

University of Denver
Faculty Senate
Minutes
April 1, 2016
Room 290, Anderson Academic Commons

Senators (or proxies) present:

Anneliese Amschler Andrews, Michael Brent, Frédérique Chevillot, Mac Clouse, Kate Crowe, Jared Del Rosso, Ron DeLyser, Maha Foster, Nadia Kaneva (proxy for Tony Gault), Jennifer Pap (proxy for Jim Gilroy), Kathy Green, Jennifer Greenfield, Blake Sanz (proxy for Sarah Hart Micke), Cynthia Hazel, John Hill, Scott Johns, Arthur Jones, Megan Kelly, Cheyne Kirckpatrick, Judy Kiyama, Shawn Alfrey (proxy for Paul Kosempel), Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Luis Leon, Eleanor McNees, Laleh Mehran, Ryan Buller (proxy for Erin Meyer), Gloria Miller, Keith Miller, Julianne Mitchell, Pallab Paul, Amy Phillips, Mike Keables (proxy for Rebecca Powell), Tom Quinn, Chip Reichardt, Aimee Reichman-Decker, Dean Saitta, Maria Salazar, Nancy Sampson (proxy for Vi Narapareddy), Jonathan Sciarcon, Jamie Shapiro, Dave Corsun (proxy for Amrik Singh), Mary Steefel, Kate Stoker, Billy Stratton, Mathew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, John Tiedemann, Greg Ungar, Robert Urquhart, Kate Willink, Melanie Witt, Duan Zhang

Call to order, approval of minutes and nomination

Senate President Art Jones called the meeting to order at noon.

A motion to approve the minutes from the February 26, 2016, Senate meeting was seconded and approved.

The nomination to appoint James Herbert Williams Dean Emeritus was voted on and unanimously approved.

Second reading discussion and vote on the recommendations and motions of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee

- *Introductory remarks*

President-elect Kate Willink and Chip Reichardt, co-chairs of the TFPR Committee, presented opened the discussion. Kate thanked the faculty on the committee for their dedicated work over the last two years and praised the structure they had created as an example of shared governance. She added that, although some faculty felt that the TFPR plan was not “punitive” enough, the Committee sees their work as an effort to create a transparent structure for taking an explicitly developmental approach, one that creates a relationship between faculty and chairs focused on developing faculty members’ strengths. The committee believes that it helps us to break down silos and to insure that all faculty receive the support they need. This structure is intended to lay

out a vision for the next committee to implement; all the parts of that vision support the end of fairness and transparency.

- *Discussion*

Discussion was taken up with a consideration of four amendments proposed by Nadia Kaneva on behalf of the Department of Media, Film, & Journalism Studies. Two of the proposed amendments were labeled “friendly” and two were labeled “unfriendly.”

The first friendly amendment proposed revising the language on Professional Development Discussions (PDD) Option 1C as follows:

Following three consecutive years of annual reviews that have explicitly labeled a faculty member’s performance unsatisfactory, the administrative head of the academic unit may require that a faculty member engage in a PDD. ~~In the discussion with the faculty member, the administrative head may either negotiate or mandate that the faculty member participate in specified professional development activities.~~ The administrative head will first attempt to negotiate appropriate professional development activities with the faculty member to the satisfaction of both parties. If a mutually agreeable resolution cannot be reached after negotiation the administrative head may mandate specific professional development activities. If the faculty member objects to mandated professional development activities, the faculty member may file a grievance following the grievance procedures of the University.

The second friendly amendment proposed revising the language on Job Responsibility Discussions (JRD) Option 2C as follows:

Following three consecutive years of annual reviews that have explicitly labeled a faculty member’s performance unsatisfactory, the administrative head of the academic unit may require the faculty member to meet to engage in a JRD. ~~The administrative head will first attempt to negotiate with the faculty appropriate changes in jobs responsibilities that are satisfactory to both parties. If a mutually agreeable resolution cannot be reached after negotiation the administrative head may mandate specific changes in job responsibilities. Any negotiated or mandated changes in job responsibilities must be approved by the Dean.~~ ~~In discussion with the faculty member, the administrative head may either negotiate or mandate a change in job responsibilities (which must be approved by the Dean).~~ If the faculty member objects to mandated changes in professional responsibilities, the faculty member may file a grievance following the grievance procedures of the University.

The first substantive (or “unfriendly”) amendment proposed to delete option 1B (below) from the motions:

Option 1B: The administrative head of an academic unit may request a PDD with a faculty member for the purpose of proposing professional development activities and

resources. Any proposed changes in professional development activities and resources would be negotiated to the satisfaction of both the faculty member and administrative head.

The second substantive (or “unfriendly”) amendment proposed to delete option 2B (below) from the motions:

Option 2B: The administrative head of an academic unit may request a JRD with a faculty member. Any proposed changes in the faculty member’s job responsibilities would be negotiated to the satisfaction of both parties (and approved by the Dean).

Kate and Chip thanked Nadia for her involvement, and pointed out why they don’t believe that the “unfriendly” amendments ought to be adopted, arguing that the potential for “abuses” that the amendments seek to avoid are non-unique, i.e., the amendments will not prevent the potential abuses from occurring, while the recommendations as is provide protection against abuse by creating transparency and an official structure for discussion. The benefits of the structure therefore outweigh the costs, while also opening pathways to extra resources (e.g., professional development funds).

Advocates of the amendments objected that the benefits don’t outweigh the costs insofar as the language is too vague, failing to distinguish between heads of departments requesting meetings for positive reasons and requesting them for negative ones. It was also objected that the language of “changing job responsibilities” opened a pathway to abuse.

Kate and Chip responded that the objections were best addressed during the implantation phase, reiterating that the amendments do not in fact prevent the possibility of the abuses they identify.

- *Voting*

The friendly amendments were voted upon and adopted unanimously.

The amendment to remove 1b passed did not pass. The vote was 14 in favor of removing the amendment and 25 opposed to removing it, with 8 abstentions.

The amendment to remove 2b passed by a vote of 21 in favor and 20 opposed, with 6 abstentions.

The motion to approve the entire document, with the above revisions, passed by a note of 41 in favor and 1 opposed, with 4 abstentions.

Updates and announcements

John Tiedemann announced that, at the next meeting, the Student Relations Committee would seek endorsement by the Senate of the Inclusive Learning Environments Initiative.

Art Jones announced that, as members of the strategic vision implementation committee on community engagement, he and Kate Crowe would be available to listen to ideas for ways to engage the community at the Provost/Faculty Reception on April 20.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Minutes prepared and submitted by

John Tiedemann
Chair, Student Relations