

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

October 30, 2014

Minutes of the Meeting

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.

[In these minutes: Institute for Diversity, Equity and Advocacy Update, Discussion with Provost Hanson, Miscellaneous Committee Business]

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

Regrets: Linda Bearinger, James Cloyd, Jean Wyman

Others attending: Deb Cran, Provost's Office; and Emily Lawrence, President's Office

Guests: Office for Equity and Diversity: Vice President Katrice Albert, Associate Vice Provost Michael Goh, and Assistant Vice Provost Doneka Scott

1. **Call to Order:** Professor Ropers-Huilman convened the meeting, welcomed those present and called for a round of introductions.

2. **Institute for Diversity, Equity and Advocacy Update:** Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Vice President Katrice Albert, Associate Vice Provost Michael Goh, and Assistant Vice Provost Doneka Scott from the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) who were invited to provide an update on the Institute for Diversity, Equity and Advocacy (IDEA) initiative.

Vice President Albert began with some introductory remarks and explained that IDEA is an initiative created to help deans and colleges localize their diversity initiatives so they can meet their equity and diversity goals. She then turned to Assistant Vice Provost Scott to provide a synopsis of OED's efforts with colleges.

Dr. Scott provided some background information about the initiative. She reported that in addition to promoting interdisciplinary collaboration, IDEA was created to enhance retention and faculty diversity by fostering stronger ties among and with faculty and the local community. Additionally, face-to-face meetings were set up with all of the deans to share data and talk about their diversity initiatives among other things. Dr. Scott then turned members' attention to a few handouts containing information about the top three diversity topics for each of the 19 colleges, areas they are interested in focusing on, e.g., increasing diversity of faculty, students and/or staff, improving college climate.

After the initial meetings with each of the colleges, noted Dr. Scott, she has been having follow-up meeting with them to help set their diversity goals, establish action plans and metrics. She added that the other aspect of this initiative was to create a diversity community of practice, which, as it turns out, has been a good opportunity for bringing people together to share best practices and resources.

The third handout in the packet was a list of components for developing a gold standard diversity program. The handout highlighted three colleges and outlined what diversity initiatives they have already established and others they are working toward.

The last handout in the packet contained information about which colleges have diversity committees and/or dedicated diversity staff. As one thinks about best practices around advancing a college's diversity goals, having both a diversity committee and dedicated diversity staff would be ideal.

Dr. Scott referenced OED's on-going collaboration with the colleges and Provost's Office. Currently, the colleges are in the process of working through a self-assessment and talking about where they are and where they want to go with their diversity efforts. She then turned to Associate Vice Provost Michael Goh who asked members to think about how the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) can help engage faculty in advancing this initiative. He noted that diverse student bodies attract diverse faculty and vice versa. Recent studies looking at the campus climate have also addressed implicit bias. Dr. Goh said he has been tasked with thinking about how to recruit and retain a more demographic representative cadre of faculty at the University.

As noted in the new Strategic Plan for the Twin Cities campus, Dr. Goh cited the desire to diversify the campus. Recommendation #2 in the report under *Field-Shaping Researchers and Teachers* section deals with improving the diversity of faculty hires at the University by aggressively recruiting, retaining and promoting field-shaping researchers and teachers. This recruitment process needs to be transformational allowing for strategic flexibility with the goal of reinvigorating the knowledge that is shared across the campus through teaching and research, etc.

With this as background information, Dr. Goh introduced CLEAR*, a faculty of color hiring initiative. CLEAR* resulted from a charge to consider a hiring process that is based on best practices. The campaign is called *Let's Be CLEAR* About Hiring Faculty of Color*. CLEAR* is an evidence-based hiring philosophy that incorporates the following components:

- Composition of a diverse search committee and countering implicit bias.
- Legal case for diversifying faculty given the University is a land-grant institution.
- Examine position descriptions for signaling of diverse thoughts and experience.
- Advertise – multiple, simultaneous strategies with an emphasis on networks and referrals.
- Relationship development during campus visits and when “closing the deal.”

While some faculty of color are leaving the University for better opportunities, there are a number who are leaving because they are not happy with the culture and climate, said Dr. Goh. He then posed the following questions to the FCC:

- If the research reveals that people are prone to implicit bias, how can this be overcome during the search and hiring process?
- What strategies should be implemented to advance the Strategic Plan's recommendation to improve the diversify faculty of hires?

In Professor Gardner's view, most new faculty positions are under the control of the deans, not the faculty. There needs to be more accountability on the part of the deans to diversify their faculty. If the University were run more like a corporation, the deans would be incentivizing faculty to hire diverse faculty. Vice President Albert said that a priority for Provost Hanson is ensuring candidate pools are diverse. She added that the Office of Equity and Diversity's (OED) bridge funding is available on a first come, first serve basis and can be used to enhance recruitment of a diverse candidate pool; however, the demand for this fund exceeds its availability.

Professor von Dassow pointed out that position requests are either authorized, or more usually denied, by the deans. The focus on search processes and hiring is meaningless if positions cannot be replaced. Professor Desai agreed, and pointed out that a number of searches in the College of Liberal Arts are not being authorized; not only are lines not being approved but units are being pitted against each other. Why would diverse faculty choose to stay when they do not see a commitment to diversity despite the rhetoric? Everyone says the word diversity, but no one wants to take responsibility for making it happen. There needs to be accountability over the long run, and not just during the hiring process. There is no clear process for targeted opportunity hires.

In response to these comments, Vice President Albert said her office will be meeting with the deans on November 10 and she will make this a central topic of the discussion. There needs to be hiring lines created before even talking about implicit bias, and the deans are aware that it is their responsibility to make lines available, given budget constraints.

Professor Konstan pointed out that the University spends substantial resources hiring people that it will likely lose due to climate, etc. Instead, resources need to be spent on fixing the climate and retaining the people who have been hired. Vice President Albert agreed and said the Employee Engagement Survey and the COACHE Survey affirms that more needs to be done to improve the climate in order to retain faculty.

Professor Krichbaum said rather than focusing on recruiting a diverse student body, more needs to be done to recruit diverse faculty to whom minority students can better relate. Faculty composition should be tied to the composition of the student body.

Are there dedicated retention funds for retaining minority faculty, and, if not, should there be, asked Professor Cohen? Vice President Albert does not believe the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) has ever had designated retention funds. She said while the

use of retention funds is one way of retaining faculty of color, it really comes down to climate and mentoring at the local level.

Professor Gini said it is not just about faculty of color, but about hiring faculty who are under-represented in departments.

Professor Carpenter suggested that the most direct way to ensure the hiring of faculty of color would be to adopt a quota system, but added that that route is clearly unconstitutional for a public institution like the University. Who advises the University on what it can and cannot do legally when it comes to recruiting and hiring faculty of color? Someone needs to be looking at creative ways or recruiting faculty of color. Vice President Albert said that the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) in conjunction with the Office of the General Council (OGC) advise on these matters. She added that search committees are being strongly encouraged to have diverse pools.

In Professor Campbell's opinion, there is a lack of accountability at the dean and department head level, and he disagrees with President Kaler when he says faculty are complacent around this issue. Diversity has to be a priority for deans and department heads.

In light of time, Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked the guests from OED for a good conversation.

3. Provost Hanson: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting. Provost Hanson said that she was invited by FCC leadership to identify items for which faculty consultation would be particularly useful. One priority issue is a new vision and structure for post-baccalaureate educational framework organized around two communities comprising: (1) traditional, research-based graduate education, and (2) professional-focused education. The shared goal would be to protect and position post-baccalaureate education for excellence, in recognition that graduate and professional education is core to the University's mission, tied to its reputation, and aligned with the goals of the Strategic Plan.

The deans have also been talking about separating out graduate research education and graduate professional education. These discussions are in the early stages, but she said she will want to come back and consult further with the FCC at an upcoming meeting on this topic. In preparation for this discussion, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked if an updated document could be circulated to the committee prior to the meeting to give members an idea of what separating out graduate research education and graduate professional education would look like so members can come prepared to provide input and have a meaningful discussion. Provost Hanson said a current document addressing professional and graduate education policies, processes, and resources is under development, including a proposed timeline for advancing post-baccalaureate structure conversations. She will make sure it goes out to the committee when it is finalized.

Professor Konstan suggested the University articulate as a value that graduate education as opposed to professional education is something the University views as a mission-central good worth subsidizing. Without funding, PhD programs on their own will never succeed. Provost Hanson said graduate education is and always been a key part of the University's mission. The question is not really about subsidizing because this is a key component of the University's mission and what it does, but instead it's about finding a way to continue to support and enhance graduate education.

Professor Cohen welcomed a discussion about the distinct needs of the research-oriented PhD program as opposed to the professional degree programs, both of which are central to the University's mission. There needs to be a robust discussion about what is required to sustain PhD programs at adequate levels of quality moving forward. How many PhD programs can realistically be sustained at this institution? Provost Hanson agreed that this is an important question and said besides a University-wide discussion on this topic, there needs to be detailed conversations at the collegiate level.

Professor Gardner recalled the May 2, 2013 Faculty Senate resolution, University Support for Institutional Training Grant Proposals (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/trnggrantres.html>) and the administration's response, which was that it did not believe it was necessary to take action with regard to the statement despite the fact that a number of schools/colleges discourage faculty from writing training grants, which go on to fund graduate education. This stance raises the question about how central administration should subsidize graduate education. In Provost Hanson's opinion, she does not see graduate education as a budget *model* issue. She reminded members that graduate education is central to our mission and explicitly mentioned in the Strategic Plan. Provost Hanson said she would check into the concern conveyed by Professor Gardner.

Provost Hanson went on to briefly touch on the recent Academic Freedom Forum, which she thought was a good event, and thanked the committee for their involvement. She also noted she is working on a procedure for having campus discussions on identifying Grand Challenges on the research side.

Provost Hanson asked the committee if there were any issues/topic they would like to work on jointly with her office. Professor Durfee suggested diversity and faculty hiring would benefit from a combined administration and faculty approach to make progress that also is aligned with the Strategic Plan. Provost Hanson said there have been discussions about increased accountability at both the school level and the administration level. She added that faculty hiring is primarily a faculty responsibility with administrative oversight, and so it is clear we would need to work together to take up this issue jointly.

While it is easy to say faculty hiring is a faculty issue, said Professor Konstan, the degree to which this is true really depends on the college one is in and the dean. He added another aspect of recruitment and retention of diverse faculty has to do with offering benefits that will allow the University to retain and develop faculty effectively. Provost

Hanson said the role Human Resources plays in faculty retention is a timely topic. She reported that she has asked for comparative data on parental leave policies at peer institutions as well as in the local market. Professor Cohen said any discussion on this topic should involve not only Provost Hanson, but Vice President Brown and possibly President Kaler. Provost Hanson agreed and said that these joint conversations have already begun.

Professor Carpenter said the University incentivizes, rewards and recognizes faculty for excellence in teaching, etc., and often gives monetary awards. In recent years, the University has started deducting fringe benefits from these awards. Why was this change made, what was the justification for making the change and can it be reconsidered? Provost Hanson said Professor Ropers-Huilman recently brought this issue to her attention. Apparently, this is not a recent change, said Provost Hanson, despite the fact that a number of people are under the impression the change was made as a result of the recent fringe pool simplification. With fringe simplification, the fringe amount is now a higher percentage. There have been some perturbations that the Office of Budget and Finance is looking into as it relates to how departments are implementing the fringe pool changes. Currently, if a faculty member elects to take the award as salary, the fringe is taken out. Professor Carpenter reported that some departments are electing to make up the difference and others are not. Professor Uggen added that the fringe pool changes also have implications for grants. Provost Hanson said that Associate Vice President for Budget and Finance Julie Tonneson will speak on this issue at the next Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) meeting.

In terms of faculty hiring faculty, said Professor von Dassow, faculty can only do this contingent on administrative authorization. When position requests are repeatedly denied, departments cannot replace losses, much less grow. One reason faculty leave is because they no longer have an intellectual home because of the loss of colleagues close in their field. In order to have a diverse faculty and grow programs, departments need to be able to hire. Provost Hanson agreed that this is an accurate description of the situation some departments are finding themselves in. While hiring is fundamentally a faculty responsibility, deans also have a responsibility to allocate resources for hiring. In discussions about growing programs and diversifying and retaining successful faculty, these discussions also need to include conversations about shrinking other programs. There will undoubtedly be differences of opinions about whether or not the right programs are being shrunk and/or if they are being reduced in the right way.

Professor Cohen asked Provost Hanson if she was having sufficiently candid and detailed discussions with the deans about growing or downsizing programs and the budgetary implications doing so will have. Provost Hanson said yes, of course, these conversations are taking place and will continue to take place. In a recent CIC meeting of the provosts, she reported they are also having discussions about whether there could possibly be a CIC approach to some of the trends facing colleges and that they will try to leverage this relationship.

Lastly, Provost Hanson replied to a question about the Salary Equity Review Committees (SERC) and said these committees are continuing their work. Professor Konstan reported that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) will be receiving a SERC update sometime during spring semester. Professor Ropers-Huilman requested Professor Konstan report back to the FCC once SCFA has received this update.

4. Committee business:

- At the November 13 FCC meeting, there will be a discussion about the letter that was distributed to FCC members about academic freedom, and was tied to the student issues that happened last spring. This discussion will focus on the policies and going forward rather than looking backward at the disciplinary decisions that were made last spring. She encouraged members to revisit the letter before the meeting.
- Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members whether they would like to have a discussion at an upcoming FCC meeting about the unionizing efforts that are underway on the Twin Cities campus. After some discussion, members concluded that until an election is impending, they do not want to put this item on the agenda. Additionally, if at some point it is put on the agenda, it would be important for faculty to get information on what unionization would mean for them in order to have an informed discussion.

5. Adjournment: Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked members for a rich discussion. Hearing no further business, she adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate