

AGENDA

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

April 18, 2015

Attendees: Sean O'Brien, Fariha Shafi, Eddie Burris, Marie Thompson, Stephen Dilks, Deb O'Bannon, Jennifer Santee, Jennifer Hunter, Jim Benevides, Susan Wilson, Jennifer Coldiron, Danielle Martinez

1. System Updates by Susan Wilson

- a. Hired first ever system CDO, Kevin McDonald; coming in June to visit our campus
- b. Launched an audit of the UM System: 2 audits simultaneously: D&I and additional audit from state legislatures
- c. 1st ever System wide diversity task force: still taking applications if anyone is interested in serving; launch date estimated for Fall 2016
 - i. Group across all campuses with task of advising, react to various products (react to audits, climate surveys from campuses), Reviewing incidents
- d. Legislature initially cut funding to the UM System \$7.6 million, but reinstated all but \$1 million
- e. Provost Bichelmeyer feedback to topic:
 - i. Excited about topic that was picked, encourages group as they work on the topic, look at this as the continuum: professionalism/civility is baseline and evolve into diversity in the classroom (if issue is still present)

2. Presentation : Original idea: Cross cultural communication

- a. Focus on **Communication**
 - i. cross cultural conversation and crucial conversations
- b. Resources someone else has developed but make sure it is fit for UMKC
 - i. "grassroots"
- c. Example—[FaCET program](#)
 - i. group learn more about teaching, successful to bring folks together about teaching ideas
- d. Serving faculty to see what specifics **they** want to focus in on with respect to diversity, specifically communication and let them identify importance (not being told what is important)
- e. **Coordination** of program:
 - i. Assigned a Coordinator of program with grad students being admin assistants
 - ii. Faculty Development Work group (this group) or others could be Advisory Board
- f. Discussions would occur in safe space
 - i. Faculty to give advice/lead sessions
 - ii. Perhaps around a lunch
 1. Example FACET: Lunch for the first 4 years, engaged over 50% of campus at approximately 12-15 per time, 3 x per week until budget constraints kicked in
 - iii. Self-sustaining/fueling in terms of new topics
 1. Could be a space for people to talk about issues that arise on campus or throughout the UM System centered around Diversity issues
 - iv. Equally on Hospital Hill
- g. **Incentives** for those who participate, certificate, financial award for those who facilitate
- h. **Marketing:**
 - i. Not training, but faculty development (staying away from overused/blaming possibly negative language)
 1. Sometimes the best learning experiences at a keynote: during q&a and getting more personal information

3. **Question from the workgroup:**

- a. Budget for staffing, logistics, lunch?
 - i. Proposal would need to come forward to apply for funding
- b. Would this structure be applicable to a variety of faculty topics or just the communication piece?
 - i. Faculty will have input and could evolve and will happen organically
 - ii. Structure: diversity specific, how do we keep to the task at hand and not something else
 - 1. Feedback: Concern is we allow it to be whatever it is;
 - a. Advisory board would identify topics/aspects to be covered
 - b. Pilot: Spin off—don't want to sell as diversity related topic
 - i. Fluid and organic environment—advisory group would address topic and relate it to the Diversity issues
 - ii. Focused, directional groups with moderator and giving direction to the talk
 - iii. After that, volunteers coming forward to address a different topic with advisory board weighing in
- c. 1st topic: Cross cultural communication: who exactly is the communication going to (faculty to faculty, faculty to staff, faculty to students) etc. AND Who would moderate/handle crucial conversations that were had? What about the compensation portion? Logistics?
 - i. Dependent on topic
 - ii. Certificate vs monetary compensation
 - 1. Certificates for faculty who put on sessions: positives on their review
 - iii. Peer to peer conversation (rather than outside entity/administrator telling someone what to do)
 - 1. Open Dialogue
 - 2. Scripted, approved conversation from advisory group
 - 3. Initial survey sent out to faculty
 - iv. 1 on Volker, 1 on Hospital Hill Campus
 - v. Strategic Advertisement: Training to be a facilitator/general development within sensitive topics, not necessarily diversity and inclusion dialogues
- d. How would we generate participation?
 - i. Support sustain and develop faculty who are models for ways in which these conversation should happen
 - ii. People learn how to engage in difficult conversations: tap in to techniques from those who are trained in mediation
 - 1. Develop ways to take the edge off of crucial conversations at department meetings, with students etc.
 - 2. Those who have note engaged have the opportunity to see gains from these methods when they are back at their schools/departments
 - a. Peer to peer conversations; share your story; informal (different delivery than someone telling you what you're doing wrong)
 - i. Also beneficial: Interprofessional conversations may intrigue

4. **Dr. Wilson asked:** Does the group like the initial idea and more details can be fleshed out by the workgroup?

- a. Formula: takeaway technique with a strategy to use
 - i. Skills reflecting on issues of concern and learn techniques to work through issues
 - ii. Could spur an organic movement
- b. Post-Survey—how did you use this, did it work? What at the implications for this discussion?
- c. More details on Coordinator inquiry: Modelled after FACET, envisioned as a contract that would be the equivalent of a teaching relief with knowledge that logistics, lunch and communication would be handled from Grad students

- i. Should be identifiable in the same group (peer to peer), eliminating another level of administrative “talking” at someone
 - 1. Build up for a few years and then passing on
 - 2. Not just 1 person’s program, shared enterprise
 - 3. Succession plan

5. Next Steps

- a. Susan will inquire as to available budget
 - i. Grad students 1 per campus part time, coordinator, lunches, and reward system for facilitators
 - 1. Demonstrate value to faculty who have expertise in these subjects
 - 2. Issues of diversity often start up from issues of civility
 - a. Civility being baseline—if you don’t have skills in civility, cross cultural skills will not be there as well
 - b. DDI will provide admin support for distributing the survey to faculty (with questions coming from Workgroup)
 - i. Suggestion: work off what we already have from the Faculty Development Group for Fall—Spring to send out another survey or informally survey the folks who are attending or using results of the Climate Survey? Sending out a mini-survey for faculty?
 - ii. Going into the launch with some intelligence
 - c. Jennifer/workgroup would provide suggestions as to facilitators for the future
 - d. Workgroup will pull together a 1 pager that outlines this idea to give to the Provost
 - i. May have ideas as to funding as well
 - e. Workgroup thinking through timeline, taking in to consideration those at the end of their academic appointments if Fall is when this will start
 - f. Suggestion: Send a representative from departments to the dialogue circle
 - i. Then after the report back to department, bring back suggestions for future discussions
 - ii. Or rotate attendees from groups
6. Workgroup will come back with: Overview, Structure, Cost Estimate, Marketing Strategy for faculty involvement, other logistics—commit to paper to get funding going
- a. Launch is important!
 - i. Suggestion: After Climate survey
 - ii. Suggestion: Pilot before launch to learn, takes pressure off for pushing a fully formed product
 - b. Deadline for 1 pager: Deadline May 20th
 - c. DDI Will send out responses from original questionnaire, faculty comments from listening sessions

Next meeting: Monday May 23, 2016