

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 7, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Will Durfee (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, James Cloyd, Eva von Dassow, Janet Ericksen, Gary Gardner, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Paul Ranelli, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Chris Uggen, Jean Wyman

Absent: Jigna Desai, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Russell Luepker, Karen Mesce

Guests: Vice President Katrice Albert; Professors Doug Ernie and Richard McCormick, Nancy Fulton, Steven Pearthree (all from Committee on Committees); Allen Levine (Liaison for Special Initiatives, Office of the Provost)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Vice President Albert; (2) Committee on Committees review of the committee; (3) interdisciplinarity; (4) replacement for Professor Ropers-Huilman]

1. Discussion with Vice President Albert

Professor Durfee convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Vice President for Equity and Diversity Katrice Albert, who began at the University in June.

Vice President Albert said that she was excited to be at the University of Minnesota and that part of the draw was the CIC/Big Ten. When she was at Louisiana State University they looked to the CIC for big ideas around equity and diversity like the Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP), which was a pipeline for diverse undergraduate students interested in earning doctoral degrees. The University was also attractive because Minnesota is a land-grant institution; her mother was a faculty member at Southern University, also a land-grant institution. Finally, she came because she believes President Kaler and Provost Hanson are committed to the goals of equity and diversity.

How can the faculty be more knowledgeable about the work of her office? They must provide resources to the faculty, Dr. Albert said. The University can be a national model, and she was attracted to the University because of the portfolio of her office, which includes 9 units, many more than most peer institutions, a fact that demonstrates the University is committed at a high level. Her office must produce so the campus is a place where faculty and student want to come and where there are good gown-town relationships. The University must tell its story so this is a place that faculty seek out; it can have a national footprint in equity and diversity. They must also engage the alumni (e.g., in order to help close the achievement gap) so that all see the University as an option and a place to which they have access. The Institute for Diversity, Equity, and Advocacy (IDEA) in her office is a major vehicle to increase diversity in faculty ranks.

* 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.

In terms of helping colleges and departments increase diversity, that must be done at the local level. She has hired a vice provost to help deans with diversity (e.g., in faculty hiring). This Committee will be instrumental in helping her office frame the approach to be taken; there are a number of ways to attract faculty, such as bringing a rising star to the campus and bringing two faculty members at a time to a department. She could use help from the Committee in setting reasonable goals.

Professor Durfee asked if, with respect to diversity in faculty hiring, from her outside perspective there are any perceived barriers that work against diversity that can be addressed. Dr. Albert said that the number one factor is geography, and it was almost a barrier for her. Does that affect diversity goals or is it true in general, Professor Durfee asked. In general, Dr. Albert said, but diversity especially, because Minnesota is seen as very white in terms of national perceptions. The question is how to demonstrate that the University has a long legacy of diversity and social justice. This is the 20th anniversary of the GLBT center and of the Office for Conflict Resolution. The University needs to tell that long history. Faculty of color would appreciate coming to a university where local climates help them succeed in promotion and tenure.

Professor Bearinger noted that the Committee has heard from time to time about gender equity in faculty salaries; how is Vice President Albert's office working with Vice Provost Carney's office to administer the response to the issues? A second question, Professor Bearinger said, is whether there is someone in the Academic Health Center (AHC) who works with her office.

Dr. Albert said she met very early on with the Women's Faculty Cabinet and talked about the gender-equity study, and her office is working with the provost and Vice Provost Carney and units to achieve salary equity. She noted that the Women's Center reports to her office and said that she meets frequently with Provost Hanson because the connections between their two offices are very important. At this point she does not have anyone outside the Medical School with whom she works in the AHC—but will get to doing so.

Professor Durfee inquired of Committee members from the AHC whether they believed the connections between Dr. Albert's office should be at the AHC level or by college. Professor Bearinger said that is a good question in a number of areas, such as communications and information technology, but said she believed direct connections between the colleges and Dr. Albert's office would be more productive.

Professor Cloyd asked Vice President Albert how the University is doing now—how does the report card look? Dr. Albert said she did not have faculty numbers at hand, although one of senior members of her office has told her the University is not doing a good job with faculty of color because of attrition: the small number of faculty of color leave the University at the same rate as other faculty and it has been difficult to retain them.

Professor Cloyd observed that departments recruit the best and the brightest they can as graduate students and postdocs—and then tell them to leave. They know that their chances of bringing someone to the University increase if that person has already been here. Perhaps the targets of hiring in selected areas should be the trainees who are already here, especially if they obtained their graduate education elsewhere. Vice President Albert said she was uncertain if that would work to change the culture if someone had received his or her Ph.D. or postdoc training here but agreed that it is more difficult to hire

from outside than to recruit a department's own postdocs. Professor Ropers-Huilman commented that they hired two of their own outstanding postdocs and have been delighted with the result. Professor Cloyd said that Dr. Albert's office could help units identify rising stars.

Professor Uggen said this discussion is related to his research interests. One of the bad numbers that Dr. Albert may not have learned is that Minnesota has one of the highest rates of racial disparities in criminal punishment. He said that as far as background checks go, he is concerned if the scope is too broad. (The African-American arrest rate is 227 per 1000 per year, and about 9% of adult African-Americans are under correctional supervision, compared to about 1% for whites.) Checking criminal backgrounds can sometimes become a slippery slope, in which applicants of color are excluded from consideration on the basis of very minor arrest records, which never even resulted in prosecution or conviction. Dr. Albert said she has had conversations with Vice President Brown and this issue was brought to her attention by Regent Omari. Vice President Brown understands the problem and the results of background checks will not be provided to search committees unless there is a major problem in the record.

Professor Satin said, apropos of Professor Cloyd's point about postdocs, that he would take the issue back to kindergarten: the Twin Cities has the greatest financial disparity between whites and African-Americans in the country—a gap that exists in a reasonably wealthy metropolitan area. Addressing that gap must be part of the strategy: if hometown kids grow up here but can't come to the University, that's a big problem. Every public university must draw significantly from its own community, he said, and that needs to be part of the long-term plan.

Professor Satin also addressed the question of the AHC. If Vice President Albert does not know of connections between her office and the AHC, and the faculty members of this Committee from the AHC do not know of such connections, they may not exist. But that may be acceptable because hiring, mentorship, and so on take place at the local level. There is a cultural element to these questions that has to be infused locally.

Dr. Albert said that at the orientation for new faculty there was fanfare about the number of new faculty members hired this year; when she spoke with them about the resources that new faculty members can use, she was looking at a sea of white faces. With all of the new faculty members hired after a drought in hiring, it appears there was no accountability in terms of expecting people to do the right thing in increasing faculty of color hiring at the local level. There was a large number of new faculty members hired but the dial wasn't moved on diversity, so her office must work harder with search committees, chairs, and deans.

Professor von Dassow said that diversity can include gender, economic, geographic, and other aspects, but the focus is now on racial diversity. Diversity must trickle up, as Professor Satin said, and it will be difficult to achieve without addressing K-12 education and undergraduate education; how the University will achieve it is a question because it cannot be accomplished from the top down. Fields attract differently; ancient history, for example, is almost entirely white. How can disciplines go about addressing that problem? When a department has a position available, it must demonstrate that it is not disadvantaging persons of color—but none apply. In their choice of graduate students, the University loses out to other institutions. Growing their own isn't the way to achieve a diverse faculty; how can institutions do so?

Dr. Albert agreed that it is necessary to take into account K-12 education as well; the faculty have to help groom undergraduates for their fields. Students cannot become what they do not know about and universities need to start mentoring students to their Ph.D. programs. It is the universities' responsibility to do so, and while they may grow graduate students that they do not hire, if all faculty members across the country did that kind of work with K-12 students (and with women in STEM fields), that would put numbers in the pipeline. The faculty cannot fix K-12 education but they can encourage good students in their classes.

