

AHC FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 17, 2013

Minutes of the Meeting

[In these minutes: Tenure/Tenure-Track and Clinical/Clinical-Track Faculty Ratios, Debrief from May 16, 2013 Third Thursday and Discussion Regarding Future Third Thursday Receptions, Election of 2013 – 2014 AHC FCC Chair, Open Basic Scientist Seat on AHC FCC, Agenda Items for June 5 Meeting with Dr. Friedman, Discussion with Provost Karen 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: Ned Patterson, (chair), Colin Campbell, John Connett, Cynthia Gross, Kathleen Krichbaum, Paul Olin for Sandra Myers

Regrets: Les Drewes, Sandra Myers

Absent: Robert Kratzke

Guest: Provost Karen Hanson

Others attending: Vernon Weckwerth

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

II). Members began by informally talking about the tenure/tenure-track and clinical/clinical-track faculty ratios in the AHC schools. A handout with information from about half of the AHC schools was distributed to members for their review. Professor Olin stated that he is pushing for the School of Dentistry to have a process in place for clinical/clinical-track faculty in terms of contract renewals, being heard, etc. In his opinion, if Dentistry expects to recruit good faculty, these individuals need to be provided some level of protection when it comes to contract renewals. He added that he also believes that each school should consult with its faculty on its personnel and strategic plans.

Professor Patterson reminded members about the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) ad hoc committee to develop procedures for review and promotion of contract faculty (which includes clinical faculty). This group will be issuing a report when it completes its work. He also noted that Professor Gross serves on this committee.

At the end of the discussion, Professor Patterson suggested putting this topic on the June 21 AHC FCC agenda for continued discussion given that this is an important issue, and is being looked at by other governance committees. Professor Connett stated beyond

comparing the tenure/tenure-track and clinical/clinical-track faculty ratios in each of the AHC schools, it would be interesting to see how the University compares to peer institutions with academic health centers. Professor Patterson suggested asking Dr. Friedman his thoughts on whether the committee should request comparison data about peer institutions. Professor Olin stated that while comparison data is interesting, at the end of the day, each institution and its schools are different.

On a semi-related note, Professor Patterson reported that at yesterday's FCC meeting, the committee talked with Provost Hanson about the status of the constitutions for the schools across the University. Apparently, the constitutions are all over the board. Provost Hanson believes that there needs to be consistency when it comes to school constitutions across the institution.

III). Moving on, the committee debriefed from yesterday's (May 16) Third Thursday gathering. Members were pleased with the attendance and thought the topic was very good as well.

Regarding Third Thursdays for 2013 – 2014, Professor Patterson solicited feedback from members about whether any changes should be made to the format for next year or if the same format should be followed. In Professor Patterson's opinion, he would like the AHC FCC to continue hosting Third Thursdays, but explore doing so with a slight twist, e.g., invite the deans, vice president for health sciences, vice president for research, provost, etc. to attend.

Professor Patterson suggested including an example of a collaboration that resulted from a Third Thursday reception when the committee submits its request to Dr. Friedman for funding for the 2013 – 2014 Third Thursday receptions.

Assuming Third Thursdays are funded for next year, Professor Patterson proposed setting the schedule at the committee's August 23 meeting. Additionally, he suggested visiting Duluth and holding an AHC FCC meeting and Third Thursday event in September. He asked Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, to check with Professor Drewes to confirm whether September 19 will work or if there would be a better day. Professor Olin noted that the School of Dentistry is exploring a "rural track," and so a few people from Dentistry may be interested in joining the AHC FCC. Professor Patterson stated that he would like to have representation from each school go to the Duluth.

IV). The next agenda item was the election of the 2013 – 2014 AHC FCC chair. Professor Patterson stated that he would be willing to serve in this capacity again next year unless someone else is interested in chairing the committee. Members agreed that they would appreciate Professor Patterson chairing for another year and unanimously voted to elect him as chair of the AHC FCC for the 2013 – 2014 academic year.

Professor Patterson suggested that since he will only chair one more year that the committee should start to think about who might be interested in serving as chair for the

2014 – 2015 academic year. Professor Krichbaum expressed an interest in chairing in 2014 – 2015.

V). Professor Patterson stated that the Medical School FAC elected Professor Paul Bohjanen to replace Professor Campbell as the basic scientist representative on the AHC FCC. According to the AHC FCC charge, “The AHC FCC shall be composed of eight faculty members as follows: three from the Medical School (one from Basic Sciences, one from Clinical Sciences, and one from the School of Medicine, UMD) and one each from Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and Veterinary Medicine. Members shall be nominated and elected by the colleges’ faculty governance committees.” Professor Campbell noted that the reason the charge distinguishes a difference between a basic scientist representative and a clinician is because these two groups have completely different perspectives on a number of issues. In Professor Campbell’s opinion, he believes the basic scientist representative to the committee should come from one of the six basic science departments – 1). Microbiology; 2). Pharmacology; 3). Integrative Biology & Physiology; 4). Biochemistry, Molecular Biology & Biophysics; 5). Genetics, Cell Biology & Development and 6). Neuroscience.

After some discussion, the committee agreed that given the different perspectives basic scientists and clinicians have that it is important to have representation of each on the committee. Ms. Dempsey was asked to contact the Medical School FAC and have them elect a basic scientist from one of the six basic scientist departments. Professor Patterson added that Professor Kratzke is the current clinician on the AHC FCC and he has been having problems being able to make the meetings. He also asked Ms. Dempsey to follow-up with Professor Kratzke to be sure he is still able/interested in continuing to serve. If his schedule does not allow him to continue serving, Professor Patterson suggested the Medical School ask Professor Bohjanen to replace him as the clinician on the committee.

On a different note, Professor Patterson stated that the FCC has contacted the Medical School FAC to let them know that their Senate election requirement that 2/3 of elected senators must be tenured/tenure-track does not comply with Senate bylaws. Professor Campbell stated that the FAC was well intentioned when it made this decision. They did not intend to disenfranchise term faculty, but rather to empower them given that only tenured/tenure-track faculty truly feel they have academic freedom.

VI). Next, the committee took a couple minutes to debrief from the May 1 AHC FCC meeting with Dr. Friedman. Professor Campbell asked members if they saw Dr. Friedman’s recent editorial in the Star Tribune - <http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/207795501.html>. In Professor Campbell’s opinion, the editorial was very direct, frank and well written.

Professor Patterson stated at the May meeting with Dr. Friedman the two agenda items were the University’s budget request to the state legislator and a discussion about salary equity. He noted that at this meeting Professor Connett gave a good presentation about what the School of Public Health is doing in terms of equity. Members spent a few

minutes talking about the salary equity discussion from the May meeting. Professor Patterson suggested this topic be raised with Provost Hanson in their discussion with her later today.

Professor Olin suggested the committee could talk with Dr. Friedman about the Affordable Care Act (ACA) "Obamacare," and the impacts that it will have on the UPlan. He then took a couple minutes to explain that the Cadillac Tax will go into effect in 2018, and that the University needs to make sure it has its ducks in a row by 2016 in order to have "safe harbor" from the Cadillac tax. The reason the administration is proposing putting plan changes into effect as of January 1, 2014 is because it needs to see how the changes actually play out in claims and plan costs and this generally takes a minimum of 18 months. As a public institution, the University, for political and financial reasons, cannot afford to offer a Cadillac-valued plan. If the University had a Cadillac-valued plan, it is estimated that beginning in 2018 it would cost the University approximately \$40 million (recurring) in excise taxes. As a result, the University is left with no choice but to shift health care costs to employees in order to reduce the plan value. For more information about the changes being proposed by the administration, members were encouraged to read the recent Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) minutes at: <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/43231>.

In addition, Professor Olin suggested the committee talk with Dr. Friedman about the parking implications for faculty, staff and students when the Vikings play at TCF Bank Stadium. A suggestion had been made at a recent Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) meeting that a liaison position be created to handle class parking requests. Professor Olin reported that he suggested to the SCFP that students should receive a portion of the stadium fees they are paying returned to them given the University will be making money on this arrangement with the Vikings.

VII). Professor Patterson welcomed Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Karen Hanson and called for introductions. He noted that a number of questions had been submitted to Provost Hanson prior to this meeting to help her prepare for a productive discussion.

Regarding the 7.12 statements, began Provost Hanson, she has been informed by Vice Provost Arlene Carney that not all of the 7.12 statements are complete. Provost Hanson stated that she has requested that all 7.12 statements be completed this summer. She added that she recognizes of importance of completing the statements. Members, off the record, elaborated on this topic and shared their concerns with Provost Hanson.

Next, Provost Hanson addressed a question concerning gender salary inequities. She noted that she has asked the deans to establish a committee that will review salaries where discrepancies have been identified. Provost Hanson added that she has told the deans that any money to remedy inequities needs to come from their respective schools. If the money to address identified inequities were to come from central, this would not remedy the problem because central money would simply mean the money would be coming from other schools. Why should units that are behaving appropriately be taxed to

pay for units that do not have fair salary procedures in place? Provost Hanson stated that in her opinion this is a matter of principle, and the remedy needs to come from within each school. She added that she has a commitment to gender equity. Professor Campbell stated that he interprets this solution to mean that salary inequities are not a central problem. Provost Hanson stated that it is not a central problem but rather a problem created by the unit that sets the salary. If deans have allowed disparities to propagate, they need to be held accountable.

Professor Gross commented that the pattern of seeking an outside offer is, to a degree, a gender-based behavior associated more frequently with being male than female. Getting an outside offer, which is countered with an internal retention offer exacerbates the problem. What can be done centrally to remedy this situation if men are more likely to seek a competitive offer than women? Provost Hanson stated that while this may be true, there is no empirical evidence to confirm it. When faculty seek outside offers and, as a result, get retention offers, is an issue that needs to be monitored for a variety of reasons. What can and should be monitored centrally when there is an outside offer is whether all faculty are treated in an equitable way, e.g., all offers must be in writing. A number of equity problems that exist are an outgrowth of market considerations, e.g., institutions being strapped for faculty resources, the financial resource disparity between public versus private institutions.

Professor Krichbaum cited the Rajender Consent Decree and noted that there is an established inequity in rank between genders at the University. Having said that, she asked Provost Hanson why the University does not believe it has an obligation to help correct the problem. Provost Hanson reiterated her earlier comment that she does not believe the administration should give money to units that have behaved badly by taxing the schools that are behaving well and giving the money to units that have misbehaved. Doing so would actually reward schools/units that have misbehaved. Professor Campbell stated that his concern is one of perception. Provost Hanson encouraged him to think through the policy because she believes he may find the optics are not as bad as he initially thought. She reminded members about the University's budget process, which works by taxing the schools because central administration has no tuition or O&M income. Taking money from a well behaved school and giving it to a badly behaved school is not good policy. On the issue of disparities across the schools, she reminded members that there are gender differences in representations among the faculty and this is a larger social issue beyond the University. She believes these differences are the main contributors to disparities across the schools.

In light of time, Provost Hanson quickly answered the remaining questions that she had been given prior to this meeting. Below are Provost Hanson's answers:

- Decanal performance reviews are on a three-year cycle. Deans are not appointed for terms but are appointed at will. Each review committee is generally made up of people from the school but outside people also serve on the committee as appropriate. Provost Hanson noted that progress was made this year related to concerns from faculty about not receiving information about the reviews. Because the review is a personnel review, much of the information is protected.

However, Provost Hanson noted that she encouraged the deans that were reviewed this past year to disclose as much information as they were comfortable sharing.

- In response to a question about minimizing the evolution of new courses being created to take advantage of the new budget model that keeps tuition in colleges if classes are taught within a college, Provost Hanson commented on the number of people who have a great deal of angst about the University's budget model. Given that tuition is a major source of revenue for the schools, she understands why the current budget model motivates them to generate as much tuition revenue as possible. She added that a curriculum committee, which was just instituted this spring, now must approve all new courses and/or programs before they can be offered, and this is expected to help address this problem.
- Pressing issues for her office include but are not limited to the budget model, which is viewed by many as an impediment for interdisciplinary collaborations, and the structure of the Graduate School.
- Is the Graduate School being re-established as a central unit? Provost Hanson stated that this is true, to a degree. In her opinion, the structure of the Graduate School needs to be aggressive in a number of different ways, e.g., more involvement in program review, more visible. She noted, however, that she does not intend to re-centralize recruitment fellowships. The schools need to take responsibility for their recruitment fellowships, and it is not true that they are unable to manage the risk. Each school's budgets and reserves are large enough to manage this risk. Gradually, Provost Hanson is seeing a cultural change along these lines albeit slow.
- Regarding MOOCs, the University has no real commitments aside from oral commitments to faculty who have expressed an interest in MOOCs. She noted that within the past week or so she gave permission to turn on "signature tracks." Provost Hanson wants to avoid the controversy that other institutions have experienced related to MOOCs. A number of issues surrounding MOOCs have far reaching educational implications. This is an ever-changing landscape and it will be important for the University to keep faculty informed about what it is doing in this arena and why.
- Provost Hanson referred the committee to Vice President and Chief Information Officer Scott Studham regarding the question about inter-campus and intra-campus video conferencing technology improvements.
- Regarding a question about the proportion of tenure-track/tenured versus clinical-track/clinical faculty, Provost Hanson agreed she would raise this topic when she meets with the AHC deans. Professor Patterson stated that this is an issue of interest to faculty, many of whom believe that they should have input into these decisions and also strategic planning for their respective school.

Out of respect for Provost Hanson's time, Professor Patterson, on behalf of the committee, thanked her for attending today's meeting.

VIII). Professor Patterson reminded members that Vice President for Research Brian Herman will meet with the committee at their next meeting on June 21. He asked members to submit their question for VP Herman to Ms. Dempsey.

Hearing no further business, Professor Patterson adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate