

AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

August 12, 2010
Minutes of the Meeting

[In these minutes: 2010 Academy for Excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Approval of June 10, 2010 Minutes, Senate Committee on Finance and Planning Update, AHC Task Force on the Scholarship of Clinical Faculty Update, 2010 AHC Faculty Fall Forum, *Dialogue of the Day*, Appendix to the University-wide Individual Conflicts of Interest policy, *Individual Conflicts of Interest: Clinical Care - Patient Contact in the Academic Health Center*]

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Present: Colin Campbell, (chair), Susan Berry, Paul Olin

Regrets: Cynthia Gross, George Maldonado, Ned Patterson, Cheryl Robertson

Absent: Stephen Downing

Others attending: Vernon Weckwerth

I). Professor Campbell called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present.

II). Information was distributed concerning the 2010 Academy for Excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning inductees and their nominators as well as information on the screening and selection committee for this award. Professor Olin began by suggesting that going forward the AHC-FCC review the applications that are received, at least on a cursory basis. Professor Berry disagreed and reminded members that the committee had agreed that it was not the role of the AHC-FCC to make judgments about which nominees are qualified; instead, this would ultimately be the responsibility of the review committee. She added that while it would be appropriate to question the review committee's process, it would not be appropriate to establish their process.

After a fair amount of discussion, Professor Campbell suggested that the AHC-FCC receive a process report from the review committee. Professor Campbell requested Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, to extend an invitation to the appropriate person(s) requesting information about the review committee's process for 2010 and to articulate the process they intend to use for 2011. This is a process issue.

III). Professor Campbell asked for a motion to approve the June 10, 2010 minutes. Professor Berry moved to accept the minutes and Professor Olin seconded the motion. Members unanimously approved the June 10, 2010 AHC-FCC minutes.

IV). Professor Campbell called on Professor Olin to provide a Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) update. Professor Olin stated that SCFP met most recently on August 3, 2010. At this meeting, Professor Luepker, chair, SCFP, announced that three items would likely occupy much of the committee's time during the upcoming year:

1. Reviews/audits of administrative units.
2. Budget cost pools, and student fees.
3. Space.

The idea for conducting administrative unit reviews, noted Professor Olin, started at a Faculty Senate meeting over a debate about the 1.15% salary reduction. Some concerned faculty postulated at the meeting that money was being spent unnecessarily on administration. The Faculty Senate referred the concerns to SCFP. In turn, SCFP heard from some of the concerned faculty members last spring and from that discussion SCFP abstracted a set of issues that it believes it could examine. In terms of the format for these meetings, while the type of information would vary by unit, in general, the units would be asked to share the following information:

- Mission, aims, and objectives.
- Staffing plan, organizational chart and job descriptions.
- The unit's compact plan including long-term compact plans.
- Why particular activities are centralized versus decentralized to the academic unit.
- Description of current and projected funding sources.
- Accomplishments in last five years.

An outcome of these reviews will be a well informed SCFP as it consults with administration on emerging issues.

Professor Olin also reported that road construction has begun in preparation for light rail.

IV). Next, Professor Campbell requested Professor Berry provide the committee with an update on the work of the AHC Task Force on the Scholarship of Clinical Faculty. Professor Berry noted that the task force is comprised of a mix of interesting people, both tenured and non-tenured from the various AHC schools. To date, the task force has met two or three times. Most recently, the task force has been receiving reports from the different schools on how they approach and value their clinical scholars and how they define their faculty lines. These reports have been both illuminating and disturbing, noted Professor Berry. For example, in the Dental School, there are two classes of non-tenured faculty who for all practical purposes functionally do the same kind of work but they have different titles, rights, and responsibilities. The task force also found that there is a vast spectrum of activities that non-tenured faculty are required to perform and a select number of these individuals are being required to perform all the duties that tenured faculty are expected to perform, including being major PIs and having almost all of their salaries on grants.

There is a lot of misclassification in the AHC and misunderstanding about the roles, rights and responsibilities of non-tenured faculty as well as misconceptions about their

roles in the governance process, noted Professor Berry. Clearly, the schools would not be able to function and could not carry out their educational or research missions without non-tenured faculty.

The task force has heard from several schools that have created documents that outline career planning and advancement strategies for non-tenured faculty. The task force intends to take these documents, many of which have been very thoughtfully prepared, in an effort to put forward metrics for advancement of clinical faculty and a better measure of respect for valuing their scholarly product. It is Professor Berry's opinion, however, that the task force will not address the elephant in the room, which is to define what makes one person tenurable and another person non-tenurable. While she believes the task force will more clearly define a path for advancement and respect for non-tenured faculty, she does not believe the task force will address the bigger issue, which is that the institution simply cannot afford to make all faculty tenured.

Professor Weckwerth asked Professor Berry about the difference between tenured and non-tenured faculty. Professor Berry stated that she believes the roles and the scholarly products are different. Particularly in the Medical School, Dental School and College of Veterinary Medicine, the degree to which non-tenured faculty have clinical responsibilities as part of their activity is skewed towards their practical responsibilities as opposed to laboratory and research-based responsibilities. While there is definitely a difference in how their distribution of efforts is spent, it doesn't mean they don't have scholarly productivity. There is really a spectrum of responsibilities for non-tenured faculty. The vast majority of the clinical faculty in places where clinical activity takes place, noted Professor Berry, are doing didactic teaching that is essential to the mission of the schools. The schools could not create their educational missions without these faculty members. There is a subtle difference between tenured and non-tenured faculty.

An obstacle the task force has run into, noted Professor Berry, is President Bruininks' decision to move responsibility for promotion and tenure to the provost's office. In Professor Berry's opinion, this is a mistake because there is a lack of understanding in the provost's office about the work of the AHC's clinical scholars. She believes this change will make it impossible for AHC schools to continue their missions. She added that the provost's office does not have the manpower or the expertise to evaluate clinical scholar's dossiers.

Professor Olin stated that all units should have a faculty plan, which, to a degree, addresses the issue of how many tenure/tenure track faculty a school has. Professor Berry stated that the institution cannot operate with an unlimited number of tenure/tenure track faculty. She added that a problem that is built into clinical faculty appointments is their annually renewable contracts. The task force will likely propose these be extended contracts based on seniority. Professor Olin stated that for him the promotion issue is secondary to whether there is a review process for termination for clinical faculty and whether they will ever have the same rights as tenured faculty to speak their mind so they can function. Professor Berry stated that intrinsically a value of tenure is academic freedom, which is clearly a part of the protections that are available to clinical scholars,

even now. The problem has to do with the annual renewable nature of clinical scholars' contracts. Clinical scholars should be given the same kinds of protections, noted Professor Berry, as tenured faculty.

Professor Campbell stated that it is disturbing that clinical scholars who are essential to the core function of the University are not tenured. This makes no sense. Professor Berry stated that part of the obligation associated with tenure is the financial obligation, however, the amount of money attached to this obligation is increasingly a smaller and smaller percentage of peoples' salaries. There is an increasing movement that uncouples the financial basis for tenure from other academic rights and responsibilities. Professor Berry stated that she believes tenure expectations should be revised and made broader to encompass many of the activities that are done by clinical scholars; tenure should be spread more widely. She added that she does not see this as happening and believes it is related to money, and not academic freedom and responsibilities.

How is the University saving money by not granting tenure to clinical scholars, asked Professor Campbell? Professor Berry stated that it all boils down to certain promises and the difficulty associated with getting rid of people. In response, Professor Campbell sees this as an excuse for exploiting people.

In light of time, and because so many members were unable to attend this meeting, Professor Campbell suggested that this item be put on the agenda for the September 9th meeting. Professor Olin requested that as part of this discussion, the committee get information on the number of tenure and tenure track faculty in the AHC and across the University by school. Professor Berry also suggested getting this information by gender and advancement.

