

## AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 18, 2012

### Minutes of the Meeting

[In these minutes: Third Thursdays, Spring AHC FCC/Collegiate Chairs Luncheon, May 17, 2012 FCC Meeting, Discussion with Provost Hanson]

*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), Paul Olin, Ned Patterson, Cheryl Robertson, Natalia Tretyakova for Cynthia Gross

Regrets: Susan Berry, Leslie Lytle

Guest: Provost Karen Hanson

Others attending: Vernon Weckwerth

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

II). The committee began by debriefing from the May 17 Third Thursday and segued into a discussion concerning Third Thursdays in general. Professor Campbell asked members if they thought it would be worthwhile to survey AHC faculty to gauge their interest in these gatherings and to solicit ideas on ways to boost junior faculty attendance. Members weighed the pros and cons of doing this and concluded that survey participation would probably be low for a variety of reasons.

Alternatively, Professor Patterson suggested using the attendance list that Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, has generated to contact the regular attendees and encourage them to invite five, for example, of their colleagues to attend. Professor Olin liked this idea, and also suggested sending out a postcard at the beginning of the academic year with all the dates for the entire year so faculty can put it on their calendar. At the request of the committee, Ms. Dempsey will look into the cost of sending out postcards to AHC faculty. Professor Patterson also mentioned having each school's consultative committee promote the Third Thursday venue.

Members agreed that while it is important to continue to do everything possible to make Third Thursdays a success, there will never be a perfect time or location, etc. to meet everyone's needs. Professor Campbell stated that he likes the idea of occasionally holding Third Thursdays at other locations, e.g., UMD, St. Paul Student Center. Professor Drewes proposed holding a Third Thursday gathering in Duluth next fall and then having the monthly AHC FCC meeting the following morning. Professor Campbell

stated that he likes this idea, but that a final decision will ultimately be made by the incoming chair, Professor Ned Patterson.

III). Professor Campbell suggested that in order to give members an opportunity to read the April minutes that were sent out just prior to this meeting that the minutes would be approved via email following the meeting.

IV). Next, members talked about last Friday's AHC FCC/Collegiate Chair's Luncheon, and briefly touched on the topics that were discussed for those who were unable to attend. Members agreed that the luncheon was a success, and that they should be continued.

Spinning off of the luncheon discussion, Professor Campbell informed the committee about what he learned concerning the most recent Medical School department head satisfaction survey that was commissioned by the Dean's Office. He reported that he was told that the Dean's Office owns the survey results, but that the department heads were strongly encouraging to share the results with faculty. Based on discussions with other Medical School faculty, it appears that many, if not all, department heads are choosing not to share the data. Is this an issue that should be raised with Dr. Friedman?

V). Professor Campbell asked Professor Patterson to update the committee on what transpired at yesterday's FCC meeting. Professor Patterson stated that the meeting went well. He said that a topic that was discussed at some length was the collegiate constitutions. The collegiate constitutions vary widely in terms of stipulating who can attend faculty assembly meetings and whether meetings can be called that exclude administrators. Professor Patterson reported that the FCC has created a subcommittee that will look into the status of all the collegiate constitutions University-wide. He went on to share some of the other topics discussed in the FCC meeting which included dean and department head reviews, culture, the AHC in general and the AHC's percentage of clinical faculty.

The committee then segued off onto a discussion about faculty plans and whether deans should consult with faculty about what the faculty plans should look like. Next year, suggested Professor Olin, the committee should consider developing best practices for deans to help make them as effective as possible.

VI). Members spent a few minutes preparing for their discussion with Provost Hanson. Topics members wanted to ask about and/or bring to Provost Hanson's attention included:

- A delineation between her provostal responsibilities and the responsibilities of Dr. Friedman.
- Solicit her views on faculty governance and consultation, and inquire about her experience with governance at Indiana University.
- Status of AHC 7.12 statements.
- Collegiate constitutions.
- Graduate education at the University, particularly intercollegiate graduate programs.

VII). Professor Campbell welcomed Provost Hanson and called for introductions. Provost Hanson thanked the committee for inviting her to attend today's meeting. She noted that she is looking forward to getting to know the committee as well as the issues facing the AHC.

To begin, Professor Campbell asked Provost Hanson about her working relationship with Dr. Friedman. Provost Hanson categorized her working relationship with Dr. Friedman as easy and informal and noted that they meet frequently both one-on-one and in group meetings.

Professor Campbell commented that he hopes Provost Hanson will find it worthwhile to intermittently meet with the AHC FCC to garner the AHC faculty perspective on issues, which oftentimes is different from the non-AHC faculty perspective. Provost Hanson stated that she would welcome the opportunity to meet periodically with the committee. She added that she really values and looks forward to having more conversations with faculty.

Professor Patterson asked Provost Hanson her perspective on faculty consultation and her governance-related experiences at Indiana University. Provost Hanson informed the committee that while at Indiana University (IU) she served on the educational policy committee for a number of years and also served on and later presided over the faculty council. She then talked a bit about governance in general at IU, and her observations about the differences between the IU and University governance structure. Provost Hanson admitted that she is still learning about the University's governance process in terms of what issues should be consulted on with governance groups and when it is appropriate for the administration to simply make a decision. People's time is valuable and every effort should be made by governance committees to focus on issues over which they have control. Professor Campbell stated that this is the same message that President Kaler is sending and cited the example of President Kaler challenging the FCC to try to do their very important work in less time given that faculty time (teaching and research) is incredibly valuable.

Professor Tretyakova stated that in her opinion faculty want to have a voice in issues that affect them. For example, the decision to dissolve the Graduate School was made with little to no consultation with faculty. She asked Provost Hanson for ideas or suggestions on how faculty can weigh in on important issues like this in the future. Regarding the Graduate School issue, Provost Hanson stated that she has heard a lot of the dissatisfaction related to how this decision was made, and, as a result, this summer she plans to convene a group, which will include faculty, to discuss whether or not some of the decisions made related to the Graduate School should be changed. Professor Tretyakova stated that she believes the elimination of the Graduate School would lead to an erosion of graduate education quality due to lower standards and the fact that decisions are no longer based on merit. Professor Campbell stated that a lot of the decisions that were and continue to be made regarding graduate education are heavily influenced by money. In his opinion, as currently structured, there is potential for conflict of interest.

He also noted that faculty are concerned about whether money will ultimately trump academic values and standards. Provost Hanson stated that she is very familiar with the issue of entrepreneurial activity to get at tuition revenue. She added under the current budget model it is clear that there needs to be some central control over course offerings.

Professor Drewes then briefly shared a comment about how the dissolution of the Graduate School has benefited UMD. Since the dissolution of the Graduate School, UMD has an all-University PhD program that is centered in Duluth (Integrated Biosciences), which would have previously been forbidden when the Graduate School was in existence.

Moving on, Professor Drewes asked Provost Hanson what she sees as needing her immediate attention at the University and what she thinks may be different five years from now. Provost Hanson stated that in her opinion, because the University's funding basis is changing, she anticipates a change in how the University is structured and how it should be thinking about the business it is in. In addition, stated Provost Hanson, an all-University e-learning/online strategy needs to be developed and enhancements need to be made to the IT/video-technology infrastructure.

In light of time, Professor Campbell thanked Provost Hanson for attending today's meeting.

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

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate