

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, October 30, 2012
2:30 – 4:30
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Scott Lanyon (chair), William Beeman, Ben Bornshtein, Arlene Carney, Randy Croce, Sophia Gladding, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Joseph Konstan, Frank Kulacki, Theodor Litman, Rishabh Mishra, Benjamin Munson, George Sell, James Wojtaszek
- Absent: Kathryn Brown, Dann Chapman, Linda Chlan, Jennifer Fillo, Carl Flink, Karen Miksch, Joe Ritter, Pamela Stenhjem
- Guests: Russ Straate (Office for Technology Commercialization), Nan Wilhelmson (Office of Human Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) entrepreneurial leaves; (2) graduate student support & faculty work; (3) meetings with probationary faculty members]

1. Entrepreneurial Leaves

Professor Lanyon convened the meeting and welcomed back Mr. Straate and Ms. Wilhelmson to bring further revisions to the policy *Faculty Development Leaves* as it proposes to establish entrepreneurial leaves. Professor Lanyon noted that the last time the Committee discussed the proposal, it favored the concept but was concerned about eligibility and frequency.

Ms. Wilhelmson agreed that the overall frequency of leaves was a concern and reported that Vice Provost Carney had developed proposed language: "*The use of sabbaticals and other leaves (including, but not limited to, single-semester leaves, entrepreneurial leaves, those from foundations, leaves without pay, etc.) should not affect adversely the delivery of instruction or the functioning of a unit. Over a seven-year period, faculty members must serve in their units for no fewer than four years. Exceptions may be granted by deans and chancellors for additional leave time in rare circumstances (e.g. service to a federal granting agency).*"

It was suggested that the language be changed slightly, to "may not be on leave for a total of more than three years, all leaves combined."

Another concern had been how the reason for the leave was stated, Ms. Wilhelmson said; the language has been revised so that it is clear that entrepreneurial leaves are not solely for reasons related to intellectual property: "*While development leaves for entrepreneurial work may typically involve ventures related to the development of University intellectual property (IP), other types of activities that can demonstrate substantial institutional benefit or that constitute an innovative and collaborative project relating to the public good are also eligible for consideration.*" The objective, Mr. Straate explained, is to enable faculty members to impart what they have learned at the University—whether intellectual property

* 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.

or best practices—to the marketplace. The University can benefit in a number of ways: there could be increased income from licensed technology, there could be better instruction, there could be better research. The benefit to the University is what justifies support for fringe benefits.

What happens to intellectual property developed by a faculty member during an entrepreneurial leave, Professor Konstan asked. Opportunities for these leaves will dry up if a company learns that something new developed on a leave belongs to the University. It doesn't, Mr. Straate said. That is covered in another University policy: If something is developed on the company's time, it belongs to the company. Professor Konstan said he has been told by colleagues that they have been told a company would not take them on sabbatical and required them to take a leave, out of concern that the University would own any intellectual property developed.

Professor Konstan noted that the policy does not cover unpaid leaves, which someone could take to develop University intellectual property; why not recognize that entrepreneurial leaves may not always be so much for faculty development as to spread the University's good work; why is it shoehorned into this policy? Because the entrepreneurial leave is seen primarily for faculty development, Ms. Wilhelmson said, another step in developing and sharing work the person has done at the University. Vice Provost Carney said that entrepreneurial leaves may not reflect the traditional view of sabbaticals and leaves, but the faculty member will return to the University with a different set of experiences and perspective; these leaves provide an opportunity to broaden the faculty member's experience.

Professor Konstan accepted Dr. Carney's explanation but observed that the language of the policy speaks to substantial INSTITUTIONAL benefit, so one could conclude that an application for an entrepreneurial leave will be evaluated by the amount of dollars or good will that it will generate. It has nothing to do with how much the faculty member is developed, it is about what is best for the University. There seems to be a gap between the language of the policy and the unwritten criteria. Many faculty members believe that this is a development leave and would be disappointed to learn that they must bring in \$5 million or do something positive that gets on the front page of the *New York Times*.

Dr. Carney inquired if the language had changed or if there was always the "substantial institutional benefit" phrase. The proposal was originally only about intellectual property, Ms. Wilhelmson said and that language was added when eligibility was expanded to include contributions to the public good. Mr. Straate commented that the policy is also about "significant work already in progress," where research has occurred and the next step is to get something to the marketplace, so this seemed to be a good place to drop the provision into policy.

Dr. Carney commented that the focus of the entrepreneurial leave has shifted enough that Professor Konstan's objection is justified. The goal is institutional benefit, so presumably a leave would not be approved unless there were an institutional benefit. One can see why faculty would read the policy that way. What if there were no public good? What if one spends a year with a company, the idea fails, and the faculty member returns to the University? There will be no institutional benefit.

Professor Lanyon said that Professor Konstan had identified an important issue: Where this started was about making it possible for faculty to take a leave that was primarily in the best interest of the institution, not the professional development of the faculty member. There are two existing professional development options, and then the entrepreneurial leaves were added to enable the faculty to pursue opportunities that would benefit the institution, without sacrificing one of their professional

development leaves to do so. Dr. Carney observed that many faculty development leaves may not produce or advance a public good but they are good for the University.

Professor Sell inquired if the debate is about the word "substantial." Professor Lanyon agreed that it might be.

Professor Konstan posed a hypothetical: He started a company, the University had equity in it, and then sold the stock. Could he go on an entrepreneurial leave to that company? The University would have no financial interest in it and there would be no dollar return to the University from him going to it. Ms. Wilhelmson repeated the point that the University benefit is not defined as only financial. That is not the only criterion. Mr. Straate pointed out that the intent is to create institutional value by increasing the potential for successful translation and commercialization of research, increasing faculty knowledge and experience for teaching, improving commercial research focus, and increasing Univ. of Minnesota public engagement.

So there are three kinds of faculty development leaves, Professor Lanyon summarized: (1) a sabbatical, which one earns through years of service; (2) single-semester leaves, which are competitive and for which one can be turned down, which the faculty understand; and (3) entrepreneurial leaves, which can be denied if the dean determines that there is not "substantial institutional benefit"—if one is turned down for one of these (presumably because of a disagreement between the faculty member and the dean regarding what constitutes "substantial institutional benefit"), is there any recourse? There is a fourth leave, a simple unpaid leave, Professor Konstan added. Professor Lanyon's (3) is an unpaid leave with benefits, in recognition of the obstacles to working with start-up companies. The dean and department head approve spending money on benefits in recognition of the trailing benefits of the work and the intent to return to the University. So entrepreneurial leaves could be placed with unpaid leaves, Professor Lanyon said.

Ms. Wilhelmson said doing that would not work and she would not want to see a leave with benefits included in a policy that focuses on unpaid leaves without benefits. It would have been possible to write a separate policy on entrepreneurial leaves, but it seems appropriate to include it with faculty development leaves and avoid a proliferation of policies.

Professor Lanyon said his concern is that there is enough ambiguity in the language that each dean could have a very different opinion about what "substantial institution benefit" means. The intellectual property problem is reasonably clear but there is much more room for interpretation in the language about the other reasons for approving an entrepreneurial leave. Dr. Carney said the language has been crafted so that the dean can turn down a request if there is an adverse effect on the faculty member's department. One problem to be addressed as the Committee considers further revision of the policy: To discuss the feasibility of full-pay single-semester sabbaticals, one would have to have a rule about how many people can be on leave from the University at any given time for any type of leave. Right now the only limit is that a maximum of 4% of the faculty may be away on single-semester leaves; that percentage will have to be changed with the addition of full-pay semester sabbaticals as an option. The question will come up, she predicted, and the big question will be the grounds that a dean/chancellor or chair/head have for denying a request. She will need to have an answer.

Mr. Straate said that there are institutions that have a policy similar to the entrepreneurial leaves being proposed and they typically see 2-3 such leaves per year. Not many faculty members want to lose

their salary. Dr. Carney agreed that they are more likely to take a sabbatical, especially if it is a full pay single-semester sabbatical.

On the language about the overall limit, Professor Konstan asked if it included time a faculty member might serve as an administrator. It would not, Dr. Carney said. The policy is addressed to individuals who hold and are in faculty positions over a period of time.

Mr. Croce inquired if any consideration had been given to making P&A staff eligible for entrepreneurial leaves as well. Dr. Carney said that could be a topic for further discussion around the policy on professional development leaves for P&A staff. Ms. Wilhelmson said she had talked with Vice President Mulcahy about Mr. Croce's question; his view is that the University will already be in the forefront with this proposals and he suggested getting the policy in place and seeing how it works, and then consider P&A eligibility at a later time. Mr. Croce said he was sure that any application would be rare, but there could be instances, for example, in the arts or someone who develops a new language-teaching program.

Professor Lanyon said the Committee had a number of ideas about the policy but nothing that appears to bar approval of the policy. Dr. Carney asked again about the word "substantial"; Professor Lanyon said he thought it could cause a problem, but if there are only 2-3 such leaves per year, it should be possible to wait and see. Dr. Carney assured the Committee the question will come to her so she will learn. The Committee has identified it as a potential problem but does not have any language to improve the policy, Professor Lanyon concluded. Professor Kulacki suggested that Professor Lanyon describe the Committee's concerns when he transmits its approval to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the policy. Professor Lanyon thanked Mr. Straate and Ms. Wilhelmson for bringing the revisions back to the Committee.

2. Graduate Student Support & Faculty Work

Professor Lanyon introduced the topic of faculty concerns about graduate education now that several years have passed since the reorganization of the Graduate School. There has been faculty concern about graduate student support and he said the Committee should have a sense of what the faculty see occurring and if it is something the Committee should take on.

Professor Beeman said there are perpetual problems with graduate programs across the University and especially in CLA. Their graduate programs are not competitive and they lose prime graduate students to both private and other public institutions. The University cannot match stipends and has fewer fellowships. CLA departments must dip down the list to make a class, and part of the difficulty is the link between graduate and undergraduate education: Some departments need TAs for large classes. The University has been round and round on the question of a fix but it remains a crucial problem. Recognition of an institution absolutely rests on graduate education, and if the University is to maintain its Research 1 standing, graduate education needs attention. The University is slipping; it has a few departments that maintain a high profile on the national scene but some departments that once were leading have fallen badly and have seen major defections in the last year. The University's competitors can attract graduate students and are constantly recruiting University faculty. Do other colleges see this same problem? It is a topic of conversation every time the CLA chairs meet.

Professor Munson noted that he is also from a CLA department and during the transition to the new Graduate School, he was a member of the Policy & Review Council. They were really worried about student services, but he can say that it has been a good transition from a student perspective. It has been seamless and students appreciate the flexibility that CLA offices allow. So one college continues to serve students well—on a shoestring.

Professor Sell asked if the defections have been senior or junior faculty. They have been senior, Professor Beeman said. A serious and continuing issue is that senior faculty members do not have not enough graduate students to sustain a program. There are four programs within his department that depend heavily on graduate students to maintain their research programs; without those students, there is no research, and if there are only two or three students per year, there is no research. How can this Committee help, Professor Sell inquired? This is ultimately a faculty matter, Professor Beeman said, because it bears directly on research and teaching, and they are all intertwined—undergraduate education, graduate education, and research.

Professor Konstan said that he serves on the Graduate Education Council and agreed with Professor Munson about what works. He was afraid there would be a much greater burden on directors of graduate study and graduate faculty, but what he has seen is an unfunded burden on the colleges, which are doing well. But it's not clear the changes saved any money. In terms of Professor Beeman's comments, Professor Konstan said that everyone knows the funding model for graduate education at the University is broken—in the social sciences, in the natural sciences, and in the health sciences. Federal caps create a problem because they include tuition and the resulting totals now often exceed those caps (even with fairly modest stipends). He said he did not know what the answer is, but the Committee could add one more voice to all of those who are saying that the system is broken and the University must do something about it. There have been task forces on financing graduate education and there have been stopgap measures from the Graduate School, but those have been patches. If there is no serious conversation about how to fix the broken model, it will stay broken.

Professor Beeman said there are a number of important graduate fellowships that are important for recruiting and they are excellent—but there is a tax on departments that accept them and his department takes money from its endowment to pay the tax. Smaller departments may not be able to pay it. The same is true for DOVE Fellowships (Diversity of Views and Experience, fellowships in graduate education) to increase diversity; there is also a tax on those that comes from department funds. They cut department budgets to pay the taxes and the system is regressive.

Professor Grier-Reed said her department has a new MA graduate program that tries to recruit DOVE scholars, and they struggle with funding. Her department is also working on a joint doctoral program with another department, but it's difficult to find models, including funding models, etc., for this collaborative venture.

This is a long-standing problem, Professor Lanyon said, but solution is central to the success of the University. The Committee must keep talking about it and help the administration with it; what are reasonable steps to take?

Professor Munson said that when one looks at the future of higher education, there will be a transition away from his kind of position, tenured faculty, to teaching P&A staff. He is in a field that continues to need many doctoral students but does not want to take on graduate students when he knows

that positions will not be available. That gets to the question of right-sizing programs and what it means, Professor Lanyon said. Professor Grier-Reed said that she has served on the GRIP committee to evaluate and improve graduate programs, given metrics identified by the Graduate School that include completion rates, time to degree, etc. One question that has come up in conversations with the Graduate School is how programs prepare students for careers after graduate school and whether programs should be evaluated on how many graduates they send into academia, given the limited number of these positions. This is a major sticking point for programs in the College of Education and Human Development, where there are professional doctorates where students are not expected to go into tenure-track faculty positions, but with the economy shrinking and changing, a major question facing terminal-level doctoral programs may be what are they training people for.

Professor Konstan said that the faculty have not found creative ways to replicate their successors. Is a Ph.D. the appropriate degree to teach in a school without a doctoral program? Perhaps it could be an Ed.D., with a focus on teaching, some research, and demonstrated ability to absorb new research even if one is not doing it. The Faculty Consultative Committee talks with the president about major issues—this is not a problem that the University can solve alone. (He said they do not worry about this in his program, Computer Science & Engineering, where industry placements dominate, but understands that it could be scary to recruit students into a program when they may not have any place to go when they finish their degrees.)

Professor Grier-Reed noted that she is also a licensed psychologist, a professional field in which one must have a doctorate. She said she did not know what will happen in health care or whether psychology departments are thinking about the size of their graduate classes.

Professor Kulacki recalled that there were discussions, when Arne Carlson was governor, about the right size of programs. In Civil Engineering, for example, there are a number of areas of emphasis; the University could decide to eliminate two of them and have only three, but he has not heard such conversations since the budget cuts imposed when Carlson was governor. One can only pare back supply budgets so much before questions about program size must be raised. President Keller raised them with "Commitment to Focus." In his college, there was a program started that is now struggling, with only five or six faculty; should the college continue to support it when budgets are decreasing? Professor Konstan pointed out that departments will cut everything except positions because nothing else receives inflationary increases.

All graduate programs are apprenticeship programs in some sense, Professor Beeman said—it is hands on, personalized instruction, often directly relevant to ongoing research and the creation of new knowledge. There is no better way to learn. Graduate students know that and want help; it is heartbreaking when graduate students are bought away from the University. Some institutions have a great deal more money in graduate education and support than the University (Wisconsin has three times the amount that Minnesota does and both North Carolina and Virginia offer about 40% more than Minnesota—they know they will increase their stature by turning out better graduate students).

Professor Konstan inquired if the discussion is about research and terminal degrees, and some MFA degrees perhaps, but not about Masters degrees or professional degrees. Those programs often have different business models. When talking about graduate education, it is generally about education that leads to the next generation of professors.

Professor Lanyon asked how the Committee wished to proceed. Help the administration? Talk with faculty and gather more information? Professor Beeman said that schools raise money for graduate education, as do individual departments, and one can be happy they do but it is difficult to mount a serious fund-raising drive without getting help for department costs. It takes about \$2 million to fund a fellowship and it is hard for a department to raise that much. Professor Lanyon said it is a systemic issue and speculated that if one asked faculty members around the University, support for graduate education would be one of their top two or three concerns. If this is a problem for only one or two departments, however, it is a local issue—but it is not. Departments across the campus are losing top graduate students. Mr. Croce agreed and said that in his college they have not been able to recruit their #1 or #2 choices.

Mr. Croce asked whether, if this is such a concern for the faculty, they have voiced the concern to legislators and the public. By and large legislators and the public express more concern about graduating students in four years and turning out graduates for the workforce. Professor Kulacki noted that few people mention President Kaler's statement which, except for the four initiatives, is focused on keeping tuition low. In his experience there is a disconnect between teaching undergraduates, professional education, and graduate education in the arts and sciences.

For most graduate programs, Professor Konstan said, if they recruit 70% of their graduate students from in-state, and 80% who graduate take jobs in state, that would be seen as failing. It is not a good sell to legislators that programs want to recruit from around the world and ship their graduates to research universities around the world, so it is easier to emphasize research. There has also been a shift towards more accountability for graduate students supported on sponsored funds, which means that programs cannot be flexible in how graduate students spend their time. Fifteen or twenty years ago, it was not uncommon for strong programs to have faculty contribute "RA slots" to a pool for recruiting new students, knowing that the students would mostly start with coursework and might figure out specific project later. Now federal authorities require effort certification to document work on a specific project, which makes it much harder to support incoming graduate students with federal dollars. One hears that the University should support graduate students for four or five years, but grant funds are mostly for shorter periods. The University loses graduate students to wealthier universities because they have more money AND they support them longer. Two years of support versus six years is not competitive.

Professor Munson asked who brought the issue to the Committee. Professor Lanyon said it is a long-standing concern of his and that the Faculty Consultative Committee has been interested as well. He said he believes this to be a big challenge for higher education; it is not a local phenomenon and it would be helpful to know about the situation at other CIC schools. This is important for faculty but there is a need to focus on faculty salaries, Professor Kulacki argued; faculty must be compensated properly and to the cost of living in the Twin Cities.

Professor Beeman asked that in the future the Committee address the demise of the McMillan travel and research funds. They have been a mainstay in CLA but have dwindled to \$300-400, so there are no funds for faculty members to travel to meetings and present papers. If the faculty cannot present at national meetings, the University's reputation suffers.

3. Meetings with Probationary Faculty Members

Professor Lanyon reported that the Faculty Consultative Committee has asked if this Committee believes it would be worth talking to probationary faculty members on some regular basis so that it is aware of any issues of concern for this critical group of faculty members.

Professor Beeman said he believes the University does a good job of monitoring faculty members during their probationary periods and Vice Provost Carney provides a great orientation. Departments are charged to do annual reviews and probationary faculty members (at least in CLA) are charged to recruit a mentoring committee to help them. One area of weakness is probationary faculty are sometimes not aware of the financial resources available to them (e.g., single-semester leaves, McKnight professorships). He said it could be useful for the Committee to hear from a sampling of probationary faculty members.

Professor Lanyon asked Vice Provost Carney about her sense of the question. Dr. Carney reported that the New Faculty Orientation has been expanded so that it is year-long: They have four social hours per year, which have been very successful. Many of the new faculty members this year are quite young (perhaps averaging 27-28 years old, where in the past the average age is been in the early 30s) and they are struck by how many older faculty there are in their departments, faculty members who talk about their grandchildren or their children in college. They feel the age divide, and some departments have a greater age difference than others. The new faculty thus like the social hour as a way to make friends and meet colleagues, and if that is a way to retain faculty, it is very important. She also hosts four lunches that focus on specific topics (e.g., how to become an excellent teacher while maintaining their research career), and President and Mrs. Kaler hosted a reception for about 60 new faculty members, which Provost Hanson and she attended as well. These activities are important but they are not enough. She agreed with Professor Beeman that the University does a good job, some departments more so than others.

Dr. Carney recalled that the University participated in the COACHE survey in 2005 [Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, out of the Harvard Graduate School of Education] and would like to do so again this year; it is expensive but much has changed at the University since the last survey. Probationary faculty members are asked what three things they believe their institution is not doing well; last time the Minnesota probationary faculty members cited (1) mentoring for junior faculty, (2) professional assistance in obtaining grants (where much has changed at the University), and (3) childcare. She said that it could be useful to listen to probationary faculty members, and with new associate professors as well. (It was noted that the Faculty Consultative Committee intends to have a session with associate professors.) It will be important to do good sampling, she concluded. It is also possible for an institution to add its own questions to the COACHE survey.

Professor Kulacki asked what other issues have bubbled up at the social settings besides socialization. Work-life balance is a bigger issue for new faculty members, Dr. Carney said; they talk a lot about it and there is a generational difference. The University needs to accommodate a different set of values.

Professor Gladding commented that as a relatively new faculty member, she saw a lot of support for probationary faculty. New faculty might welcome the opportunity to think about other issues that the University might ask about. Sessions with this Committee could be beneficial. Dr. Carney agreed and said that while chairs and heads may know about the issues probationary faculty members face, it is important that the tenured faculty know as well.

For example, Dr. Carney commented, the University has policies in place to extend the probationary period but there are places in the institution that do not have a culture that embraces acceptance of extension. She related that she knows of one faculty member in a department who counseled junior faculty not to extend their probationary period. That can cause two problems: One, in the case of childbirth or adoption, the tenure policy provides that there is a right to extend the probationary period, so counseling against doing so could lead to procedural problems in the promotion and tenure process, and two, departments need to get away from the idea that one will look "weak" if one extends the probationary period and that one should "muscle through." She reiterated the point that extending the probationary period is not a leave—the faculty member continues to work and (for example) probationary year three is repeated as year three.

Professor Konstan said he thought it a wonderful idea to invite probationary faculty members to the Committee, even if it is possible to obtain their views in other ways as well, because governance probably seems remote to most of them. He urged that probationary faculty members NOT be invited from the same department as anyone who is a member of the Committee.

Professor Beeman said he had one question about probationary faculty members when he arrived at the University. Most institutions provide multi-year contracts to probationary faculty members, such as a two-year contract followed by a three-year contract. Minnesota does not do so. He said he was not sure if this is a problem but he would like to hear probationary faculty members talk about the issue. Dr. Carney said that the institutions that have such contracts often also do a serious three-year review, at which point many probationary faculty members are terminated. At the University, probationary faculty members are terminated only infrequently, and at P & T workshops she talks with chairs/heads about sending messages to probationary faculty members. (For example, she asked probationary faculty members how they view a unanimous departmental vote to continue their appointment combined with comments expressing serious concerns; they replied that they thought that they were doing fine. Some departments have separate votes on a scale of how well the probationary faculty member is doing in research and teaching and on continuation.)

It was agreed that the Committee would hold two or three sessions with 6-10 probationary faculty members in the near future and that one objective would be to develop additional questions for the COACHE survey. Professor Wojtaszek said he would talk with colleagues at Morris and recommend whether to include Morris probationary faculty members in the sessions or to have a separate discussion with them.

Professor Lanyon adjourned the meeting at 4:20.

-- Gary Engstrand