Professor Gardner commented that they have a problem with the applicant pool in agriculturally-related fields; there are few persons of color interested. Part of that lack of interest may be historical, not wishing to be associated with the farm, and another part may be that the remuneration in medical professions looks much better than it does in agriculture. One of the faculty's jobs is to train the professoriate, which starts in high school and undergraduate education; funds from Dr. Albert's office could help get students from other places into the University. The SEED project in the College of Biological Sciences is a good example that works well and should be expanded to a broader range of disciplines. With regard to the question of future faculty who receive their preparation here, but then leave, the University might lose Ph.D.s to other institutions, but their programs may then be resources for recruitment.

Dr. Albert said there are many programs for faculty members to participate in education at grades 9-12. Her office is a partner in such a program to diversity the information-technology field. For students coming to the University, they working with Genesis Works, a non-profit organization working to increase people of color in the IT profession and Vice President Scott Studham of the Office of Information Technology to see if they can provide student jobs in information technology.

Professor Gardner said that the workstudy office does not appear to have a connection with academic jobs; if he knew of a work-study student who was interested in plant science or horticulture, for example, he would hire him or her. It would help if that office could help match student desires with jobs related to student interests.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said that the University is large and decentralized; as one example, she was recently at a meeting where she was provided a list of University of Minnesota projects in K-12 schools—and the list was pages long. The institution is doing much as a collective but the work seems not to be well coordinated. Relatedly, in talks at the University about the achievement gap, it often is said that the schools have a problem, but she is in higher education and sees achievement gaps here as well. Does the University provide meaningful experiences for students who are here? It needs to look in its own back yard as well as at K-12 education.

Professor Ben-Ner asked if the achievement gap at the University has gotten worse over time and if the closing of the General College has affected it. He said it would be appropriate to look at the effectiveness of programs that were established to replace it.

Professor Bearinger said that when there is talk of bringing students in for summer experiences, that is incompatible with the nine-month appointments that many faculty members hold. It takes time to mentor the young; the University needs to find a way to support faculty members to do so.

Professor Durfee told Dr. Albert that if there is any way the faculty governance system can help her, she should let the Committee know. It can also serve as the voice of the faculty to support initiatives. He suggested she think about where the Committee can help. Dr. Albert thanked Professor Durfee for the offer and said it would also help if the Committee could brainstorm ideas with her, including about actions that have worked in the past.

2. Committee on Committees Review of the Faculty Consultative Committee

Professor Durfee next welcomed Professors Ernie and (Richard) McCormick, Ms. Fulton, and Mr. Pearthree to the meeting. He explained that the Committee on Committees is charged to review periodically all senate committees, including the executive committees. This is timely because in the next year or so it may be appropriate to have a review of the entire governance system to determine if it is operating in an effective and efficient manner.

Mr. Pearthree began by telling Committee members that they are free to send email messages to any of the four of them with comments about the functioning of the Committee. The questions they bring include whether the charge to the Committee encompasses recent efforts of the Committee?

Professor Ranelli said that he has been on his college FCC and that this is his first year as an ex officio member of this Committee, and he has begun to wonder why this Committee does not serve the system campuses with unionized faculty members. He said he knows there are longstanding issues involved, but the review should include whether governance operates efficiently and effectively at the system level.

Professor Satin said the chief charge to the Committee is to give advice to the president and provost, and it does give a lot of advice; the Committee on Committees should ask the president and provost if the advice is useful.

Professor Ben-Ner said that the Committee is to give advice and also a place where information is aired for discussion and transparency; administrators explain what they are thinking.

Professor von Dassow said that as the executive committee of faculty governance, it has a responsibility to faculty; only part of its role is liaison with the administration, and governance is very different from giving advice. The faculty at large should be able to come to the Committee with issues; she said she did not know where the Committee's agenda items come from, but it is not the faculty or Committee members. If the Committee only offers advice to the administration it is not performing its role as executive committee of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Ericksen said that as a faculty member from the Morris campus, she has found it very valuable to serve on the Committee. When topics are discussed here, she brings them back to her colleagues at Morris, and the discussions here also enable her to learn what the Twin Cities faculty are doing. She said she believes that Committee members can bring issues to the chair if they sense a problem that needs to be addressed and that is a way that faculty issues are raised through the Committee.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said a key function, which the Committee plays well, is that its members are asked to be citizens of the University, not their specific colleges and departments.

Nevertheless, they bring particular experiences and Committee members can bring an understanding of how issues affect particular units.

Are there enough or too many members, Mr. Pearthree asked? It the Committee composed of the right mix of members (e.g., by campus, gender, etc.)?

Professor Ranelli said that the faculty union is an obstacle and that because of that the Committee is not a system committee.

Professor Uggen said he has been very impressed with the service norms of the people on the Committee and the level of consultation with department chairs and deans. The Committee is really out and about and has good representation; he said he has been impressed with his colleagues and the listening they do for concerns.

Professor von Dassow reported that the Nominating Subcommittee is identifying lists of potential candidates for the Committee and has looked at the historical patterns of representation by college, and it is trying to fill the gaps. She said she does not believe the Committee is too big; it cannot adequately represent all parts of the University, but if it were bigger, it would not have the same kinds of conversations. It should not be smaller with less breadth of representation, rather, ideally it would expand without becoming unwieldy.

Professor Cloyd said he believes there is a rich array of voices present when one includes the ex officio committee chairs in the mix. As the Nominating Subcommittee works on slates of candidates, it has asked whether there are missing voices. Representation on the Committee will never be perfect but it is a reasonably good representation across a broad swath of the University.

Professor Ben-Ner said that there have been experiments about the willingness of people to make contributions to a public good as a function of group size. The Committee is about the right number and it would not be beneficial to add another 10 members.

Professor Satin, who noted that he is only filling in for a couple of months for Professor Pacala, said he would err on the side of fewer members. He knows that reduces the diversity of opinions, but with respect to the charter of the Committee, it can probably perform better providing advice if the president and provost get to know a small cohort of faculty members well with whom they can talk candidly.

Professor Gardner said that with respect to the Duluth faculty, it is important that the Committee get a clear answer about the relationship between the union and faculty governance—from both the union and the governance side. He went on to comment that the tension between consultation and governance is an important issue. Of senate committees, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, for example, has considerable governance responsibility; the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs discusses a large number of bargaining-unit issues but does not have negotiating power. There is need to talk about what governance means, and it may be that it means having a voice that might be ignored.

Professor Bearinger said that she was ex officio on the Committee as chair of the Senate Research Committee and she would have found it frustrating NOT to have been a member of this Committee. There is a sense that committee work can be dead-end unless one can learn what happened and if a

committee proposal is being discussed. Serving on this Committee gave the Senate Research Committee a greater voice.

Professor Patterson said the current membership provides broad representation and pointed out that there are smaller-group meetings, such as pre-FCC meetings with the president and provost, the 3x3x3 meetings with the president, provost, and Regents chair and vice chair, and so on.

Professor (Richard) McCormick asked if the stipulated ex officio committee chair representatives provide what is needed or if there should be additional members (which would raise again the question of the size of the Committee). Professor Ropers-Huilman said she did not know if there should be additional ex officio chairs but that having the ones who do serve is very important because those committees look at issues in depth and then bring them here.

Professor von Dassow picked up on Professor Bearinger's remarks to the effect that a committee can put a lot of effort into a project and not be sure that the effort will yield anything. This committee is a very thin membrane between the faculty at large and the administration. The Committee is a tiny fraction of the faculty; the connection between what the Committee does and what the faculty across the University do is tenuous. Many faculty members know nothing about the governance structure or how policies are developed. As it is, many faculty members ignore messages pertaining to governance, but it is important to consider how to engage more of the faculty, both pre- and post-tenure, in developing the policies that determine how they can do their work.

Mr. Pearthree asked about representation for the Rochester campus. Professor Ranelli said he believed it should be represented, but it was noted that there are no tenured faculty on the Rochester campus (yet) and that it had just achieved a sufficient number of faculty members in total to qualify for membership in the Faculty Senate. Professor Cloyd said there are points of view specific to the other campuses that this Committee needs to hear. Professor Ericksen reported that she has been asked faculty members at Rochester if they need representation on this Committee, so they are thinking about the question.

Professor Durfee thanked the guests for the discussion with the Committee.

3. Interdisciplinarity

Professor Durfee welcomed Dr. Levine, Liaison for Special Initiatives in the provost's office who is focusing on interdisciplinary matters, and noted that Dr. Levine served earlier as Dean of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resources Sciences and as head of the Department of Food Science and Nutrition, and had a long and distinguished career in investigating interdisciplinary issues. The Committee wishes to learn what Dr. Levine has been hearing as it moves toward developing recommendations to the provost.

Dr. Levine said that he is still in the discovery phase of his work and wants to know what people think. He commented that he was appointed in 6 departments and 3 graduate programs and that people do not know what to do with individuals who are in interdisciplinary fields. In the past, he never felt that he could not talk to someone, but barriers arose: "what percentage will be on the grant?" He encounters questions about money; if that problem is to be solved, the University has to identify mechanisms to address it. He said he has been looking at the situation around the country and talked to faculty members

and deans in order to get an understanding of what is going on. The problem is not interdisciplinarity, it is cooperation and the silo effect.

Professor Bearinger said she had looked that morning at the list of issues and recommendation regarding interdisciplinary research and teaching that the Council of Research Associate Deans had created. From her perspective, there were pieces missing. She has been in a number of discussions about interdisciplinarity, recently with deans and department heads with the FCC, and the story from the faculty seems to be missing: what is their experience trying to work intercollegiately? She said the term "intercollegiate" should be used because the problems must be addressed at that level. Overall, these discussions have moved quickly to the educational realm, about which she cares deeply, Professor Bearinger said, but was surprised to hear the deans and department heads indicate that there are no major problems in interdisciplinary research, compared to teaching. She did not agree; she said that if they were asked, the faculty would likely say there are problems in intercollegiate research as well. For example, in the case of providing matching dollars (which are required to be competitive even if a grant does not require them), any school that is not home to the PI is reluctant to provide funds with multiple schools. None want to be the first on the dance floor. Deans are hesitant to contribute match dollars unless they have a lead role in the research, i.e., the PI is a faculty member in their college and the grant can be counted in the tally of grants funded to their college. Some deans also do not want faculty members contributing time on grants that are housed elsewhere because doing so can potentially take away from their effort on grants housed in their own college.

Professor Ericksen said that interdisciplinarity has been discussed at Morris, including at a Campus Assembly meeting, and Professor Ng provided at the Senate discussion a list of issues from Morris. They do not have an intercollegiate problem because they function as a single college, and they do not tend to work with Twin Cities faculty (she said she does not know the history behind that lack of collaboration). The Institute for Advanced Studies supports some interdisciplinary work.

Professor Ranelli said that problem he sees is in research: at Duluth, the question is which Sponsored Projects Administration office (Duluth or Twin Cities) they are to report to. In the College of Pharmacy, which is based in the Twin Cities, each SPA office says it's the other one. It is not a smooth path to interdisciplinary research.

Professor McCormick said that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy has identified several issues related to interdisciplinarity: credit and recognition for teaching efforts across colleges; the need for the value of such efforts to be judged by people who understand the value of the interdisciplinary work to the University (as distinct from the value to specific departments); rethinking how cross-listing of courses works to make them accessible and easier to manage in the course database; streamlining how TA support is arranged; and (in graduate education) providing incentives and support for large intercollegiate training grant proposals that can compete with other universities.

Professor Ben-Ner alluded to a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that reported that those who graduated with interdisciplinary degrees earned lower salaries than those who did not. There are two views about interdisciplinary work and training, he said. One view has it that someone should know a little bit about everything but not be held to the same disciplinary standards as others within a single discipline are. The other view is that someone should be held to the standards of all the disciplines on which he or she draws. Where should the University go? This is not a purely 'academic'

question; there are practical and important implications for training graduate students and hiring interdisciplinary faculty.

Professor Gardner said, first, there is a difference between interdisciplinary and intercollegiate; the two concepts are confused a lot at the University. For two engineers in the same college, collaboration is not a big problem, but it is across colleges. That is a problem the University should be able to fix, but budget issues stand in the way. Second, on ownership, deans often abandon responsibility for interdisciplinary centers: "if it is not in my shop, I don't care about it." That is a major detriment to research. Faculty members work well together, but if the activity involves money, the deans get in the way because dollars drive their decisions.

Professor Satin said that they see interdisciplinary research in bioethics; can local centers or consortia succeed or do they run into the same problems? That depends on where they are housed, Professor Bearinger said; if in a college, they have the same problems, but if at the level of the AHC, for example, they would not. The amount of money received per credit is an impediment for Duluth faculty, Professor Ranelli said, because, he understands, UMD receives one-third the funding/credit vis-à-vis Twin Cities campus.

On the research side, Professor Durfee said he hopes that the solution will go beyond simply creating a pool of funds to support interdisciplinary research, but rather that the University will work to generate a culture where interdisciplinary research is valued, encouraged, and facilitated.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said she assumed that there are lessons that can be learned about what does work. She noted that both Gender, Women, & Sexuality Studies and American Studies grew out of interdisciplinary work, and putting people in departments is one of the solutions that people have used in the past.

Professor von Dassow recalled that there was a long discussion about interdisciplinarity at the last Faculty Senate meeting and there were many faculty views. She emphasized teaching and said the obstacles are inter-departmental. Even for cross-listed courses, units argue about the costs down to duplicating expenses—even though the students are attending one university. There are many budget barriers to what should work automatically. With respect to centers, faculty in departments are evaluated by the faculty in the department, so the system of promotion, tenure, and merit is tied to disciplinaryity; to change that system would require a change in the structure of evaluation, especially for faculty members before they achieve tenure, so that interdisciplinary work does not detract from their profile.

Professor Gardner commented that it is important that each department looks at its 7.12 statement to be sure that it recognizes interdisciplinary work. In terms of the drivers of research, there is gamesmanship across colleges: each has its own policy about the distribution of tuition and indirect-cost funds to departments, so what is logical in one college will not work in another. In the past, Professor Gardner said, tuition tracked with faculty member Social Security numbers, so it would make no difference where they were teaching. It may be that directing 25% of the student's tuition to the college in which the student is enrolled is too high.

Professor Gardner said he did not agree with Professor Durfee about the desirability of a separate pool of funds for research: the grant-in-aid program is a separate pool of funds that is based on quality

and there are no games played with it. That works well, he said. That is internal, Professor Durfee said, and it would be good if interdisciplinary research is not restricted to internally-funded sources.

Professor Ericksen asked if interdisciplinarity is ever a factor in graduate admissions. If an undergraduate applying to graduate school does something new and interdisciplinary, does the person look worse from a practicality perspective? She said she has not seen the Graduate School promote acceptance of students with interdisciplinary degrees. Professor Bearinger said it is necessary to separate the courses students take from interdisciplinary degrees. Both are important and the University needs to address the interdisciplinary mix of students in classes because it enriches the classes.

Professor von Dassow offered three thoughts in response to Professor Ericksen's comments. One, several departments in CLA explicitly cultivate interdisciplinary work and pitch that orientation to prospective graduate students. Two, what graduate students find out when they come to the University (in her field) is that it takes a lot of time to learn, for example, Greek and Hebrew before they can become interdisciplinary scholars. Three, in the process of restructuring graduate education the outside field requirement was dropped, which had a knock-on effect on the curriculum and reduced interdisciplinarity in graduate education.

Dr. Levine thanked the Committee for its discussion and asked that as Committee members have other comments, they should send them to him. Professor Cloyd asked that Dr. Levine bring back to the Committee whatever it is he learns. Professor Durfee thanked Dr. Levine for joining the Committee.

4. Replacement for Professor Ropers-Huilman

The Committee voted unanimously to elect Professor Tabitha Grier-Reed to replace Professor Ropers-Huilman while she is on leave during spring semester.

Professor Durfee adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota