



LGBTQ+ Committee Meeting
September 15, 2017, 2-4 p.m.
Denver Conference Room, 1800 Grant Street

Minutes

Attending: Lauren Fontana, Scarlet Bowen, Dena Samuels, Grace Wagner, Tina Moser, Matthew Brown, Nora Van Leuvan, Darren Chavez, Ravinder Singh, Rian Cheley

Regent Carson Statement

- Clarification – Regent John Carson serves as lead attorney at Cherry Creek Mortgage and the opinions expressed are not his own.
- Faculty Council (FC) statement on the matter was delivered during the FC Chair Report at the Board of Regents (BOR) meeting on September 7.
- Lauren Fontana attended as well, and submitted an additional statement put forth by the Boulder chancellor’s advisory committee – no response has been received by the BOR as of yet.
- Committee is ready to move forward from the matter.
 - o At this time there is no interest to discuss the matter at FC with Regent Carson
 - o At this time there is no interest to discuss the university statement in the Daily Camera article with VP Ken McConnellogue.

Regent Law and Policy - Article 5 (<http://www.cu.edu/regents/laws-and-policies/regent-laws/article-5-faculty>)

- Action: By October 13, review the outline of suggested changes (appended) and provide feedback to Lauren or Scarlet. They will take to FC on committee’s behalf.
 - o Additional comments outside of the outline of suggested changes are welcome.
 - o Individual comment submission form: <http://www.cu.edu/regents/forms/regent-laws-and-policies-review-feedback-form>

Optional Student Self-Identification

- Data collection for preferred name option, pronouns, and orientation will soon be collected on each campus.
- Once in place, we’ll have to encourage our constituents to participate so we can ensure we are collecting information from our stakeholder groups.

Employee Self-Identification

- A white paper was submitted to HR in April 2016
 - o Original response at the time was that the HRCM system did not support the functionality.
 - o With the roll out of student self-identification, Scarlet has written to HR to revisit the proposal.

Symposium

- **Calls for proposals are out – submissions are due October 16.**
 - o <https://www.cu.edu/faculty-council/lgbtq-emas-symposium-2017>
 - o Action: further disseminate information to stakeholder groups
- **Food**
 - o Boxed lunches, pastries (breakfast)



- Action (Rian): request RSVPs for an accurate food count
- Action (Rian): collect vendor quotes- refer to budgeted amount from last year.
- **Keynote Speaker**
 - Action (Tina): follow up with Dr. Nadal's assistant to get the title and topic of the keynote address
- **Social Media**
 - Action (Grace): Organize social media platforms
- **Volunteers**
 - Committee members need to contact faculty who teach students on related topics to recruit volunteers
 - Help with registration, direction-giving, set-up/take-down, floaters
 - Actions (Scarlet and Matt): Coordinate volunteer sign up
 - Darren can advertise the call for volunteers with the President's Diversity Awards.
- **Other Updates**
 - Ravinder available to deliver introduction
 - Event is on the BOR schedule
 - Tina to reach out to the Chancellor or Provost to attend
 - Parking - Public transportation is encouraged.

Other Business

- Two graduate students at Anschutz are leading a gender-inclusive bathroom project.
 - Maps are available.
 - For the symposium, we will place temporary signage on restrooms.

Adjournment

As there was no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m. The next meeting will be October 13, 2017, from 2-4 p.m. in the Denver Conference Room at 1800 Grant Street.



TO: Regent Laws & Policies Stakeholders
FROM: Michael Lightner, Vice President for Academic Affairs
DATE: September 8, 2017
RE: **Outline of Current Changes Being Considered for Regent Article and Policy 5**

Article and Policy 5 focus on many issues critical to the university including academic freedom, tenure, and faculty grievance procedures. Rather than submit revised wording for consideration by the broader community, we propose to begin with discussions of changes in principle, specific goals and organization. We solicit feedback on these before submitting revised wording for consideration. We welcome additional suggestions with respect to any part of Article and Policy 5. The suggestions presented are the work of team representing each campus and the System, and have been approved by the Provosts of each campus and the System Office of Academic Affairs.

Process

We are submitting this document to Faculty Council, EPUS, the campus Faculty Assemblies, and the public website <http://www.cu.edu/regents/rlpreview>. We will be taking comments for the next 60 days on the suggestions given below **and** any other points in Article and Policy 5. During this time, we will be meeting with the shared governance groups to hear suggestions and discuss the goals and other concerns and recommendations. All individual comments should be submitted through the public website. Comments from shared governance groups may be submitted through the public website or directly to the [Office of Academic Affairs](#). After the 60-day period, we will produce the first draft of the revised wording of Article and Policy 5 for review and comment. We plan to share this draft by 12/8/17.

Academic Freedom

The current statement of academic freedom conflates freedom of speech with academic freedom. These are different concepts. The first proposal, based on the inherent importance and current prominence in the news, is to put freedom of speech in a separate section in a different regent law. This will allow detailed discussion of the university support of freedom of speech as it is framed across our campuses and constituents.

Moving freedom of speech from the academic freedom section will require some rewording of the section, but we are not proposing significant changes.

We do propose to expand on faculty responsibilities with respect to academic freedom. Specifically, we want to make it clear that individual faculty do not have the right to override

academic unit faculty-based criteria with respect to course syllabi and text. Curriculum that has been determined by academic unit faculty with approved syllabi and texts, must be followed, specific examples include course sequences with pre-requisite dependencies. In no way will this clarification limit faculty in the content and structure of courses for which they are solely responsible.

We also intend to state that, while faculty are free to research topics as they see fit, faculty academic evaluations – annual review, comprehensive review, tenure, post-tenure review, promotion to full, and various non-tenure track faculty evaluations – will be conducted relative to the standards of the discipline as set by the primary unit.

Tenure Home

Current regent law and policy is silent on tenure home. Our intent is to specifically state that tenure resides in the university. This statement has multiple consequences that we intend to capture. For example, once tenure has been granted, a faculty member can seek to change departments or campuses based only on the receiving unit having a budget line they want to assign to the faculty. The receiving unit must have a process to make this determination that may include a review and vote by the faculty, but tenure will not be reconsidered. Once a transfer has been approved, the faculty member will be evaluated based on the criteria of their new unit.

There will be an APS providing broad guidance on changing academic homes, but the primary policies will be at the campus, school/college and department level. A key guidance in APS will be that faculty in the receiving academic unit must participate in the decision making.

Tenure and Non-tenure track Faculty

Full time non-tenure track faculty play a significant role in the university but are not appropriately recognized in the laws and policies. We propose to make direct statements on the importance of full-time, long-term NTTF to the university. We propose to allow senior NTTF faculty, after a period of time, with appropriate performance, to apply for professional development time, which might be a reduced teaching load for a semester. Approval will be left to the academic unit/school/college and depend on availability of resources. Separately, we are exploring the possibility of proposing legislation to extend the maximum allowable contract for NTTF from three years to five years. This parallels the time frame for post-tenure review.

We acknowledge the need and solicit suggestions for a descriptive term for the full-time long-term non-tenure track faculty. Currently, NTTF covers a very broad range of appointments and does not adequately respect our career non-tenure track faculty.

While we plan to recognize the important contributions of the NTTF, we want to clearly differentiate the tenure-track faculty and the NTTF. Currently tenure-track faculty are hired with a clear focus on their scholarly contributions and disciplinary area, and are provided a workload that requires equal concentration on scholarly work and teaching, and an additional service component (40/40/20). Additionally, they have higher salaries than NTTF because of the

scholarly requirements and the additional value of research/scholarship to the university. There is an expectation that tenure-track faculty impact their field outside the university. Thus, we are proposing adding one clause to the tenure criteria that states that a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching or research must include external evidence of impact beyond the institution. The nature of this evidence is left to the primary unit and can be quite broad. *Any change to criteria for tenure will only impact faculty hired after the changes have been approved and implemented.*

Faculty Grievances

Current statements in article 5 and policy 5H on faculty grievances contain significant material from the Faculty Senate Constitution and Faculty Senate Bylaws. However, there are now discrepancies between regent law and policy and the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. We propose to maintain key requirements on the timing of processes and other high level principles in law and policy, but then indicate that the actual process will be carried out in accordance with processes defined by the Faculty Senate. This change will maintain due process requirements, but places the control of the details entirely with the Faculty Senate.