V). Professor Campbell introduced the next agenda item, 2010 AHC Faculty Fall Forum. He reported that he contacted Dr. Ananya Roy from UC Berkeley to invite her to present at the forum, but that, unfortunately, she is not available on October 29, or for the fall of 2010 for that matter.

In response to a question from Professor Weckwerth about the reason for choosing Dr. Roy, Professor Campbell cited the January 4, 2010 New Yorker article - <http://archives.newyorker.com/default.aspx?iid=32099&startpage=page0000029#folio=022> and went on to explain why he thought she would have been a good presenter. He mentioned that he thought it would be interesting to hear her story and what she sacrificed in her efforts to stand up for public education by denouncing privatization.

Professor Weckwerth asked about the topic of the forum. Professor Campbell stated that the forum, *The Voice of the Faculty in a Changing Environment*, was motivated by huge changes in the University of California system with its large budget cuts and the impact on tuition, which is similar, to a degree, to the financial crisis facing the University. Also, added Professor Campbell, there is the Mark Yudof connection.

Professor Campbell reported that Professor Fred Morrison has agreed to present at the forum. He asked if the committee had ideas for other presenters. Professor Berry stated that the committee needs to be really careful about the focus and direction of the forum. The committee should decide the goal of the forum. After a fairly lengthy discussion, members agreed to invite Dr. David Hamilton.

Professor Weckwerth asked if there would be any enabled participation by attendees or whether the forum would be strictly presentations. If there is to be participation by attendees, what would that look like? Professor Campbell suggested forming a small working committee to work on the forum. Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, stated that Vickie Courtney, Maureen Lally and herself should be involved. Professor Olin volunteered to serve on this working group along with Professor Campbell. Professor Campbell added that he would send out an email to all AHC-FCC members to see if anyone else is interested in serving on this work group.

VI). Professor Campbell solicited ideas for the *Dialogue of the Day* for the August 25, 2010 AHC-FCC meeting with Dr. Cerra. The committee suggested discussing the implications on the promotion and tenure process of President Bruininks' decision to move these responsibilities from Dr. Cerra's office to the provost's office.

Professor Campbell then realized he would be unable to attend the August 25 meeting because he would be out of town. Professor Berry stated that she has clinic that day so she also would be unable to attend. Professor Campbell suggested canceling this meeting, and members agreed. The committee went on to discuss the possibility of changing the meeting dates with Dr. Cerra from Wednesdays to another day of the week. Professor Campbell stated that this would be discussed with the full committee when it convenes on September 9, 2010.

VII). Professor Campbell reported that Professor Jeff Kahn contacted him to find out whether the AHC-FCC ever weighed in on the appendix to the University-wide Individual Conflicts of Interest policy, *Individual Conflicts of Interest: Clinical Care - Patient Contact in the Academic Health Center - http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Operations/Compliance/CONFLICTINTEREST_APPA.html*. Professor Campbell contacted Professor Isetts to see if the committee talked about this policy, and was told by Professor Isetts that he brought it to the committee's attention, but members did not express an interest in pursuing it.

Members commented on how restrictive the policy is. It was noted that the appendix completed its AHC school consultation along with a 30-day comment period and has received Dr. Cerra's endorsement as well as the endorsement of the AHC Dean's Council.

Professor Campbell stated that this will be added to September 9th agenda for further discussion.

Professor Olin noted that there will be a webinar on Organizational Conflict of Interest sponsored by the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs, Inc. (AAHRPP) next week at the McNamara Alumni Center. This webinar will deal with institutional conflict of interest matters, and not the appendix to the University-wide Conflict of Interest policy, *Individual Conflicts of Interest: Clinical Care - Patient Contact in the Academic Health Center*.

VIII). Hearing no further business, Professor Campbell adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate