

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 28, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, Ned Patterson, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler

Absent: Peter Bitterman, James Pacala, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman

Guests: Provost Karen Hanson; President Eric Kaler

Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) grade context posting options; (3) discussion with President Kaler; (4) faculty legislative liaison]

1. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Provost Hanson. She reported that she and Professor Hancher had suggested several topics of discussion.

Provost Hanson began with decanal reviews. She completed several such reviews this year and had discussions with all of the deans who were involved; she and the deans will provide information about the review to the faculty in the colleges. In the normal cycle of reviews she is also starting a review of Dean McQuaid this semester.

The provost said there will be an announcement of the candidates for Vice Provost for Student Affairs to succeed Vice Provost Rinehart. Mr. Rinehart has been a stalwart member of the University community for a long time and has agreed to remain in his position for a short time to assist with the transition.

Provost Hanson turned next to 7.12 statements. She said that she checked on their status following her conversation with Professors Hancher and Kohlstedt and has an accounting for which are done and which are not. Some are not finished because they are being held up in Morrill Hall while others are being held in the colleges. Those not completed: Pharmacy has 3, CLA has 2, Dentistry has 4, and Landscape Architecture. In many cases, the delays are because departments are having difficulties dealing with the language concerning post-tenure review.

Professor Durfee asked the provost if she had a sense that things were moving ahead and these long delays would be a thing of the past. Provost Hanson said she did not know because there is nothing

* 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.

about the process for review and approval that has changed. This is important, Professor Kohlstedt commented, because there was some confusion among associate professors about what they were being assessed on, especially when there are ongoing modifications.

Provost Hanson said she had reviewed the Statement on Governance Service that the Committee had adopted; she said she thought it excellent. It is also correct on one specific point: the excessive encouragement that probationary faculty members not take on University citizenship responsibilities. The institution reaps the consequences when probationary faculty members are not involved in those responsibilities. The document is an important philosophical statement on University citizenship. [The statement is appended to these minutes.]

On the matter of faculty salary equity, Provost Hanson reported that the outside consultant the University used before, Professor Clayton from the University of Wisconsin, will be on campus on April 19. The new salary analysis is to be completed by mid-April so it can be distributed to the deans. She said that she wants to be sure that deans are reminded that the colleges must have a process in place to deal with whatever the data uncover—and she would like to see the process in place this salary cycle. It may not be possible to adopt all of the recommendations of the Women's Faculty Cabinet this spring but there can be a mechanism at the college level to look at the data and to provide a safety valve in the college if there are problems with the way merit increases are distributed.

Professor Bearinger recalled that when the Committee discussed this subject earlier, she and Professor Pacala asked about the inclusion of the Academic Health Center (AHC) in the study. Is this another analysis that did not include the AHC? It included only Pharmacy and Public Health from the AHC, Provost Hanson said, because an exact replication of the study with 2012 salary was needed to establish any changes in the results between 2007 and 2012. A study of those AHC colleges that were not included in the forthcoming replication study will begin once the outside consultant has submitted his report. Professor Bearinger said there should be a mechanism in the AHC schools to address inequities that parallels the processes in other colleges, particularly in those that do not have clinical faculty. Provost Hanson agreed and said that the creation of mechanisms need not wait on data; the AHC colleges can set them up to do second-level merit reviews. It will be helpful to have the data and she agreed that they needed to be brought into the analysis.

Professor Bearinger asked if there is a way, apart from raising the point in these meetings, to ensure that the AHC is not overlooked in the next round. The provost said she was not sure there would be a next round with an outside consultant; there just need to be mechanisms in the colleges. Professor Kohlstedt asked if there might be a need for an outside consultant just for the AHC; Provost Hanson said that there is difficulty in determining how salaries are set in some AHC schools when there is a clinical component. When those salary structures have been fully determined, the University's Office for Institutional Research will likely have the capacity to do the analysis.

Professor Patterson reported that the AHC FCC talked with Vice President Friedman about salary equity analyses; Dr. Friedman said that they could be conducted for faculty members who do not have clinical appointments. The clinical question is difficult, in part because the clinical appointments and responsibilities are so varied across fields. But there is no plan in place right now to actually do the analyses for the non-clinical faculty.

Provost Hanson asked if the Committee would be happy with leaving out such a large segment of the faculty (i.e., those with clinical appointments). Professor Patterson noted again that it is a complicated matter. Professor Kohlstedt suggested moving forward where possible and not try to solve all the problems at once. Provost Hanson agreed but said she worried about potential disparities when a large class of faculty members was not included in the analysis. Professor Bearinger commented that it would be possible to identify disparities within categories.

Professor Lanyon asked where things stand in terms of college readiness to deal with inequities that are identified. Provost Hanson responded that she could not say with confidence; this has been a topic of discussion with the deans all year, and she hopes she has an understanding with the colleges that they will get mechanisms in place.

Provost Hanson turned next to graduate education. She said she had tried to indicate, in her message that went out to the University community earlier in the day, that she wants to work with this Committee on the issues. She has established a timeline, in concert with Dean Schroeder, and they thought they might do a quick survey to see where the problems are. She said they will work closely with governance committees to identify the problems that they see in order to avoid duplicating efforts; she would like to approach this in an integrated way. Professors Hancher and Kohlstedt have indicated that a number of committees are interested in the issues; if there can be communication about the issues, that would be helpful for her.

Professor Bearinger asked if a statement from committees on what they had addressed would be useful; Professor Kohlstedt said it would and that she would circulate a query to committee chairs and ask them to identify specific issues that had come up under their purview. Provost Hanson said she wished to underscore the need to identify issues, of which it sounds like there are a number.

Professor Durfee asked the provost to elaborate on her comments about interdisciplinary initiatives. Most of the angst seems to center on teaching, Provost Hanson related, and the complaints are about the budget model. She said she did not see an abandonment of responsibility-centered management as a solution to the problem, though we will examine the effects of the budget model. She and Vice President Herman are looking at the issue together; there have already been a number of studies, which they will review. She said she believes she has already heard the most pressing complaints about interdisciplinary activities. There may be places where a redistribution of resources could be helpful to provide incentives for interdisciplinary teaching and some of them are coming quietly through the compact process. They must be sure that schools are rewarded for allocating resources to interdisciplinary work and there may be other sources of funding that could perhaps be employed in ways that would assist interdisciplinary teaching and research. She and Vice President Herman need to know what the biggest barriers are and also do an external scan to learn where the University is well-positioned to take advantage of opportunities. So there will be internal reflection on problems in the way the institution operates as well as attention to external opportunities.

Professor Cloyd asked what the provost has been hearing are the barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and research. In teaching it is that some departments and colleges might discourage cooperation in teaching because then not all the tuition dollars flow to the college, Provost Hanson said. Is that an all-or-nothing proposition, Professor Cloyd asked? It is not, the provost said, but when a student takes courses in his or her college, 100% of the tuition revenue stays in the college; when the student takes a course outside the college, 25% of the tuition for that course stays in the student's college of enrollment.

What about in research, Professor Cloyd inquired? People say that there are procedures that are unnecessarily complicated, Provost Hanson said. And the question of which unit receives the overhead funding, Professor Kohlstedt added. Professor Cloyd said he thought that the Council of Research Associate Deans (CRAD) had dealt with that question and there was agreement on how to allocate the funds. Professor Beringer pointed out that on the back end, the proposal-routing form requires a designation of the split or an indication that the split will be decided if the research is funded. On the front end, everyone knows that there must be matching funds, even if they are not required, and there is a deindividuation process with interdisciplinary proposals: If a match is needed, which dean or school will start anteing up the money? If there is one primary dean, one knows where to go; if there are three deans involved, it gets to an "if you will, I will, and if you don't, I won't" situation, so the PI has to play the chessboard. That is not what the University wants and it is an administrative matter to establish a process that provides a way to proceed.

Provost Hanson said she could see an administrative solution but some schools could be more supportive than others. One solution would be a fund for interdisciplinary work, but that would be expensive and difficult to work out. This is a difficult problem. And if one unit is the lead, it will put up funds for something that is borderline interdisciplinary, Professor Lanyon added, but if there are three or four units with stakes in the research, no one steps up. Provost Hanson pointed out, however, that there are a number of cases where the deans are very cooperative.

Professor May related an example of how discouraging it can be to implement interdisciplinary teaching; she recalled a course that involved six faculty members from different departments and colleges on "ways of knowing" that was offered for about four years, with the faculty each teaching a part of the course and then being a student in it when not teaching. The course was offered through continuing education and it worked astoundingly well—but there was no way to bring it into the regular curriculum because it was spread across three colleges. Even though it was a tremendous success, it died. There is no way to think about such courses now; there is something about the budget model that makes everything difficult and everyone is under pressure to put bodies in seats. She said she did not know what alternative budget models there are but suggested there must be a way to loosen up the rules.

Provost Hanson said she was not sure it was the budget model and might be the budget instead. The example Professor May provided is an expensive way of teaching that ties up a lot of faculty time in one course, which is the way a dean will look at it. Deans could be reluctant to approve team teaching because of the scarcity of faculty members and the abundance of students. Because students are now such a large part of the budget, and tuition is so crucial, there is not enough money to run the University the way it should be. But, she added, the University is not so strapped that it could not consider a way to mount such courses; it can decide that it will spend money to offer some number of them because it is what a university does. They could be one-offs or they could be regular investments in teaching on the part of the institution.

Professor Kohlstedt expressed disappointment that the University did not have more funding from foundations interested in innovation and higher education, including Sloane, Mellon, Ford, and others. Provost Hanson said the University has sought funds from a number of those sources and has received funds from these foundations, including recent Mellon funding.

Professor Sheets said that the course Professor May described was marvelous and well worth support from the provost, and something she could revive. One way to do that would be to have a suite of courses, with a number of faculty members involved, and their contributions together would total one course. The University could offer courses not offered elsewhere, courses unique to the University, which could be a selling point in recruiting students. Provost Hanson repeated her point that the University might need to consider spending extra resources on such courses, and this could be amply justified.

Provost Hanson reported that she met with the chairs in CLA about the future of the college, and will continue to do so. She also met with the CLA Dean's Group. Nominations were invited from CLA faculty, staff, and students for an interim dean and for search committee members.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the provost for joining the meeting.

2. Grade Context Posting Options

Professor Kohlstedt turned next to Professor McCormick to report on the discussions at the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) about the options for posting information that would provide a context for grades. She noted that SCEP has been working on the issue for about a year and is bringing options for Committee consideration; this Committee (FCC) will need to move the discussion forward. As one step, the information from SCEP will be placed in front of the Faculty Senate and comments will be invited in an "open mike" discussion.

Professor McCormick reported that, at FCC's request, SCEP had revisited several times the question of how to provide context for grades; what he will present at this meeting are options for web posting. There are a limited number of institutions that do so and it is an option that this Committee and the Faculty Senate could consider.

This issue is related to the question of whether instructors adhere to senate policy on the definition of grades, Professor McCormick said. For A, B, and C the definitions are:

- A -- Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements
- B -- Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements
- C -- Represents achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect

That is an issue SCEP is working on with Vice Provost McMaster.

SCEP has also been discussing how to provide context for grades for both students and those who read transcripts (e.g., those who review applications for graduate or professional school). They learned that context is already being provided in an indirect manner: in 2003 the General Counsel said the University had to acquiesce to requests for grading data from commercial organizations. The Registrar, Ms. VanVoorhis, informed SCEP that most public universities respond to such requests. The organizations publish the data and one signs up for a membership to gain access to it. So the data are already available indirectly. The University has no control over how it is displayed or whether it is accurate or helpful to students or others.

Professor McCormick reviewed screen-shots from two such organizations that post University of Minnesota grades to show how they are displayed. One advertises the fact that they are official course grades; the other expressly provides that students should subscribe to find the easiest classes. So one question—if the University were to view posting grade distributions as a useful way to convey grade context—is whether the University has resources to post grade distributions for students itself.

The University has the data available for all faculty and staff, in UMRports, but not for students or others. The information could be released in some form to students, transcript readers, or the general public with little difficulty, if the University chose to do that. Does anyone do so? Professor McCormick reported that Ms. VanVoorhis asked on SCEP's behalf and learned that 12 of the AAU schools do display contextual information for their own students, and of those 12, 8 make the information completely public. All of them redact the numbers for small classes, typically those with fewer than 10 students. Professor McCormick reviewed screen shots of the various ways that a few peer institutions post grade data on the web with public access. The most developed of these is at Indiana, which has a searchable database and allows a student to request a report summarizing grade context information for the courses the student was in that term.

Professor McCormick next reviewed examples of web-posting options available.

	General description	Effort required	Timeline possible	Advantages	Disadvantages
1	Simply direct people to MyEdu, Koofers, etc.	No new effort needed	Immediate	These commercial services already provide course grade distribution data released to them by the University in response to Freedom-of-Information-Act requests (practice of UMN since 2003)	Not necessarily accurate. Requires user to create a commercial account, (no cost to user, but requires agreement to terms-of-use). Questions of whether UMN should recommend (e.g., terms of use, user privacy, appearance of endorsement by UMN, etc.)

2	<p>Though not all currently available to students, could adapt part or all:* UMReports "SCEP Grading Distribution"</p> <p>The "SCEP Grading Distribution" report shows % A-range (including A&A-) and the average GPA-value of undergraduate grades in 1/2/3/4/5xxx-level courses. These are aggregated by campus, by college, and by program (click through to go to deeper levels).</p> <p>* Currently available to faculty and staff at UMReports. Easiest way to find after login is to search for "SCEP".</p>	Small	Immediate	<p>Easy to implement. Aggregated by discipline, provides overview for student and transcript-reader without need to look up each course. Reports only undergrad grades; does not mix with grad and professional grades.</p>	Currently no course-level detail (but could be created).
3	<p>Though not currently available to students*, could adapt part or all of: UMReports "Grade Distribution"</p> <p>Shows %'s of each grade, for ALL grades recorded (both grad and undergrad), in 1/2/3/4/5/8xxx-level courses. These are aggregated by campus, by college, and by program (click through to go to deeper levels).</p> <p>*Currently available to faculty and staff at UMReports. Easiest way to find after login - search for "Grade Distribution".</p>	Small	Immediate	<p>Easy to implement; relatively easy to understand; provides a great deal of detail</p>	See questions above. Lumps together both undergraduate and graduate/professional grades.
4	<p>Develop large pdf posting of all grade distribution information similar to University of Wisconsin.</p>	Small-Medium	Very near future	<p>Provides all the information for a given term in one location</p>	Due to size of PDF, difficult to read or search
5	<p>Develop grade distribution tables featuring different levels of detail and aggregation, similar to those Indiana University and Georgia Tech display -</p>	Medium	Near future	<p>Easier than (4) to find more specific information.</p>	Still difficult to search for specific course information.

6	Develop searchable course-level webtool similar to that provided by another Indiana University website	More significant	Near future	Easy to read; easy to get to any course the reader is most interested in seeing; thought not done at Indiana, might be possible to give different levels of access for different audiences	
---	---	------------------	-------------	--	--

Background and current practice:

- I. For *faculty and staff*, UMN currently posts grade distribution information in umreports.umn.edu.
 - a. The "SCEP Grading Distribution" report posts average grade and percent-A-level-grades for CAMPUS, COLLEGE, and PROGRAM 1/2/3/4/5xxx undergraduate* grades. (*separated from Grad/Professional student grades)
 - b. The "Grade Distribution" report posts full grade distributions (including W's) for COLLEGE and PROGRAM 1/2/3/4/5/8xxx grades (undergraduate and graduate combined) as well as each COURSE.
 - c. These capabilities will improve with a new interactive interface being developed in the Office of Institutional Research.

- II. *Students and the public* have limited access to some information now - UMN currently posts the CAMPUS and COLLEGE "SCEP Grading Distribution" report annually in the Faculty Senate minutes.

- III. *Students and the public* also have access to the commercial websites "myedu.com" and "koofers.com", which post detailed COURSE information that is released to those companies by UMN under FOIA requests. Most public universities release information under FOIA requests, and most private universities do not.

- IV. An AAU survey (62 universities) by Registrar Susan VanVoorhis found that 8 universities post at least some undergraduate grade distribution information for their students at websites that are *publicly* accessible, and 4 more post for *students* (but not public) - all are public universities. One (Cornell) uses a contextual transcript.

Consultation should be sought (from faculty, students, advisors, and others) to identify and discuss concerns...

Here are some faculty concerns expressed so far in discussion with SCEP members:

- a) Many see more educational value in providing grade context information to students who are already in or have already completed a course or program (to better understand the context of their own grade) than for other audiences; some note that different levels of detail may be appropriate for different audiences.
- b) Some are concerned about how the data will be used and the educational value to students. For instance, some are concerned about whether posting specific course and section information for students who haven't yet taken a course or program might encourage unbalanced academic decisions (course choice with overmuch emphasis on anticipated grade distribution, and too little emphasis on other academic factors) and may even increase grade inflation pressure. Thus, some suggest that grade-context discussions should be linked to advising at the program and college level.
- c) Some are concerned that grade-context posting should be have lower priority than asking program-faculty to actively consider their own grade distributions and, if necessary, consider efforts to more closely adhere to existing Senate policy (grade definition) using efforts such as those in General Chemistry.
- d) Some are concerned that grade-context posting needs to be accompanied by metrics of the students (e.g., admission ACT statistics, average student GPA) to help discern whether higher grades can be correlated to academically stronger students.
- e) Some are concerned that the type of grading practice should also be posted (e.g., if criterion-referenced)
- f) Some are concerned about the cost and administrative effort involved, and ask what are sustainable options.

Professor McCormick emphasized that SCEP has not engaged in extensive consultation but has the heard the concerns he outlined. There is need for a great deal more consultation by FCC should it wish to pursue this direction.

Professor McCormick then posed a set of questions for the Committee to consider, if it is to recommend the University to move in the direction of releasing grading information.

Questionnaire for FCC discussion about providing grade-distribution information to students, transcript readers, and the public

1 - Consider whether UMN should provide grade distribution information for students:

- a) Should UMN post COLLEGE 1/2/3/4/5xxx-level aggregate grade distribution information on a website more easily available to students (i.e., as currently done in the Senate minutes, but in a new way so students could find and use the report more easily?)
- b) Should UMN post PROGRAM 1/2/3/4/5xxx-level aggregate grade distribution information for students?
- c) Should UMN post grade distribution information from each COURSE for students? (Legally, would need to redact if class-size is too small in order to protect student identity.)

2 - Should the same information (or different, or any) be posted for transcript-readers (i.e., those who select for employment/fellowship/intern/grad program)?

3 - Should the same information (or different, or any) be posted for the public?

4 - Some details about providing grade-distribution information beyond faculty and staff.

- a) Should different level of detail be provided for any of the following:
 - students who have already completed the course and are researching the context of their specific course-grade;
 - students in that program who are likely to take that courses in that program in the future;
 - all students at UMN?
 - transcript-readers
 - public

- b) What type of grade distribution information should be provided:
 - General metrics, e.g., Average grade assigned and Percent A-level (like UMReports "SCEP Grading distribution" report)
 - Detailed distribution - percent of each grade assigned (like UMReports "Grade distribution" report)
 - Information about W's as well?

- c) With what history should the information be posted:
 - Current year;
 - Last 5 years;
 - All years?

- d) Should undergraduate grade distribution be separated from grad/professional?
If yes, should grad/professional grade distribution information be shown as well?

- e) Who needs to be consulted on specific details on format, aggregation, method of posting:
 - faculty (junior faculty especially)
 - non-faculty instructors
 - current students (students nearing graduation and submitting applications especially)
 - recent alumni
 - advisers
 - others?

Professor Kohlstedt said that SCEP has worked long and hard on this subject; the question now is what should be presented to the Faculty Senate.

Professor Lanyon said that many of the questions are related to what path to follow in implementing a plan. That is not the primary faculty concern; the faculty question is concerns on the part of students and others about releasing the information, now about how far to go or how to do it. The concerns must be dealt with and then the audiences can be asked about the how. The faculty can also ask about the value of the information to students, Professor Kohlstedt said.

Professor May commended SCEP for the magnificent compilation of possibilities and said that grade inflation—a term he never used—has been on the minds of many for a long time. The question is

what it means. An A in a course with 90% A's might be a very advanced class that only the best students take; a C might be an English student stretching to take a Physics course. There are many ways to approach the issues where grades get convoluted. Some faculty members are seen as giving easy A's, some feel under pressure to get good student ratings for their merit reviews, and so on. These are complicated issues.

Professor Ben-Ner also commended SCEP for the presentation and said the question will be how to contain the discussion at the Faculty Senate. There will be a need for procedural guidelines. Something this Committee will be responsible for, Professor Kohlstedt said. The notion is not to put a particular proposal on the table but to lay out the options to see if any of them gain any momentum. Professor McCormick said that SCEP wants to know if any of them have any momentum with this Committee.

Professor Luepker thanked Professor McCormick for SCEP's work and said he had not been familiar with the problem. What would be a good conclusion, what outcome is wanted?

Professor Lanyon said that the interest is in serving students and those who read transcripts. The Committee needs to know what faculty concerns are; once those are addressed, then one can ask students and transcript readers what would be useful. The concerns must be addressed. (Transcript readers would be those who review transcripts anywhere a University of Minnesota student is in competition for something, whether admission, employment, fellowship, etc.) Professor Lanyon later clarified his comment to say that the needs of transcript readers must be identified in order to help students, which means that it is important to know how readers use the transcripts. All decisions should be in the interest of students.

Professor May said that she would be a transcript reader, but when evaluating students for something, she never looks at the transcript—but she looks at the letters of recommendation extremely carefully. She said she would favor getting rid of grades altogether. Part of her concern is whether the University should elevate the importance of grades when they are difficult to interpret, and should they be emphasized vis-à-vis letters of recommendation? Is it in the best interest of students to provide this information? She said she is skeptical of grades. Professor Kohlstedt suggested that Professor May bring up her point at the Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor McCormick agreed to prepare materials for the Faculty Senate meeting. Professor Kohlstedt again thanked him and SCEP for the work they had done in preparing the material.

3. Discussion with President Kaler

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed the president to the meeting.

President Kaler and the Committee discussed issues involving the AHC, hospital, and Fairview Health Services.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the president for the discussion.

4. Faculty Legislative Liaison

Professor Kohlstedt reported that she had contacted one individual about replacing Professor Sheets as legislative liaison, but that in the meantime one of the members of this Committee expressed an interest in the position. Professor Bearinger, who had left the room, had indicated her interest; the Committee discussed her candidacy and other issues related to the position and then voted enthusiastically to recommend her appointment to the president.

Professor Kohlstedt adjourned the meeting at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Reflections on Governance Service

A Statement by the Faculty Consultative Committee to the Faculty

Both in recent discussions and from time to time over many years, the question of recognition (financial or other) for service by faculty members to their department, college, and at the University level has arisen. The members of the Faculty Consultative Committee (who self-evidently value service to the institution) offer reflections to their colleagues about service.

The idea of "service" in an institution such as ours arises from the ancient conception of the university as a self-governing community of scholars. While modern law recognizes only a corporate structure and vests plenary authority in governing boards, the prevailing ethos and the actual practice of a major research university is that of a democracy where scholars make the important decisions about carrying out the mission. But the university cannot strive to reach the ideal of the self-governing community of scholars unless some of us participate in decision-making processes at all levels of the university.

It would be possible to leave all major decisions in the hands of deans and vice presidents and the president and provost. It is perhaps even likely that many of their decisions would have positive effects for the faculty, the university, and the state. But it would not be all of them, and even when administrative officers could be seen as moving in the right direction, there are often—usually—nuances of decisions and policy that those in governance can inform them about in order to significantly improve the decisions. Moreover, the members of the community of scholars have a responsibility to seek changes and decisions that they believe important to the well-being of the university; it is not primarily, or even mostly, the responsibility of the institutional administrators to do so.

Some have urged that there be a financial reward or incentive for participation in service in intra-institutional governance service. While we are sympathetic to that proposition, we believe there are good reasons why an explicit provision of financial incentive for service is most often counter-intuitive to the idea of shared governance.

First, as we pointed out, one of the obligations of a faculty member in an institution like ours is to participate in its governance. It is part of the definition of a faculty member that he or she has a role in governance. There are intrinsic rewards to participation beyond the financial, including having a voice in determining actions taken and, outside the department, the almost-invariably rewarding experience of meeting colleagues from other departments and colleges.

Second, as far as we can tell, virtually every department 7.12 statement, required by the Regents' tenure policy, has language that recognizes service. When decisions about merit and promotion are being made, a department that pays no attention to institutional as well as departmental, collegiate, and disciplinary service does so at the cost of understanding and recognizing how we conduct the university's business.

We are also concerned that the practice of sheltering probationary faculty members from almost all service responsibilities can be a mistake. Doing so can give them a distorted view of what it means to be a full-fledged member of the community of scholars, with its attendant obligations. While we concur that probationary faculty members should not be expected to perform significant levels of service, we believe they should be involved at a level that will not harm their prospects of achieving tenure but that will provide them an understanding of what it means to be a citizen of a major research university.

Faculty Consultative Committee
Adopted unanimously March, 2013