1. Attendees:
   - Barbara Bichelmeyer, Susan Wilson, Sean O’Brien, Jennifer Coldiron, Michael Frisch, Brenda Bethman, Peggy Ward Smith, Kevin Sansberry, Danielle Martinez, Deb O’Bannon, Eddie Burris, Marie Thompson, James Benevides, Stephen Dilks, Jennifer Santee, Orisa Igwe

2. Dr. Wilson reviewed Committee Charge
   - The committee’s charge is to create a comprehensive faculty development program in diversity and inclusion that meets the specific needs of faculty. A Faculty Development approach is essential to achieve a unified understanding of diversity and why it is critical to our university’s success.
   - As we host listening sessions, we are hearing the suggestion that faculty development should be facilitated and developed by internal faculty, not by outside trainers, which is consistent with our initiative.

3. Provost Bichelmeyer on Faculty Development and Diversity (summary)
   - Thanked the committee for addressing dimension 3 of the UMKC Diversity Strategic Plan: Responsive Teaching, Research and Experiential Learning and expressed our efforts may be crucial to her initiative to develop faculty professionalism, one of four major initiatives she is in the process of formalizing.
   - **Discussed how Civility or rather “Professionalism” must be defined/established to lead us to accepting, embracing diversity**
     - Story of how she came to UMKC and hear a constant theme in meetings when she was asking for needs
       - Pervasiveness and deep concerns about civility, which she is coming to refer to now as professionalism
       - Discussed with Dr. Wilson the difficulty in identifying when an individual is engaging in bigotry versus general incivility
   - Discussed social and educational context result in needed focus on professionalism
     - Content vs. subjection, instructional aspect to teaching
     - Current K-12 assembly line model for students: individuals do not get educated in mass. Yet we are blaming individuals for not learning in an assembly line model that holds time constant
     - Higher education: gate-keeper model
• Taught to be “good little girls/boys” who listen at a young age and then pushed into adulthood without skills for
  • appropriate assertiveness—Somewhere in the middle of remaining docile and kicking and screaming
  • Responding to micro-aggressions
  • And, use of Nonviolent communication (see book by Marshall Rosenberg)
    • We all have contributions to make, and we all have critical needs based on those contributions
    • Negative emotions = indications that needs are not being met
  • Example (being cut off in a meeting):
    • “When you do __________ (cut me off in the middle of my thought), it makes me feel ___________ (like my thought is not important). I need ___________ (to finish my thought) because ___________. How can we move forward?”

• UMKC Statement on Professionalism: Does not exist
• Current UM System policies/rules limit responsiveness to issues dealing with a lack of appreciation of diversity and/or lack of civility
  • 2 Options: Ignore or go through a long, formal grievance process
  • Some faculty shared they have had a lot of diversity training but it is not really translating

• Shared that her expertise is in performance based instructional design and organization development: reverse engineering working backward from a goal to examine resources/policy/practices/incentive systems needed to achieve that goal

• New initiative: Progressive Developmental Performance Management System
• As part of four pronged approach
  • Statement of Professionalism
  • Progressive Developmental Performance Management System (Curators will have to approve, UMKC could possibly lead the charge)
  • Targeted support for specific groups (Considering Barbara Butterfield, consultant on respect and diversity matters, for targeted needs)
  • Comprehensive faculty development aspect
    • To create clear expectations, feedback on expectations and natural consequences
    • This Faculty Development group may lead, and is crucial now to identifying the behaviors we do not accept and those we do
    • Could be institutionalized through FaCET for professors first 2-5 years of teaching and focused on development possible including instructional aspects, research/creativity, meeting management, setting expectations, communication channels; performance based
  • UM System review of policies over the next 90 days and see what is lacking
• Prompts to consider
  • What does what we teach look like when manifested in the world?
  • What have you experienced, heard about?
  • Examples:
    • Having great conversations in class, but actions/issues still develop in the hallway
    • Micro-aggressions in meeting, speaking then cut off by colleague
    • Departmental competitions for budget dollars
  • Appreciation or lack of appreciation for diversity happens in a moment – what are these moments we’ve seen?
  • Responsiveness—how are people responding well or poorly when these moments happen?
  • What are most common effects/behaviors of offense that manifest themselves that we want to address; to share we do not tolerate these behaviors and this is how may we keep that from happening
  • What kind of community do we want? Are those behaviors in our value statements? Resilience

• Goals
  • Behaviors to change, design curriculum around this
  • Educate each student; students, staff and faculty to feel appreciated
  • Culture of Respect/Appreciation—cannot work together if this does not exist
    • Nothing more important in Higher Education
• Needs (priority for our institution)
  • Orientation—to reach faculty that are hard to reach (adjunct professors, those who touch the most students)
  • To work with Peggy Ward-Smith and others to ensure FaCET and other key mechanisms are supported to institutionalize the faculty development experience
  • Key: Developing benefits for different stakeholders
    • “Why do I care” in various contexts
    • Appropriate rewards system; appropriate, natural consequences that allow folks to grow
  • Recognize faculty are like herding cats – we are trained to have critical minds and be independent; but that there is a difference between critical mind vs. critical spirit
    • Help people help themselves, respect each other
    • Statement on professionalism will help us all agree on how to live together
  • The future is hyper customization of education – 21st century to address all form of diversity, e.g. religion, ability...
• This group’s charge is worthy—willing to come and listen when the group has something developed

4. Dr. Wilson expressed that she appreciated the Provost’s passion, that she is a strong ally
   • Diversity and inclusion cannot be done in our office alone, but needs to be embraced as part of all of our roles

5. All discussed concern with system down approach/results of current state of affairs
   • Wilson attending Chief Diversity Officers from UM System Meetings
     • Discussing having a process in onboarding to establish UMKC values
     • Discussing $ toward each campus (because needs differ by campus)
     • Online training--starting point for orientation but not the solution. Our groups products should be specific to our needs and our preferred delivery methods; asking for baseline parameters from the Curators with room to tailor our approach

6. Next steps:
   • Jennifer Santee introduced Dr. Stephen Dilks from the UMKC English Department as an additional co-chair for our initiative representing Volker campus along with herself and Dr. Fariha Shafi (Hospital Hill representatives)
   • Group will meet in January to discuss prompts issued today
     • Prompts will be summarized and sent out by DDI to collect specifics examples of behaviors that diversity related faculty development needs to address, both behaviors that are unacceptable and those that embody the kind of community we want to create (in regards to all faculty spaces, e.g. classroom, faculty meetings etc.)
     • Implications: Committee members need to reflect on what each has seen and ask others in the departments they represent
   • DDI will follow up on the request for a map/web document that visually illustrates all diversity related initiatives and who is responsible.
     • To include Diversity Action Plans submitted by the deans in FY 2015