

**University of Denver
Faculty Senate
Minutes
February 26, 2016
Room 290, Anderson Academic Commons**

Senators (or proxies) present:

Michael Brent, Tess Bruce, Rodney Buxton (proxy for Tony Gault), Victor Castellani, Fred Cheever, Frédérique Chevillot, Kate Crowe, Mike Daniels (proxy for Rebecca Powell), Jared Del Rosso, Ron DeLyser, Maha Foster, Jim Gilroy, Kathy Green, Sarah Hart Micke (Proxy for Elizabeth Drogin), Cynthia Hazel, Annabeth Headrick, Scott Johns, Art Jones, Megan Kelly, Judy Kiyama, Paul Kosempel, Michelle Kruse-Crocker, Rick Leaman, Eleanor McNeese, Laleh Mehran, Erin Meyer, Gloria Miller, Keith Miller, Julianne Mitchell, Paul Pallub, Ronnie Pavlov, Amy Phillips, Tom Quinn, Chip Reichardt, Aimee Reichman-Decker, Dean Saitta, Maria Salazar, Nancy Sampson (proxy for Mac Clouse), Jonathan Sciarcon, Orna Shaughnessy, Amrik Singh, Mary Steefel, Kate Stoker, Billy Stratton, Mathew Taylor, Nicole Taylor, John Tiedemann, Greg Ungar, Ann Vessels, Joshua Wilson, Melanie Witt, Carol Zak-Dance, Duan Zhang

Call to Order, Approval of Minutes

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

A motion to approve the minutes from the November 13, 2015 and January 29, 2016 Senate meetings was seconded and approved.

Announcements – Art Jones

Art reported that the Committee on Freedom of Expression has paused work until a highly recommended colleague, who is unable to join until spring, can be added to the committee.

The Exploratory Committee on Divestment encountered a tension between the committee charge to explore the issue of divestment and the students, on the committee, who have already determined to recommend divestment. The students have chosen to resign from the committee and remaining members have met with the Chancellor to discuss next steps.

Provost Report – Gregg Kvistad

Gregg reported that there were updates to the implementation process for the Strategic Plan since his last report. The consultant recently met with sixty people in a workshop to begin thinking about how to implement the plan. Currently nineteen small teams are being assembled to think about implementing each of the strategic initiatives. These groups will have four weeks to put together a strategy.

The Provost's Conference in late April will be on "Just Sustainabilities" and feature Julian Agyeman, professor of urban and environmental policy and planning at Tufts.

Report from Gary Brower, Chaplain and Don Enloe, Director of Campus Safety

Gary and Don distributed a chart outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Critical Incident Response Team that responds to deaths and serious injuries of campus community members. They stressed that faculty and units do not need to deal with notifications and responses, but should alert Campus Safety as soon as we hear of a death or serious injury involving a community member. They also reminded us that, while we may want more information on an incident, there are times when the family wishes to limit the publicizing of details and that we want to respect those wishes.

First reading and discussion of the recommendations and motions of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee

Art introduced the first reading of the recommendations of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review Committee, brought forward with a unanimous endorsement of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This document represents one and a half years of work by a committee charged, by a vote of this body in 2014, to look at what kinds of things can be done to evaluate faculty as they move through their careers. The vote included the stipulation that the committee would not be charged solely with investigating "post tenure review", but to think about the issue more broadly. Kate Willink and Chip Reichardt chaired the committee and Chip will lead the discussion of the document and the faculty survey that informed it. A vote on the recommendations will be held at the April 1, 2016 meeting.

Chip thanked the members of the committee for their work over the past year and a half, during which they studied policies; read literature on post tenure review; conducted a Qualtrics survey of all DU faculty; and met with all deans (and chairs of AHSS) individually, as well as with Gregg Kvistad, Rebecca Chopp, and FEAC.

Some highlights of the Qualtrics Survey:

- 63% agreed or strongly agreed with concept of job responsibility discussions
- 53% of tenure-line and 70+% of non-tenure-line agreed with the concept of a developmental approach
- 70% of tenure-line, 84% of non-tenure-line thought faculty should be reviewed to identify unsatisfactory performance
- Chronic and un-remediated deficiencies – sterner 45% of tenure-line and 56% of non-tenure line agreed that the language tenure

Chip added that the recommendations of the committee, in sum, are that we not have anything called “post tenure review,” that there be three types of developmental options available, and that these should be open to all faculty, tenure-line and non-tenure-line.

Question: How many faculty are tenured vs. untenured?

Answer (Gregg): Around 700 appointed faculty, 2/3 of them are tenure-line.

Question: Should the job conversations be documented by chairs?

Answer (Chip): In some cases, such as the mandated conversations, yes they should, but a lot of details were left out and are to be decided by the next committee, to be tasked with policy and procedure details. Just as with APT revisions, these would need to be approved by faculty.

Art added that the recommendations document currently under discussion and up for approval is providing only a framework and that, similar to the strategic plan implementation, many necessary details would still need to be decided. On April 1, we will be voting on this framework; if we approve, we will be working within this framework.

Question: I have issues with Section 3: peer-to-peer feels wishy washy. Another kind of peer-to-peer mentoring happens with older to younger faculty. Can this include faculty “mentoring”?

Answer (Chip): This section is not meant to curtail any other developmental activities or to supplant them.

Question: Did the committee receive deans’ approval?

Answer (Chip): Not the deans approval, no, but the committee did meet with all the deans and they were, in general, amenable. The APT revisions were voted on by Senate, approved by the faculty, and then approved by Board. When it’s approved by the Board, FEAC gets input from Gregg who gets feedback from deans.

Question: How much is this going to cost?

Answer (Chip): That is an unanswered question. The committee talked to Gregg some about this and we know it will need some resources and included wording to remind us of that. Some things can be done without new resources, like utilizing OTL.

Question: Is the “administrative head” the chair or dean?

Answer (Chip): It depends on the academic unit.

Question: Are there mechanism for adjuncts to participate in faculty development at some point? Also, the Job Responsibility Discussion assumes there is some document already stating how job duties are allocated but that's not always the case.

Answer (Chip): As written, this applies only to appointed faculty so no, it does not specifically apply to adjuncts.

Question: For Option C under Sections 1, 2, and 3 the language states that something is mandated, but there is no timeline or stated consequences.

Answer (Chip): The committee didn't want to state all details of implementation, but focused on what is mandated what not.

Question: Section 2 might reference other documents that apply for underperformance.

Answer (Chip): This document doesn't add anything to terminate people. That is already in the APT as "for cause", for dereliction of duty and moral turpitude.

Question: To whom does this apply?

Answer (Chip): All appointed and benefited faculty, not just tenure-line.

Question: My unit made the comment that section three [Peer-to-Peer Conversations] is not needed. It's a best practice but not at the level of policies.

Answer (Chip): That will be left up to departments. Some might mandate on a timeline, others might make it minimal or not include it at all.

Question: I'm new to Faculty Senate and I heard from colleagues that developing a post-tenure review process was really forced upon Senate by the Board.

Follow up questioner: I agree. Perhaps we should add this to the document?

Answer (Chip): As Senate President, Scott Leutenegger received comments from wide variety of constituencies including the Board, concerned faculty members, deans, and chairs, about some shirking their responsibilities. The concept of PTR was also a part of the times and "in the air" in many ways. Scott heard it repeatedly over two years from wide variety of people. So even if none approved of PTR, we still had a very vigorous discussion on these issues, which is valuable.

Question: Why isn't pay, incentives for good work included? If I'm not tenured and I engage in these activities, set goals and meet them, then what happens? Am I rewarded? My department asked why isn't this being incentivized; the document states "increased resources" in what sense?

Answer (Chip): It's separable issue, after we tackle this. In many ways, these developmental activities are both a reward in themselves (lead to better teaching, for example) and should lead to promotion and merit increases. The resources are for providing developmental activities. My sense is that there is a good strong push for salary increases in other areas.

Art added, we don't want to go down the line of "if I attend a workshop on writing then I get this reward."

Annabeth Hedrick added that in many universities untenured don't get any support; you sink or swim. This gives you something to help untenured faculty, with teaching for example.

Chip added that these activities aren't just for remediation; you could be a stellar teacher and want to take workshop online to improve.

Question: This is all nice about development, but those of us who are tenured have a protection that those who are not tenured don't. What about the three years of bad reviews? Many of us in Education already have 3 year contracts and they are mandated.

Answer (Chip): If you have a three-year contract this really doesn't apply. If you have a five-year contract this applies some, a seven-year then more so. Mandated changes might not apply but the others could still apply.

Comment: If you are teaching faculty then you might want to not only renegotiate for more research but also a higher salary or a tenure-line appointment.

Response (Chip): Well you would have to have a tenure line open. The new APT makes it clear that any teaching or other non-tenured faculty can apply for tenured positions.

Comment: We aren't one faculty, but bifurcated or trifurcated faculty so maybe we need multiple documents. The survey shows that 50% of us don't feel valued or are indifferent or don't know. Maybe we need to know more about how we are valued as tenured or associate professors. Some statement about needing to be valued might help administration or others.

Question: Now that the recommendations aren't punitive or about post-tenure review, but more strength based, what is sense of how Board will take it?

Answer (Chip): We met with most all constituents including the Board, Rebecca, etc. They haven't approved but they haven't given a sense that this won't work for us. To have shared governance we want these types of documents approved by both faculty and Board. This also gives them idea that they should ask us to approve documents as well.

Gregg added that the committee tried to thread a needle very carefully. Tenure not understood or supported by the public generally: times are not kind to tenure, particularly in public institutions run by legislatures. In most places it's "post tenure review" and it's seen as a way to prevent people from doing nefarious things once they get tenure. This is meant to protect against that. Our Board is part of the public, mostly business people, who don't really deeply understand the academic freedom that underlies this but they aren't thinking there are many people we need to get rid of. The committee wants to show trustees that this is a way to get the very best faculty members we can.

Comment: It could be that you want to do more research, not just more teaching.

Comment: Yes it could also be that you want to do more service. Some resent service getting in the way but should be teaching, research, service are equally weighted.

Comment (Chip): Yes, we elder people maybe need to do more service.

Comment: For the discussion on values, maybe want to negotiate on your job responsibilities and get evaluated for merit on new responsibilities.

Comment: The document lack many details but in Senate we've been working on it for quite a while. We are doing pretty well here in relation to what's going on outside, and think this is a nice effort and better than waiting for a police state. I want to thank the committee for their work on this. [Followed by a round of applause for the committee].

Question: If we make revisions, will we need another first reading?

Answer (Art): We need to ask our parliamentarian John Hill, who is not here today.

Closing Announcements - Art

The veterans ad hoc committee work is ongoing and he will update us on that.

Question: The language about this was limited to vets of American wars, would we want to open that up?

Answer (Art): Yes, good point, and we might want to think of people who are non-veterans.

The meeting adjourned at 1:14pm.

Minutes prepared and submitted by

Erin Meyer
Faculty Senate Secretary