FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
August 26 and August 27, 2014
Retreat Meeting Minutes

These minutes reflect discussions at a retreat 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.

[**In this document**: Discussion about Diversity and Equity, Discussion with Student Government Leaders, Academic Programs/Undergraduate and Graduate Issues/Program Accreditation, Discussion on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Discussion about Effects of External Environment on the University]

Day 1 - August 26, 2014

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, James Cloyd, Jigna Desai, Janet Ericksen, Karen Mesce, Jean Wyman

Regrets: Dale Carpenter for August 26, 2014

Guests:
Panel 1: Vice President for Equity and Diversity Katrice Albert, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity Michael Goh, Provost Karen Hanson, Women's Faculty Cabinet Co-Chair, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Rachelle Hernandez and CFANS Office for Diversity and Inclusion Director Karl Lorenz

Panel 2: Valkyrie Jensen, chair, University Student Senate; Andrew McNally, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS); Alfonso Sintjago, president, Graduate and Professional Student Association (GAPSA); Joelle Stangler, president – Minnesota Student Association (MSA)

Panel 3: Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Sally Kohlstedt and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bob McMaster

Panel 4: John Coleman, dean, College of Liberal Arts; John Finnegan, dean, School of Public Health; and Jean Quam, dean, College of Education and Human Development

Panel 5: Associate Vice President for Public Engagement Andy Furco, Vice President for Research Brian Herman, Vice President and CFO Richard Pfutzenreuter, and Special Assistant to the President (Government and Community Relations) Jason Rohloff

1. **Welcome and Introductory Remarks**: Professor Ropers-Huilman convened the retreat, welcomed those present and called for a round of introductions. She then made a

few introductory remarks. In her opening comments, she encouraged members to review the University's mission, which can be found at http://www1.umn.edu/twincities/history-mission/.

2. **Diversity and Equity at the University of Minnesota**: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed the first panel of guests - Provost Hanson, Vice President for Equity and Diversity Katrice Albert, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity Michael Goh, Women's Faculty Cabinet Co-Chair and Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Rachelle Hernandez and CFANS Office for Diversity and Inclusion Director Karl Lorenz. These guests were invited to address three questions that had been posed to them ahead of time:
1. What are the most important opportunities and challenges that the University of Minnesota has in relation to diversity and equity?
2. How does the University assess its current efforts (and how is the University currently doing based on these assessments?
3. What steps can the institution take to speed up progress in meeting its goals?

Challenges and themes that came out of this discussion included, but were not limited to:
- The University needs to do more to admit and retain students of color.
- The University needs to do a better job of hiring and retaining faculty of color.
- More attention needs to be paid to transfer and graduate students.
- There is a role for the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) in promoting affirmative action.
- Survey data indicates there are serious climate problems related to equity and diversity in some units.
- A gender salary gap exists between male and female faculty, which tends to increase with rank.
- Females are under-represented in some disciplines.
- The University's faculty parental leave policy needs to be benchmarked against peer institutions.
- More should be done to promote spousal hires.
- The University needs to improve its accessibility and developing its relationships with communities of color.
- More work needs to be done to eliminate the structural interpersonal barriers that limit the opportunities for under-represented and underserved groups. The deans should be given more power to address structural diversity issues.
- Effort should be put into building a tradition/culture at the University so people feel more passionate about the institution.
- The curriculum needs to be more diversified, which would force students to have courageous conversations.
- Diversity takes hard work and serious thought needs to be given to instilling the value of diversity and inclusion within the University community.
- Senior leadership needs to champion diversity and equity efforts.
- The University faces a pipeline challenge.
- There is no consistent voice at the University around diversity.

- Authenticity at all points of contact when interacting with diverse students and communities is important.
- Students need to see themselves reflected in the University's leadership.
- More scholarship dollars are needed.
- Hiring opportunities are missed due to inflexible hiring policies.
- There should be a focus on recruiting and retaining first generation and under-resourced students.
- Introduce incoming students to other students from their culture – similar to the "ambassador program" in the School of Nursing.

3. **Student Government Leaders**: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed the next panel of guests, student government leaders, who included – Joelle Stangler, president – Minnesota Student Association (MSA); Valkyrie Jensen, chair, University Student Senate; Alfonso Sintjago, president, Graduate and Professional Student Association (GAPSA); and Andrew McNally, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS). These guests were invited to address three questions that had been posed to them ahead of time:
1. What are the best and most challenging aspects of being a student at the University of Minnesota?
2. What should faculty know about how to enrich students' experiences even further?
3. What are the priorities of your membership and student government group this academic year?

Issues identified and responses from undergraduate student leaders included:
- Focus should be put on the classroom experience.
- Faculty need to know that students have a life outside of the classroom.
- Students should be asked to evaluate faculty mid-semester to give faculty input on their course and give them an opportunity to improve if there are problems.
- Student debt is an issue for most students.
- Use open-access/source textbooks whenever possible.
- Increase the number of service learning opportunities, e.g., research, cross-college collaborations.
- *Support the U Day* should be an excused day from class.
- Faculty should make their syllabi available to students early.
- The Liberal Education (LE) requirements should be more broad, e.g., University Honors Program.
- The shared governance structure is often difficult to navigate for students, though there is a strong desire by many students to participate actively.

Issues identified and responses from graduate student leaders included:
- All faculty should be encouraged to engage with student groups.
- Good advising is key.
- Increase opportunities for assistantships, etc.

- Increase the number of professional development opportunities outside of academia.
- Provide professional training, e.g., salary negotiation.
- The graduate student experience should allow for more interdisciplinary opportunities allowing students to take courses outside their college.
- Examine multiple options for completing coursework and dissertation. For example, consider three published papers in a journal equivalent to a dissertation.

Faculty responses to responses included:
- Learning takes time. A vocational orientation is somewhat at odds with intellectual reasons for the University's existence.
- Never stop challenging faculty.
- Students who say governance is important and agree to serve on governance committees need to attend committee meetings.
- Students need mentorship on multiple levels and need to be supported.
- It is clear that there is a desire on the part of students for more collaboration with faculty.

4. **Academic Programs/Undergraduate and Graduate Issues/Program Accreditation**: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Bob McMaster and Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Sally Kohlstedt. Drs. McMaster and Kohlstedt were invited to address three questions that had been posed to them ahead of time:
1. Where are we in the academic program review/accreditation process? What remains to be done?
2. What have we learned so far and how are we planning to use what we've learned to improve the University?
3. What permanent processes are being established to continuously assess our progress toward established goals?

Drs. McMaster and Kohlstedt walked members through the materials they prepared for this discussion, which addressed the above questions in detail. Based on the discussion following their presentations, it was clear that the University needs to seriously consider the best ways to evaluate, support, and make difficult decisions about the futures of degree programs.

5. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty**: After a lunch break, Professor Ropers-Huilman reconvened the committee and welcomed the next panel of guests, John Coleman, dean, College of Liberal Arts; John Finnegan, dean, School of Public Health; and Jean Quam, dean, College of Education and Human Development. These guests were invited to address the three questions below that had been posed to them ahead of time:
1. In what ways does your college rely on non-tenure track faculty to fulfill its mission?
2. In your view, what are the implications of universities increasing reliance on non-tenure track faculty on academic work, including governance work?

3. What do we need to think about in terms of ensuring high-quality working conditions of non-tenure track faculty, including adjunct faculty, at the University?

Guests' answers/comments to the questions included but were not limited to:
- A dean should push back if he/she receives a request to hire a contract faculty member to be sure it is the right/most appropriate type of hire. Upfront due diligence is critical in hiring decisions.
- Contract faculty need a 7.12 statement that clearly outlines expectations, rights, responsibilities and privileges.
- Hiring contract faculty can be more efficient, depending on the circumstances of the hire.
- The size/percentage of the instructional P&A staff is an issue for some colleges, and has implications for governance.
- Longer-term contracts would serve to boost morale for contract faculty.
- Instructional P&A usually do not have a specified role in the governance process.
- University culture values tenure versus contract status, whether appropriate or not.
- Contract faculty oftentimes feel like second-class citizens, e.g., cannot vote on tenure and promotion, cannot serve on ATP.
- The sustainability of higher education requires flexible hiring options.

Members' remarks:
- Annual appointments are problematic and have an impact on the climate in the schools. Contract faculty are less likely to speak up on issues knowing they are on annually renewable contracts.
- Two reasons for hiring contract faculty include:
  o Staffing flexibility.
  o The contract faculty position allows for greater flexibility in terms of responsibilities for research, teaching and service.
- Essential staffing should be done by tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- Contract faculty hires inhibit innovation, risk-taking and creativity. If the institution cannot commit to a person, why should the person commit to the institution?

6. **Effects of External Environment on the University**: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed the next panel of guests, Vice President for Research Brian Herman, Vice President and CFO Richard Pfutzenreuter, Associate Vice President for Public Engagement Andy Furco and Special Assistant to the President (Government and Community Relations) Jason Rohloff. These guests were invited to address the questions below that had been posed to them ahead of time:
1. From your vantage point, what are the challenges and opportunities for the University of Minnesota in our current external environment?
2. Who are the critical partners and partnerships we need to ensure a robust future for the University?

Guest responses about opportunities for the University included:

- Connections with the business community are critical for the University.
- The University needs to better communicate with K-12 about what they need to do to prepare students to achieve state standards.
- The University needs to do a better job of communicating its accomplishments with state legislators.
- Faculty should talk with legislators about their research.
- Showcase the system campus accomplishments.
- The University needs to do more outreach to communities given the University's inaccessibility.
- MNDrive is a good example of a collaborative initiative.
- More needs to be done to communicate the meaning of intellectual property to legislators, and the broader community.
- Increase its visibility with external communities and alums.
- Plan for the long-term.
- Showcase the best and brightest students.
- Create a brand to differentiate the University from other higher education institutions.
- Redefine the research engine to incorporate more collaborations.
- Continue to be more efficient in what the University does.
- Focus on increasing public and private relationships.
- Incorporate external partners in curriculum.
- Connect academic work with community development in mutually beneficial ways.
- Conduct more research that has a broad impact and is driven by community needs.
- Make opportunities for students to succeed.
- Move away from projects to partnerships.

Guest responses to challenges facing the University included:
- Funding.
- Changing demographics that will impact how the University does business.
- Collegiate silos. More needs to be done to promote and reward interdisciplinary collaborations.
- An unabated appetite for programs and services. How will this demand be met and where will the funding come from?
- Look at whether the University is appropriately pricing its services, and, if not, adjust the pricing to make money.
- Aging population of employees.
- Costs associated with the research enterprise.
- Aging technology infrastructure.
- Federal funding, e.g., NIH, NSF.
- Perception by the public that the University is not operating efficiently.
- Unrealistic expectations for the University to make immediate changes, e.g., graduation rates.

- Public expectations that the University should run more like a business.
- Measurement and assessment of outcomes.
- Indirect cost rates.
- Lack of sufficient faculty rewards.

Following guests' initial comments, members engaged them in a meaningful discussion about the effects of the external environment on the University.

Day 2 - August 27, 2014

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), Eva von Dassow, Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, Dale Carpenter, James Cloyd, Jigna Desai, Karen Mesce, Jean Wyman

Regrets: William Durfee and Janet Ericksen

1. Professor Ropers-Huilman convened the retreat and explained that the agenda would be broken up into four parts:
    - Reflecting on yesterday's retreat format, which illustrated a new way of doing things for the FCC, and talking about how the FCC should interact/work with senior leadership and students moving forward.
    - Sharing members' skills, strengths and experiences, which the committee can then draw upon during the course of the year, as need, for their expertise/knowledge in a particular area.
    - Setting the agenda for the 2014 – 2015 academic year.
    - Discussing this year's intellectual future's conversation, e.g., topic and format.

2. The committee began by reflecting on the format of yesterday's retreat. At the end of the discussion, a majority of FCC members liked the idea of being thought of as an advisory/consultative body versus simply a body that receives reports. The FCC would like to be consulted in advance of decisions being made by the administration rather than being reactionary to decisions that have already been made. Members liked the conversational format centering around a set of questions/topics and inviting people with diverse viewpoints to share their perspectives. They also liked the idea of moving away from simply getting long presentations/reports from administrators and would prefer having strategic discussions with them. Other thoughts included:
    - Reports/materials that administrators would like to discuss with the committee should be provided at least a few days in advance of the meeting so members have time to review and prepare for a meaningful discussion.
    - Questions posed to panelists should be taken one at a time versus having them answer multiple questions at once.
    - Smaller panels were better than larger panels because the larger panels tended to get repetitive.

- Consider inviting the Provost to the full day of panel discussions.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked members for their input and feedback.

3. Next, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members to go around the room and share information about their skills, area(s) of research, interests, strengths and experiences, which the committee can then draw upon during the course of the year, as needed.

4. The committee went on to develop a list of priorities for the FCC to engage in for the 2014 – 2015 academic year. Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members to write down their top three topics that they would like the FCC to address this year. Following this exercise, Professor Ropers-Huilman summarized the results. The top five topics that were identified by multiple people were:

   - Graduate School funding
   - Non-tenure track/contract faculty
   - Equity and diversity
   - Post-Tenure Review (PTR)
   - Administrative silos

   Other topics identified by more than one person included:

   - Visibility/communication of faculty work
   - Faculty benefits
   - Liberal Education (LE) requirements/student learning outcomes
   - Faculty governance, involvement and the consultation process
   - Faculty engagement, including survey results
   - Campus security/sexual violence

   Additional items mentioned by individual FCC members:
   - University funding
   - Regents Scholarship
   - Bridge funding for faculty research
   - Academic excellence
   - AHC issues/awareness of other campuses
   - Role of technology
   - Required training for faculty/students/risk tolerance

   Members then took a few minutes talking about each of the top five agenda topics. Professor Ropers-Huilman reminded members that the annual fall all-faculty email will be sent out soliciting issues from the broader University faculty community. Members recommended getting this message out sooner rather than later.

5. In light of time, the discussion of this year's intellectual future's conversation, e.g., topic and format, was deferred to the September 4, 2014 FCC meeting.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked members for their participation in this year's retreat.

<div style="text-align: right">

Renee Dempsey
University Senate

</div>