

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 17, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair pro tem), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Russell Luepker, James Pacala, Richard Ziegler
- Absent: Linda Bearinger, Chris Cramer, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, George Sheets
- Guests: Provost Karen Hanson; Faculty Athletics Representatives Professors Linda Brady and Perry Leo; Professor Paula O'Loughlin (Chair, Senate Judicial Committee); Professors David Bereiter (Dentistry), Linda McLoon (Medical School), Ned Patterson (Veterinary Medicine), Tim Wiedmann (Pharmacy)
- Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Becky Hippert (University Senate Office)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) annual report from the Faculty Athletics Representatives; (3) annual report from the Senate Judicial Committee; (4) change in cell phone policy (FCC supported ending reimbursement and no "grandfathering"); (5) discussion with Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee members (AHC FCC) and AHC College FCC Chairs]

1. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:00, explained that Professor Cramer was out of town, and welcomed Provost Hanson. She invited Provost Hanson to raise any issues she wished.

Provost Hanson first brought up the proposed change to the teaching awards. She said she remained uncertain that it is a good idea to have both faculty members and P&A staff eligible for the same award, but she will accept the recommendation to make that change. There is also a proposed change in the financial payment for the award (instead of adding to the base salary of the award recipients, there would be a much larger lump sum payment). She would like to see a similar increase in the award for advising, she added. There would be no change for those who have already received one of the two teaching awards, she affirmed.

Professor Ericksen reported that the people with whom she has spoken about the change feel that the change in financial payment would dilute the award because it would be one-time, one year, rather than career-long. That is what the change would be, Provost Hanson agreed, but pointed out that it would be a substantial award; there are not the funds available to make it any larger. The perception, Professor Ericksen said, is that the University is backing away from teaching. Provost Hanson said she hoped that perception could change; the original proposal from the governance committees was to increase the

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

number of those eligible, but there are no additional funds available. It would be possible to reduce the recurring amount to each recipient in order to increase the number of awards given. The idea was that the recurring commitment made the award more like the Regents Professorship, Professor Brothen recalled, and to move to a lump-sum payment goes back to the original practice. It would not be a trivial award, Provost Hanson said, and the information she has received suggests that Minnesota provides a much larger financial award for teaching than do its peers.

Provost Hanson next commented that she would like to look at the reorganization of the Graduate School. One question is whether the colleges are duplicating what the Graduate School did, creating inefficiencies and increased costs, and she has found interesting the increased willingness to consider centralization. She said she does not take lightly the expressions of concern about the way tasks have been distributed from the center; the costs are not only financial but also in faculty time.

Professor Kohlstedt commented on issues related to the changes to the Graduate School. (1) The distribution of fellowships, which is complicated and a subject on which there is divided opinion. Some wanted the money allocated to the colleges but there is a sense that there have been cuts in fellowships to the traditional disciplines and an increase in the funding allocated to professional schools. There is tension around this issue. (2) There was also a lot of support for student activities, such as travel grants that were often seed money for proposals to NSF or NIH; that money has evaporated and the answer, when anyone asks what happened to it, is that the colleges should provide the funding. (3) Colleges are picking up convocation but they do not have the expertise; the Graduate School did it well. Maybe the new process will work but it seems inefficient. (4) There will be no in-person orientation for new graduate students this fall; it will be online. In the past, graduate students met with peers from other fields and were welcomed to the University community, effects that are lost with online orientation.

Professor Bitterman said that in the health sciences there are a number of intercollegiate programs that are challenging to operate when they live under two deans, one of which is designated the lead dean/college. The process is not smooth; colleges have different cultures. What gives the University an advantage, in apply for training grants, is these interdisciplinary programs that emerge organically. There is now tension that did not exist before, when the Graduate School was the home college.

The professional schools were the ones that sought the change in the Graduate School, Professor Luepker observed. The money from the reduced cost pools has not filtered down to the programs and they feel that they have more responsibilities that the Graduate School used to address. Plus there is a sense, of the faculty at a recent training committee meeting, that the structure is new but that there is an increasing number of rules about what programs can and cannot do. The Graduate School is no longer providing services but the programs are seeing more regulations that they must implement, such as years to graduation.

It is also more difficult to keep up with changes in laws and regulations, Professor Kohlstedt said, which is something that the Graduate School did for programs. Now it is not clear where one calls for help.

The rationale for the change was economic, to save about \$1 million, Professor Hancher recalled. Did central administration save \$1 million with the change? Insofar as costs were outsourced to colleges and programs, which have seen more costs, was there a net savings? Cost savings were a reason for the change.

Provost Hanson said there was a reduction in the cost-pool charges to the colleges and units did not lose recruiting fellowships; how the colleges deploy them is their decision. The budget office watches to be sure that the increased funding is used for fellowships. But there is a question about ramping up services in the colleges, she said, and she would like more information on what has occurred. She said she hoped that finances were not the only rationale for the changes. A savings of \$1 million for an enterprise as important as the Graduate School must be weighed against the role it played in ensuring the quality of graduate education. The \$1 million savings were in administrative costs, Professor Luepker said. More money went to the colleges because of the reduction in cost-pool charges.

Professor Kohlstedt observed that the Graduate School was also seen as providing incentives for interdisciplinary work and provided funds and oversight, and encouraged it. Professor Bitterman said his program came out of the Graduate School and created an intercollegiate mix. The Graduate School could parent that kind of initiative; it is not clear if that mechanism still exists.

There is also a question about staff workload, Professor Kohlstedt said. People were given additional work and some are leaving because it is just too much. The costs of the change in the Graduate School are complicated. What about the work of the faculty, Provost Hanson asked? Professor Ehke said the faculty workload in general has not changed that much but the work of the Directors of Graduate Study has increased exponentially, as it has for staff, and there have been no additional people hired. This has been a significant burden.

Professor Boyle agreed with the points about convocation and interdisciplinary centers and the impact on the Directors of Graduate Study, but said that the reduction in state funding for the University is probably the biggest threat to graduate programs. In CLA they pay little more than \$14,000 per year for graduate teaching and research assistants. This really hurts its ability to recruit the best and the brightest.

Professor Ziegler said he wished to reinforce the proposition that it is much more difficult to support interdisciplinary activities without the Graduate School.

Professor Luepker noted that many on the Committee were not satisfied with the explanation of how the quality metrics were used to allocate fellowship funds. Vice Provost Schroeder has said it would be different next year.

Provost Hanson asked that Committee members let her know of other problems they have identified.

Professor Kohlstedt inquired of Committee members if they had other issues for the provost.

Professor Pacala asked if there are any University plans to respond to massive open online courses [MOOCs]. He hears from faculty members that they are concerned about them and what they mean for the future. What does the administration think?

Provost Hanson said that one of her larger projects this summer is to get the lay of the land on e-education at the University and identify the challenges. She said the University must move quickly to be part of what is occurring and she takes seriously the credentialing elements of MOOCs. The University is

not behind the curve but it is important to know where the pockets of engagement are and who the faculty are who are involved. She said she believes that Harvard and Stanford will persist as residential universities even though they are leading on MOOCs. The University needs to think about how it will position itself to make use of what is on the web to add value to education. This is a major issue, she concluded.

Professor Hancher offered several observations. He recalled that there was an e-learning committee, composed primarily of administrators; if this is a faculty concern, the faculty should be involved. Second, the lecture method has strengths and weaknesses; e-education could repeat the limitations. Third, graduate-student orientation lost its liveliness when it went online, something one can say about much that goes online. Fourth, how is MnSCU investigating these questions?

Provost Hanson said that the University's major benchmark is not MnSCU but rather peer institutions: What makes an undergraduate experience here different from a place that is not a research university? She and Professor Hancher discussed the relative merits of lectures and lectures online and how they might be used. Professor Bitterman suggested that there could be Google analytics, like counting downloads, and it will quickly become known which online material is the preferred knowledge. It will be competitive and the University will need to move quickly, or there could be no one in the room here if the best lectures come from elsewhere. The University needs to get it right, but in a relatively compressed timeframe. Provost Hanson agreed but said that is not the only part of the vision; there are elements of a residential undergraduate experience that must go beyond the analytics. There could be a big impact on graduate programs, however, Professor Bitterman said.

Professor Ben-Ner said it is necessary to re-think the role of faculty when there are rapidly-increasing sources of learning. Perhaps faculty should be thought of as conductors. He related that he met with recent graduates of his department's two-year master's program who extolled the virtues of the residential experience because of the opportunities to learn from each other, to work in groups, meet alumni and visiting professionals, learn in the classroom, be in touch with recruiters, and receive guidance from faculty. Education is becoming an ensemble of guided activities where faculty help students assemble intellectual and social resources. There are so many resources, so many differences among students, so little time—an experienced and dedicated faculty member can provide the guidance that steers students in their desired direction (like a family physician or a hospitalist; the latter is a relatively new position in many hospitals, in which an internist or family physician provides and coordinates the care given by different specialists to a hospitalized patient).

Professor Boyle noted that youth unemployment is a huge issue in public discourse right now. The University is doing better than most in placing students, but are there initiatives to increase career services? To make them more dynamic? That could be a recruiting measure for the University. It varies by school, Provost Hanson said, and she does not know the lay of the land. She said she would follow up on the point. It is a good investment even when funds are tight, Professor Boyle said.

Provost Hanson said she would like to follow up on this subject and worries that there is not enough faculty involvement in e-education. She asked the Committee for recommendations of the names of people who should be involved.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the provost for joining the meeting.

2. Annual Report from the Faculty Athletics Representatives

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Professors Brady and Leo to report on their activities as Faculty Athletics Representatives.

Professor Leo began by noting items of interest from the Big Ten Conference and the NCAA. First, there is a proposal to reform and change the enforcement of NCAA rules. Many of the rules are silly; part of the effort is to try to get rid of them. More important, in removing the less-important rules, the proposal is to increase the penalties for violating the more important ones. The penalties would include loss of competition, suspension of coaches, and loss of financial aid for athletes. The proposal would also hold head coaches responsible for enforcement of the rules—if an assistant coach violates the rules, in certain situations the head coach could also be suspended.

Second, there is a proposal to help athletes with the cost of attendance, an attempt by the NCAA to respond to the perception that student-athletes make a lot of money for institutions and receive nothing in return. Athletes will be given annually up to \$2000 each, up to the total cost of attendance at their institution over the amount of their athletic scholarship. (The difference between the scholarship and cost of attendance at Minnesota is less than \$2000.) This is really controversial, Professor Leo related, and many faculty members do not see student-athletes as having it all that bad, with tutoring, full aid, etc. This proposal was approved by the NCAA presidents last summer but it received a lot of opposition from schools because, among other things, it did not help in meeting gender-equity goals. There are several models being floated, with the one that has the most support in the Big Ten being need-based.

Third, at the Big Ten, because of the scandals at Ohio State and Penn State, at the suggestion of the presidents and chancellors, a statement on "Standards and Procedures for Safeguarding Institutional Control of Intercollegiate Athletics" has been prepared. Professor Leo provided copies of the proposal, which will be voted on by the presidents and chancellors. It establishes guidelines on who has authority over intercollegiate athletics so that wayward presidents/chancellors and regents/trustees may not subvert the authority. Responsibility is located with the athletic director. The proposal also sets out severe penalties if there is found to be a lack of institutional control at one of the member institutions. The faculty tend to see this as wrenching institutional control to the conference level, however, the presidents will review the current document and see if it meets the spirit of the original request while leaving institutional control matters that are appropriate to each institution.

Professor Brady next passed along several items of information. (1) One often hears of problems in athletics, but she emphasized that the majority of student-athletes are top students and a number of them received all-Big Ten academic honors. Of the 700 student-athletes, about half have GPAs over 3.0, they provide a great deal of service in the community, and they represent the University well. (2) They are optimistic about the new athletic director, Mr. Teague, with whom they have met once and will again with the chairs of the two athletic committees; he has made it clear he wants to have a good relationship with the faculty. (3) She called to the attention of the Committee the Kane-Leo report, from several years ago, and the concern it expressed about student-athletes clustering in certain majors and the significant number of majors that student-athletes were unable to get into even though those majors would fit the needs of those students. Such majors are quite competitive (e.g., Sport Management, Business and Marketing Education). She said she does not know what the answer is, but these are not at-risk students. What are they to do if they cannot get into the major they want? There are criticisms of student-athletes clustering in certain majors, but that may be because they cannot get into the majors they want.

Professor Leo said he believes that student athletes in many ways are a microcosm of the general student body and that they may be under more time pressure as well as eligibility pressure. As majors become more and more competitive, what happens? Whatever happens, it is possible that not getting into selective majors may become an issue for the rest of the student body as well.

Professor Hancher asked what measures are used to exclude students from competitive programs. GPA and other criteria, Professor Brady said. Professor Leo said that Chemical Engineering is very popular, for example, and (using entirely hypothetical numbers) it may have 300 students apply for 120 spaces, so there are 180 students who can't get in. Similar ratios may obtain for a Business and Marketing Education major, so many cannot get in. Professor Hancher said he knew of programs that use a GPA threshold but said he did not know of any that use other criteria. Professor Brady said it would be interesting to know what other criteria are used. But the dynamics apply to all students, Professor Hancher pointed out, and the question is how they work. Professor Kohlstedt said that when programs are confronted with increasing numbers of applicants, they keep increasing the GPA threshold; she said she did not know of other factors they may use. Professor Brady said that it was the hope of the Kane-Leo committee that the University would look at majors that could be available to student-athletes; Professor Leo added that student-athletes take class schedule more into account than many students because of potential conflicts with practice times.

In terms of the public perception, Professor Boyle said, it is that the NCAA makes money and the student-athletes do not benefit. Another perception is that intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by the University and does not make money. What is the truth? Professor Brady recalled that Tonya Moten Brown, Chief of Staff to President Yudof, prepared a report on athletics predicting that it would have huge deficits by 2008. When Mr. Maturi began as athletic director in FY03, the athletic department received \$6.8 million of central funding that was used to support the direct operations of the department. For FY12, the equivalent number is \$1.6 million (and there was legislative funding provided to the University specifically for intercollegiate athletics for women beginning in the 1970s, which funding was folded into the University's general appropriation with the understanding that the support for athletics would continue). There are conflicts that arise, Professor Brady pointed out, because when athletic departments are under pressure to be self-supporting, they can be driven to engage in rule-breaking behavior in order to generate the revenues needed. [It was noted that the average institutional subsidy to intercollegiate athletics, for the 130+ Division I institutions, is about \$10 million per year.]

Professor Luepker commented that at the Regents' meeting, it was reported that the Vikings will be renting the University's football stadium for anywhere from one to four years, for \$250,000 per game plus other revenues. President Kaler said the money from the Vikings' games would go to intercollegiate athletics. Do they know any more about the details? They did not, Professor Brady said.

Professor Pacala said he would advise people to be careful about using the idea that student-athletes are a microcosm of the general student body. Many would be quite vocal in disagreeing, saying that student-athletes are a special group that receives special treatment. Many would say that if a student-athlete chooses a major that does not conflict with practice, that is the student's choice. Other students must also compete to get into certain programs as well. Professor Leo took the point, and noted that he meant only that when there are problems with University policies or procedures, it is likely the problems will pop up first for student-athletes. He agreed that they have easier access to services such as advising and tutoring compared to the general student body. Other students also do not face the eligibility rules of

the NCAA and Big Ten, Professor Brady observed; they cannot change majors as easily as other students because they must make progress toward a degree each semester in order to remain eligible. They have benefits but also factors that work against them, she concluded. Professor Leo said that student-athletes are an interesting group and that if one talks to them one is struck by the number of really good people in athletics.

What are the goals of the intercollegiate athletic program, Professor Pacala asked? Are there publicly-stated goals? Mr. Maturi has done a good job with graduation rates, gender equity, and support for the programs. One does not hear about that. Is the goal to win? Make money? Professor Brady said that in the strategic planning process in 2004 a set of seven goals was established; they were revised in 2010. They frame the mission, values, and vision, and are articulated to everyone in the department—and people are hired and fired on the basis of the goals. It would be a good idea to ask the new athletic director, Mr. Teague, to articulate them to this Committee and others. [The Board of Regents policy on athletics for the Twin Cities campus is here: http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/academic/Intercollegiate_Athletics_TC.htm.] The goals did not originally include winning, Professor Leo said, but now one of the tenets is competitive excellence.

Why would the University have any program that does not strive for excellence, Professor Bitterman asked? If not, it shouldn't do it. Professor Leo agreed.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Professors Brady and Leo for joining the meeting and for their excellent work over a long time.

3. Annual Report from the Senate Judicial Committee

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Professor O'Loughlin, chair of the Senate Judicial Committee (SJC), to provide a report on SJC activities.

She is the outgoing SJC chair, Professor O'Loughlin noted, and she can report on what the SJC does and how it does it, but not on individual cases. The SJC was created in the 1940s to hear complaints from faculty members who believed themselves harmed by administrative actions that violated the tenure policy. The SJC jurisdiction is defined by the tenure policy and it is advisory to the president.

SJC creates hearing panels when it receives a faculty complaint; it has two kinds of jurisdiction. One is original, for cases where the code specifies it is the venue for redress—promotion and tenure and academic freedom; the vast majority of complaints come from promotion-and-tenure denials and a significantly smaller percentage are related to academic freedom. The second kind of jurisdiction is appellate, when a faculty member has brought a complaint to another University office that alleges a violation of the tenure policy. They do not know how many cases they will have each year related to promotion and tenure, which usually come late in the academic year, but the academic freedom and other cases can arise at any time during the year.

The tenure policy was revised a few years ago, after which she, Professor Chomsky, and Vice Provost Carney worked on a revision of the Procedures document ("Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty," at http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/hr/Contracts/TENURE_PROC01.html) that was approved by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and presented for information to the Faculty Consultative

Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Board of Regents. The SJC has now also revised its own rules of procedure, which will bring them in line with the other changes that have been made in other documents. The rules of procedure changes will come to the same groups for review.

The SJC has also affirmed the importance of outside counsel for its work.

They encourage more conversation about section 12 of the tenure policy, on what constitutes programmatic change, Professor O'Loughlin said. The SJC cannot do so because it is outside its jurisdiction.

Professor Kohlstedt inquired about the number of cases per year that come to SJC. It varies, Professor O'Loughlin said; some years there are none, then there can be three, but there has never recently been more than five. What is the number of cases that involve tenure denial, Professor Luepker asked? That also varies, Professor O'Loughlin said. Sometimes none. She said she surmised that the more there is special post-tenure review, the more likely SJC will be the venue for cases. At what level does the SJC become involved in a case involving tenure, Professor Pacala asked? Not until there has been an official letter from the provost denying tenure, Professor O'Loughlin said.

Professor Kohlstedt inquired about the change in SJC rules. The process is that the faculty member must specify how the tenure policy was violated, the provost's office provides a respondent, and there may be a motion to dismiss, Professor O'Loughlin related. The revision eliminates the possibility of a motion to dismiss and the process moves immediately to discovery once a complaint is filed, documents are exchanged, and there is a pre-hearing conference. At that point there can be a motion for summary judgment, but a panel may agree on three of the six counts of alleged violations and have hearings on those three. Following the hearings there is a recommendation to the president, who agrees with the SJC recommendation 90-95% of the time. If the president does not agree with the recommendation, he or she is encouraged to meet with SJC to explain the disagreement.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that in Office for Conflict Resolution panels, one can have a lawyer or not; does the SJC have a lawyer? Many years ago there was no legal counsel available for SJC panel members, Professor O'Loughlin said, and sometimes things did not go well and cases went to the Minnesota Supreme Court, so the SJC faculty wanted outside counsel to help them do their job. As for the parties, if the faculty member brings an attorney, the Office of the General Counsel will provide a lawyer for the University. Often, however, the faculty member brings a faculty adviser who is not a lawyer, in which case the provost's office will not bring in a lawyer, either. The lawyer for the SJC, however, is much more skilled at the processes and it was important that the General Counsel and the president affirm the importance of outside counsel for the SJC.

Professor Brothen said it is his sense that SJC bends over backward for faculty members. It is a venue for faculty members to vent their thoughts and feelings, Professor O'Loughlin agreed, and it is a faculty venue for faculty members, but it is also true that some of the harshest critics of a faculty member can be other faculty. The goal is to provide a good process that the faculty member is comfortable being a part of.

What is the burden of proof, Professor Bitterman asked? The preponderance of the evidence, Professor O'Loughlin said. Professor Luepker asked if the SJC covered clinical faculty as well. It does

not, Professor O'Loughlin said; it is available only for faculty members who are governed by the tenure policy, which does not include clinical faculty members.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Professor O'Loughlin for her good work and for the work of the Senate Judicial Committee.

4. Change in the Cell Phone Policy

Professor Kohlstedt reported that the administration had proposed changes in the policy governing reimbursement for cell phones used for University business: There would be no reimbursement except in specific cases, although those presently being reimbursed would be grandfathered. One member of this Committee has taken exception to the proposal on the ground that it is another case of the University passing costs on to employees.

This proposal raises considerable emotions, Professor Luepker remarked. About a month ago, Vice President Pfitzenreuter and Mr. Volna (the Controller) discussed this change with the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning. In the beginning, when cell phones were new and expensive, the University decided that certain people needed to have them and should be reimbursed for the expense. In the view of the Finance and Planning committee members, the world has changed, almost everyone has a cell phone, there are tax issues in reimbursement that cost the University to deal with, and it is nearly impossible to separate business and personal use on cell phones. The Finance and Planning committee offered no specific plan but it did not object to the proposed change. The policy language itself, Professor Luepker noted, has no provision for grandfathering. [It was noted that because the grandfathering is a temporary practice, it is not included in the policy language.]

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the Committee was asked to discuss whether the proposed change was unfair.

Professor Hancher said that in some cases, it may be that when a college sees a need for equipment that people need, it pays for the equipment and manages it.

Professors Bitterman and Pacala told the Committee about their experiences as physicians, who are often on call, who have never been reimbursed for their cell phones. Committee discussion reinforced a consensus that if a critical-care physician on call is not reimbursed for a cell phone, it is difficult to imagine anyone else at the University who should be.

Following additional discussion, the Committee concluded strongly that it endorsed the policy change and that it did not believe there should be any grandfathering provision. Everyone has a cell phone and no one should be reimbursed for it.

5. Discussion with Academic Health Center Faculty Consultative Committee Members (AHC FCC) and AHC College FCC Chairs

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Professors Bereiter (Dentistry FCC), McLoon (Medical School FCC), Patterson (Veterinary Medicine representative to the AHC FCC), and Wiedmann (Pharmacy FCC). Professor Luepker noted that he serves as chair of the Public Health FCC.

Professor Patterson explained that the AHC FCC met with the college FCC chairs last week so they can represent the views of that group.

The college FCC chairs reported briefly on the issues with which they are dealing.

Medical School: The desire to have edited 7.12 statements returned to the departments from the Provost's office and a timeline for final approval of the new 7.12 statements, a new department-chair review process, requirements for mentoring, and who should represent the Medical School in the Faculty Senate.

Public Health: The Ph.D. programs, recruiting, financing, the student experience, job placement, rationalization of international programs, new statements on promotability criteria for non-tenured faculty, the CTSI, and the AHC review.

Pharmacy: The AHC review, the desire to have 7.12 statements returned to departments, the role of clinical faculty (their view is that the tenured faculty are the "holders of the university"), redoing the college constitution (because of changes in the Graduate School), and the increasing number of administrators hired even though the number of faculty who generate revenues gets proportionately smaller.

Dentistry: [The Committee went off the record for this discussion in part because it involved personnel matters.]

Nursing: Professor Patterson reported that the primary issues revolve around the dean.

Veterinary Medicine: Things are going well, they have a parallel document for the promotion of clinical faculty with which they are reasonably happy, department committees for promotion and tenure, the decanal review process and who chooses the faculty members on the review committees, bringing contentious issues forward before they get into the newspaper, and other issues.

Discussion turned to college constitutions. The status of the Dentistry constitution is unclear. Professor Wiedmann wondered what value a college constitution has if the administration has the power to set it aside. Why have one?

Professor Ben-Ner said there are a number of issues raised by the situation in one of the AHC colleges, such as how things could go wrong for so long in a college, how the situation could end up so bad, how it could be prevented in the future, and how there can be limits placed on executive power. He said it is a serious concern when non-tenured faculty members in some colleges in the AHC fear to speak out because of reprisals; this is also a cultural issue. He suggested that this Committee should bring up with the president and provost the need for greater oversight of deans from Morrill Hall; there need to be limits on executive authority because of fear and reprisals that reportedly occur in some colleges.

Professor Bitterman agreed that the issue is culture. The review of the AHC should deal with the question of a separate vice president for the units across Washington Avenue and with the sense that the AHC colleges have never really reported to the president or provost. He noted that department heads can also abuse power, in addition to deans. The more the AHC is separate, and less part of the University, the more the oversight functions are at risk, he concluded.

Professor Pacala agreed. The AHC tradition is that they are autonomous entities without very much oversight or accountability. That is a view widely held by AHC faculty members. Part of the message should be that there will be rigorous reviews of deans and chairs, reviews that will have meaningful outcomes. Faculty members in some AHC schools also have reservations about airing their concerns to the dean of the Medical School (who is also the vice president), Professor Patterson added, and now say they should possibly go to the provost, given the current reporting structure.

Professor Bitterman said that it is also important that the faculty in a college, by constitutional provision, should be able to meet and invite whomever they wish to their meeting. Inviting the president or provost should not be unusual and could be annual. Non-tenured faculty will not speak up when there are issues at hand, he added, because they do not want to endanger their income.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the guests for coming and adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota