

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 23, 2006
1:15 – 3 pm
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Jean Bauer (chair), Gary Balas, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Dan Feeney, Kathleen Krichbaum (Lois Heller), Morris Kleiner, Scott Lanyon, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Fred Morrison, Terry Roe, Martin Sampson, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor

Absent: Barbara Elliott, Megan Gunnar, Marvin Marshak, Steven Ruggles

Guests: President Bruininks, Naomi Scheman

Other: Kate Stuckert

[In these minutes: (1) Review of Senate Docket; (2) Naomi Scheman, Equity, Access & Diversity Committee; (3) President Bruininks; (4) Legislative Liaison; (5) Committee Business]

Professor Bauer convened the meeting at 1:20 pm.

1. Review of Senate Docket

Professor Bauer began by reviewing the senate docket for the April 6 senate meeting. The committee discussed the docket. The committee discussed the formation of the Disabilities Issues Committee as noted on the docket. The committee also agreed that the Policy on Student Evaluation of Instruction be held until the May Senate meeting. The committee went on to discuss the order of the items on the docket and agreed to switch the order of Faculty Senate Bylaws Amendment addressing collegiate membership and the Faculty Senate Constitutional Amendment addressing the definition of Faculty and Faculty-like Academic Professionals.

2. Naomi Scheman, Equity, Access & Diversity Committee

Professor Bauer welcomed Professor Naomi Scheman of the Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee (EAD). Professor Scheman said the committee had taken its charge very seriously as it pertains to strategic positioning. She highlighted the duties and responsibilities of the committee which included: advising the president and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective; promoting compliance among the University community with equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity laws and policies relating to students and staff; reviewing policies, programs and services related to equal opportunity for and the diversity of students and employees, and recommend any changes; bringing concerns to the Senate, as appropriate; and recommending to the Senate Consultative Committee such actions or policies as it deems appropriate.

* 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.

Professor Scheman said that the EAD had been monitoring responses to its report. She said that the committee wanted to be more a part of the dialogue that is happening around campus, and that's why she was at this meeting. Professor Scheman said the committee had begun with a risk assessment, which asked the question, what does the University of Minnesota lose if a commitment to equity, access, and diversity is not internalized as a core institutional value? She referred to the blueprint for transformation, saying that it outlined what the committee meant by a serious commitment to equity, access, and diversity. She stressed that this included development of knowledge and ideas requiring the intelligence and imagination of people with a diverse range of life experiences and social and cultural backgrounds. Professor Scheman reviewed the six points noted on the materials for putting the principles into practice. She stressed the reasons for diversity and a commitment to recognizing the value and experience different people bring to the university. Professor Scheman also highlighted the importance of diversity at a research university and how it reverberates through the larger community. She cited the need for civic engagement and that the University wants its students to be cultural translators.

Professor Carpenter said the document would read better if it indicated it were the "defining mission." She also noted that the narrow focus seems to leave out the coordinate campuses. Professor Scheman acknowledged that they probably were being too "Twin Cities-centric", but that they had tried to be strategic in their approach. Professor Roe said he felt the document went too far, that it left no room for extreme positions. Professor Scheman said that its focus was not on individuals but the institution itself, and that the committee did indeed want there to be room for extreme positions. She cited examples of how people's roles can be defined by mechanisms which do not allow their experience, judgment and creativity to be used, and thus the University is wasting valuable resources. She acknowledged the creativity and intelligence everyone brings to their jobs no matter what level, from custodians to provosts. She stressed that outsourcing was a bad idea, as it gets the University away from its core competencies and prevents people from being engaged at all levels and that it was desirable for all employees to be part of the process.

Professor Chomsky said that there were a large range of suggestions and at this point, perhaps the task for EAD would be to take a proactive role in how to implement the ideas. EAD should take this as a starting point, and the challenge was how to integrate these concerns into the university culture. Professor Chomsky said that it needed to be determined what pieces of the initiative could be moved forward. Professor Scheman acknowledged this, saying that they were at an intermediate level between ideas and implementation. Professor McCormick added that at this point in the process it was important to find where the most influence can be brought to bear.

Professor Scheman thanked the committee for its time and Professor Bauer thanked her for the information and the committee's work on the issues.

3. President Bruininks

Professor Bauer welcomed President Bruininks, who updated the committee on several issues. He cited the dean searches, and said the candidates would be coming to campus for further meetings and interviews. He also discussed the chancellor search for the Morris campus. President Bruininks said that these were important searches and that they were trying to deepen the engagement of the campuses in the searches. President Bruininks discussed the current legislative session and the University's funding requests, and the ways monies may be distributed among projects. He noted that the hearings had gone well thus far. President Bruininks said the stadium issue was making some progress and there may be a

compromise strategy. He discussed two main issues with the stadium issue: student fees and naming it after a corporation.

President Bruininks continued on to strategic positioning, and said that he had encouraged staff to work on bringing the priorities of strategic positioning into a coherent story in moving the initiatives forward. He said that strategic planning and positioning must be articulated in a way that makes sense to the University community as well as the outside community. President Bruininks said it was important to communicate what the University of Minnesota does, who we are and why it is important.

President Bruininks went on to cite the success of the Founders' Scholarship, and cited new support for student scholarships. He said that donors have been very excited about the scholarship and have been enthusiastically stepping forward to contribute matching funds.

Professor Kleiner said that data presented at the Faculty Affairs Committee, had shown that the percent of salary increases for faculty were lower than for administrators' salaries, and cited figures which exemplified this. President Bruininks said that they had tried to remain competitive, and had made extraordinary attempts with the compensation pool to rectify this. He went on to say that they needed to figure out how to best make it part of the compensation strategy at the University, and that they've had to make some adjustments due to market considerations. Professor Martin pointed out that everyone who is not in a competitive area falls further behind in compensation, and cited CLA as an example. Professor Kleiner added that the University had fallen behind other research universities in salaries during the past few years, and President Bruininks said they were making headway in relationship to other institutions. The committee went on to discuss the compensation pool, its administration, and retirement issues.

4. Legislative Liaison

Professor Chomsky discussed the legislative liaison position and a particular faculty member who expressed interest in the position. The committee supported the individual (a co-chair of the one of the strategic planning task forces) and agreed that Professor Chomsky could contact the individual to determine whether the faculty member wanted to move forward with a formal nomination from the FCC. She noted that both Professors Morrison and Sampson would help with the transition. The committee discussed the legislative liaison position. Professor Feeney moved to proceed with the nomination of the faculty member for the position. Professor Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. [The faculty member later declined the nomination.]

5. Committee Business

Professor Carpenter discussed the chancellor search at the Morris campus, and advised of upcoming meeting with candidates. Professor Bauer stressed that the FCC needed to be represented in candidate interviews.

Professor Sampson discussed the bonding bill at the legislature, saying that the University had three major initiatives before the legislature: the bonding bill request, the request to fund five new bioscience buildings in the next ten years, and the stadium request. Professor Sampson distributed information for the committee's reference.

Professor Bauer adjourned the meeting at 3 pm.

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 23, 2006

4

--Mary Jo Pehl

University of Minnesota