

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

February 5, 2015

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: Discussion of Caregiver Support at the University of Minnesota, Election of 2015 – 2016 FCC Chair, Miscellaneous Discussion, Discussion with President Kaler]

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Joseph Konstan, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, James Cloyd, Allan Erbsen, Karen Mesce

Regrets: Maria Gini, Kathleen Krichbaum, Jigna Desai, Janet Ericksen, Jean Wyman

Others attending: Amy Phenix, chief of staff, Office of the President; and Jon Steadland, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President

Guests: Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) members Yuhong Jiang, Christy Haynes (WFC co-chair), Brenda Ogle (WFC co-chair), P&A Consultative Committee Chair Katherine Dowd and President Kaler

1. Discussion of caregiver support at the University of Minnesota with members of the Women's Faculty Cabinet: Professor Ropers-Huilman began by welcoming today's guests from the Women's Faculty Cabinet (WFC) Professor Yuhong Jiang, Professor Christy Haynes (WFC co-chair), Professor Brenda Ogle (WFC co-chair) as well as Katherine Dowd, chair of the P&A Consultative Committee (PACC) to engage in a discussion about enhancing caregiver support at the University of Minnesota. She provided some background information to set the stage for the discussion. Professor Ropers-Huilman noted that a number of members of the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) believe the committee should continue to seek progress on the initiatives in the Resolution on Faculty Caregiver Support

(<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/caregiversupportres.html>) despite the administrative response. In previous discussions with Provost Hanson, said Professor Ropers-Huilman, the provost had agreed to convene a small group of faculty and key administrators to try and make some movement on this issue, but then later changed her mind and decided to let the WFC take the lead on this matter. Professor Ropers-Huilman said that after today's discussion she hopes to have a sense of how the FCC would like to position itself in relation to the work being done by the WFC on caregiver support.

Professor Jiang turned members' attention to a draft Faculty Teaching Relief proposal that had been sent out along with the agenda. She noted that Provost Hanson tasked the WFC with developing a policy that addresses the issue of teaching relief. The WFC faced a number of constraints in writing the document, and, as a result, needed to add language dealing with modified duties. The WFC has also written a broader version of the proposal that addresses 1) researchers who are on federal grant support, and 2) caring for family members who are ill; however, they decided against moving forward with that document in favor of this narrower document that focuses on teaching relief in an effort to keep the issues separate. Professor Haynes clarified that Provost Hanson did not direct the WFC to draft a narrow proposal, but rather it was the WFC's decision to keep the scope more focused. She added that because Provost Hanson is interested in including the proposal in the Strategic Plan, the WFC is operating under a relatively short timeline.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked if Provost Hanson was open to a broader policy, why the WFC chose to narrow the focus of their proposal. Professor Jiang explained the WFC elected to draft different proposals because the purpose of each proposal is different and requires different justifications. Professor Konstan said while he does not believe all the issues related to faculty caregivers are related, he believes a lot of them are related, and thinks like issues should be combined in a single proposal. He added that it is the University's responsibility to structure leave so no one has an incentive not to hire someone and/or are reluctant to take the leave they have coming to them. He added that he believes it would make for a stronger proposal if like issues related to childbirth were combined into one proposal.

Professor Jiang said the WFC was instructed specifically by Provost Hanson not to deal with the issue of paid leave. The WFC feels it will be more likely to make headway if it just focuses on teaching relief. She added that

the paid leave policy is controlled by the Office of Human Resources (OHR) – birth fathers get two weeks paid leave and birth mothers get six weeks paid leave. The WFC proposal deals with teaching relief, which is a separate issue from paid leave. Faculty members needing teaching relief assistance are still being paid because they are continuing to do research and service, but it is the classroom component that is the acute problem.

The WFC, said Professor Jiang, faces a few challenges in developing this proposal, which include a lack of expertise/knowledge in this area. Professor Konstan said that Professor Gini, chair, SRC, has compiled some data, which the WFC will likely find useful and they draft their proposal. In his opinion, he feels strongly that there needs to be more coordination of issues so it does not look like a couple of haphazard efforts.

There are substantive differences in the issues being discussed, said Professor Cohen, and used caregiver issues and maternity issues as examples. He said if all the issues are lumped together in an omnibus proposal it could easily get bogged down with no improvements/changes being made. Having said that, he suggested working on the issues separately, starting with parental leave. Professor Ropers-Huilman said the FCC in conjunction with the WFC needs to think strategically how far to take this matter without jeopardizing some of the basic benefits members would like to see move forward. In Professor Cohen's opinion, modified duties could be a quick win.

Professor Gardner suggested the University think about allowing faculty to accrue hours towards a personal/family leave benefit. He cited an example of a junior scientist working on a grant using sponsored money to take sick leave because it is a University benefit. The University should consider offering such an earned benefit. Professor Konstan added that it is not accurate to say someone working on a federal grant cannot be paid while on leave. The federal rules have always been clear about this and how it relates to certifying effort; certified effort is a percentage. While one cannot shift their effort percentage, noted Professor Konstan, if someone is working on a grant and entitled to a leave, they can take it. However, under the University's current implementation, this creates a tension between the PI of the grant and the employee about how the work will get done. Having said that, this scenario makes the argument for a fringe benefit solution by moving the risk centrally.

Professor Uggen agreed with Professor Cohen in that it makes sense to disaggregate the caregiver issue from the parental leave issue. He reminded members that a point of resistance that has come up again and again related to benefits has to do with targeting a particular benefit to a particular class of employees for which other employees would not be eligible. Professor Konstan added teaching assistants, whose only duties are typically teaching, would be an example of this. How should this be dealt with? It would be odd to have found a nice protection for faculty and nothing for other classes of employees.

Professor Jiang reminded the committee that Provost Hanson has a larger goal in mind; however, it will be put together piecemeal and the modified duties proposal would be a piece of a larger goal. When drafting the teaching relief proposal, the WFC emphasized the post-academic career as well as teaching. Including these two components in the proposal more or less narrows it down to faculty. Presumably, at some point in the future, there will be another document dealing with teaching assistant and post doc issues.

Professor Ropers-Huilman asked Katherine Dowd, chair, P&A Consultative Committee, her thoughts on whether the WFC document should be written more broadly or whether it should stay narrowly focused. Ms. Dowd said she too thinks teaching relief would be a quick win. If a P&A employee, for example, is getting paid by sponsored and non-sponsored funds, and ends up going on leave, they cannot receive sponsored funds because doing so requires reporting effort. Because the University policy groups faculty and P&A employees into the same category for the parental leave benefit, Ms. Dowd thinks the WFC teaching relief document should also include P&A employees and not just faculty. P&A employees with teaching responsibilities need to be covered by the policy too. In Ms. Dowd's opinion, any policy that is drafted should be in alignment with the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). Professor Ropers-Huilman said she would like to think about, as an institution, if it would be possible to go beyond FMLA for the sake of equity.

Professor Erbsen raised a potential concern about how some departments handle teaching relief. Some faculty have reported that departments have required them to make-up work missed while on paid leave. This would violate University policy as faculty cannot be penalized for exercising their

right to leave. This practice, if it is occurring, would raise statutory compliance issues if applied to unpaid leave.

Professor Mesce encouraged the WFC to be very clear and explicit in its proposal about how a leave gets paid. When it gets murky, said Professor Bearer, it opens the window for discrimination and inequity in administration of the policy from department to department

In Professor Campbell's opinion, the WFC should focus on the teaching relief for the birth or adoption of a child first before tackling other issues. Secondly, while he understands the possible disproportionate impacts on a PI in a small lab, for example, he is more concerned about not hiring women post docs or graduate students.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said if the decision is to focus on teaching relief, it will be critically important to keep the other issues on the table. There needs to be a plan for moving forward. Professor Konstan suggested identifying two to four policies that have the best chance of getting approved and having an impact. Regardless if this is accomplished with one or more documents, he thinks it would be best to give them to Provost Hanson in a single bundle all at the same time.

Professor Konstan warned that the current policy uses a dangerous phrase, which is "upon request." Neither maternity or paternity leave is automatic, it is only automatic if it is requested and does not take into account circumstances under which someone might be dissuaded from making a request. Another thing to think about when drafting this proposal has to do with maternity that is anchored to a date in the summer. For nine-month faculty this is an issue that needs to be clearly spelled out.

In terms of next steps, the committee agreed that SCFA and the Senate Research Committee (SRC) should work together on a document that outlines other strategies to support caregivers at the University. This document should accompany WFC's proposal and should provide a framework for next steps to take in future years. The FCC will be inclined to endorse and support both the WFC's proposal and the SCFA/SRC report.

2. Election of 2015 – 2016 FCC chair: Professor Ropers-Huilman said the next order of business is to elect the 2015 – 2016 FCC chair. She began by

explaining the process. Following this explanation, the committee voted and unanimously elected Professor Colin Campbell as next year's chair.

3. Miscellaneous discussion: While waiting for President Kaler to join the meeting, the committee began talking about research productivity. Professor Bearinger reported the Senate Research Committee wrote a statement a few years ago on this topic – *The Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota, Whether or Not Externally Funded* - <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/committees/productivity.pdf>. The committee agreed that this is an issue that needs to be put back on the radar because it is clear the public, in general, does not understand what research is and what the University actually does. As an example, it was mentioned that there are a number of people who do not understand the difference between MnSCU and the University.

4. Conversation with President Kaler: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed President Kaler to the meeting. He began by talking about the University's biennial budget request to the legislature and the importance of telling the University's story in order to demonstrate the amazing work that is done here. If the University were to receive what has been proposed to date, said President Kaler, he does not see a way to avoid a tuition increase, unfortunately. Any money generated by an increase in tuition will be spent to recruit, retain and reward exceptional faculty and to make other academic investments.

President Kaler asked if the committee has met yet with Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Government and Community Relations. Professor Ropers-Huilman reported that Ms. Dady is scheduled to meet with the committee later this spring. President Kaler strongly encouraged the committee to meet with her sooner rather than later.

Professor Cloyd asked about the funds Governor Dayton has proposed in his budget for the Medical School and whether it is equivalent to a legislative special that will go directly to the Medical School or if it will go in the general budget. President Kaler said the University would prefer the money goes in the general budget because it gives the institution optimum flexibility; however, as of right now, it is unclear how the money will be allocated. Regardless of how it is allocated, Professor Cloyd said he wants to put in a plug for the continuation and expansion of cluster hires. President Kaler agreed and mentioned a recent editorial written by Dr. Phillip Sharp

about the convergence of biology, engineering and the social sciences as a way to build an ecosystem of invention and innovation. Cluster hires provide for great opportunities and are completely consistent with the Grand Challenges.

Regarding the myths about the cost of tuition that are being proliferated, Professor Bearinger urged the University to set the record straight, particularly with the legislature. President Kaler said when he testifies at the legislature he will make sure he clearly articulates this message. He said the notion that the University cannot control its costs and tuition is spiraling out of control is simply wrong. The reality is the cost of tuition is well managed; however, the cost of running universities is being shifted from society to students.

Moving on, President Kaler went off the record spent a few minutes talking about work to re-vision UMore Park that are expected to go to the Board of Regents in February.

Professor Cohen suggested the University go beyond providing the Board of Regents with public reports on research productivity measured in grant funding levels and actually relay to them the value of the research that is conducted at the University. This is an excellent point, said President Kaler, and a better job needs to be done in providing them with this information. The research report that the Office of the Vice President for Research produces is an excellent document that tells the story of the funded research metrics, but it does not speak to the broad spectrum of research conducted here. The University would need to communicate this information strategically, however. Professor Cohen said he feels strongly the University needs to do a better job communicating to the public and the legislature about the substantive research accomplishments occurring at the University that are contributing to knowledge, learning and society. The notion that reports need to be strictly dollar-based is silly. President Kaler said this is a terrific suggestion. Depending on the charge to the Vice President for Research, noted Professor Konstan, maybe another high-level administrator needs to take charge of looking at the University's research more holistically. It sends the wrong message if the Vice President for Research is only concerned about one aspect of research no matter how financially lucrative it may be. This is a fair observation, said President Kaler.

In terms of presenting research accomplishments to the public, said Professor von Dassow, frequently universities across the country present themselves as being able to solve the world's problems. This world, however, has a lot of intractable problems that are not susceptible to solution in any simple sense. This approach is not therefore beneficial in the long run. Universities are society's engines for developing knowledge and understanding regardless of solving problems. President Kaler agreed, and said there are no other institutions in society that take the place of great research universities, which he described as "guardians of the seeds of civilization." Professor von Dassow noted that if this argument were presented in the right way, she believes legislators would find it persuasive. As a counter-balance to this approach, Professor Beringer suggested sharing stories from the Public Engagement Council (PEC). She also suggested President Kaler or Provost Hanson send a message directly to the deans to meet with or talk to their legislators in support of the University.

Professor Cloyd asked President Kaler to comment on cross-college collaborations. President Kaler agreed that this is an area where the University can and should do a better job. He added that while he is not yet ready to change the budget model, there are plans to solicit input from the University community for ideas around the Grand Challenge themes. He added that the Institute on the Environment is a model that has worked fairly well to foster cross-college collaborations.

As the University moves forward with strategic planning and repositioning units, said Professor Cohen, it will require strategic budget planning for programmatic purposes. The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) is concerned about the sustainability of programs in the long-term given the current fiscal situation and forecast. In Professor Cohen's opinion, not enough strategic budgetary planning is taking place. President Kaler said the conversation around the Strategic Plan and the direction the University goes is expected to guide the conversation about budget. These conversations will happen, but another thing to remember is that the University needs to decide what things it will and what it will not do, which will be a difficult discussion.

If a program is found not to be good, asked Professor von Dassow, but it is essential to nourishing the seeds of civilization, shouldn't that program receive more resources so it can become good? Yes, said President Kaler, but then the decision needs to be made, given the limited resources the

University has, how many things the University can be good at. The University cannot be all things to all people; there simply are not enough resources to do this.

Professor Gardner commented on the cuts in allocations have mostly resulted in loss of faculty lines. Losing faculty lines results in not being able to hire faculty who will bring creative ideas to the institution, which is the University's bread and butter. The University needs to be able to recharge its intellectual side. With that said, he suggested the message to the legislature and the public be about positive reallocation rather than negative effects on programs. While agreeing with this comment, President Kaler asked members to think about faculty productivity and activity at the end of a faculty member's career (highly paid, but not as productive as they once were or should be), which can be a problem for the institution. Professor Gardner concurred that the public sector does not have the same flexibility/mobility that the private sector has in taking advantage options of their more senior employees' strengths. He urged the University to think about ways to facilitate senior employees contributions to the University even if those contributions change over time.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked President Kaler for his time and adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate