with this change. David Daniels: A key/value role of senators is to bring information back to units, and bringing concerns back and forth, they would still be doing that. Kate W: Making sure that at key decision points, all units are involved is key. Rafael Ioris: Do we know there will be
enough people to serve? Doug Allen: What about the range? 3-8 is a maybe somewhat random number. Kate: This will be brought back to the Executive Committee after this meeting, in some cases the committee chairs might be able to decide that in some ways that would be less problematic and appropriate to the missions of the committees.

Table discussion, cont’d: Several people at the table discussed the issue of making sure all units are represented, and with this change you could have lopsided representation or have a whole unit not on any committee. Also, the committee structure in the constitution is fairly well defined, and Sarah W. would recommend that the committee structure may not change, but maybe working groups on different topics or projects that are more time- and project-based, quarter to quarter. Question about the distribution of labor (Linda Bensel-Meyers): Should there be a rep from each of the divisions? The overall Senate has guidance on representation and so it would make sense to reflect that in the committees. Kate C.: Agree! Also used PPFD as an example where you’d want to make especially sure to have representation. Sarah Watamura: The committee service in her case is much clearer because the committee is more project based. Doug Allen: Some people could give dedicated time to a specific project, he used the Bookstore Committee as an example, and spread the work around supported by sub-committees that are standing. Sarah W: people have a lot of different reasons for serving on Senate. Doug: An interesting difference in motivation is “are you here representing your unit or are you looking at the good of the university?” This is something to look at when we restructure the committees. He would like to advocate for looking at the good of the university as an orientation for Senators. Sarah W: The flexible hat wearing is a skill! You want to bring that perspective in and both perspectives. It’s also a question of how to recognize the diversity of tasks, jobs, projects that a Senator could work on. Doug: Limiting “service” to “committee service” isn’t an even accurate measure of effective service. Maybe that’s a designated role for the people who are the “honey bees” rather than “worker bees.” Sarah: it is now a formal and did not used to be a formal update at Psych Faculty meetings. Doug: It is more ad hoc in our case, but there are both department level faculty meetings and all-division. Linda: this change could liberate Senators to serve in ways that made more sense. Doug: I’m not sure I would require Senators should be required beyond full Senate participants. Everything else is additional, and there should be additional recognition for committee service.

As table discussion concluded, Kate W, reminded everyone that this is a non-binding vote, and to please vote based on mandatory vs non-mandatory committee service, and a principle of smaller committees. Paul Kosempel: Also reminded everyone to vote with the assumption that the Senate size stays the same and that the details of the size of the committees will be responsive to the table discussions, which will come back.

Results: Exactly the same as the first vote, 80/20.
Reminders:

The deadline for faculty awards is extended to March 15, 2018. Please bring this back to departments and units. These are on the Senate page and will send again in next Senate newsletter.

Provost's Reception: Monday February 19, 2018 Time: 3:30-4:30 topic: How do we teaching in the current hyper-political, hyper-mediated environment. Last for Gregg.

Chancellor Roundtable: Thursday Feb 22, 2018 3:30-4:30. Ryman Theater, Margery Reed Academic and Student Affairs partnership.

April 5: Gathering for Courage and Renewal:
9-11:30 AM Courage & Renewal for Faculty and Staff in Higher Ed
2:30-4:30 PM Peer to Peer conversations kick off
7-8:30 PM: The courage to teach 20-year anniversary: Live encounter with Parker Palmer & Diana Chapman Walsh. Around burnout, struggles, etc.

We adjourned at 1:30 PM.