

## FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 16, 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: Strategic Plan Implementation, Faculty Senate Docket Approval, Nominations for Parliamentarian, Senate Clerk and Senate Vice Chair, FCC Priorities Update, Faculty Oversight of Human Subjects Review, Personnel Matter (meeting closed)]

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

Regrets: Eva von Dassow, James Cloyd, Jean Wyman

Absent: Linda Bearinger

Others attending: Deb Cran, chief of staff, Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost; Becky Hippert, executive assistant, Senate Office; Jon Steadland, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President

Guests: Dr. Mary Nichols, special assistant to the provost, Office for the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and dean of the College of Continuing Education)

**1. Strategic Plan implementation** – Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Dr. Mary Nichols, special assistant to the provost, Office for the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (and dean of the College of Continuing Education) to the meeting. She noted that she was invited to provide a Strategic Plan implementation update. Before beginning, Professor Ropers-Huilman called for a round of introductions.

Dr. Nichols said she would begin with a quick update on what has been done thus far in terms of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and then give members a sense of next steps moving forward. She noted that to date five Grand Challenge courses have been approved. These courses are primarily undergraduate courses but they are targeted toward all students. The goal of the Grand Challenge courses is to bring together distinguished faculty from at least two disciplinary perspectives. The five approved courses are:

1. GCC 3001 Grand Challenge: Can We Feed the World Without Destroying It?
2. GCC 3002 Grand Challenge: Beyond Atrocity: Political Reconciliation, Collective Memories and Justice.

3. GCC 3004 Grand Challenge: The New Boom – Promises and Challenges of the Hydrocarbon Renaissance.
4. GCC 5003 Grand Challenge: Seeking Solutions to Global Health Issues.
5. GCC 5005 Grand Challenge: Global Venture Design: What Will You Make?

For more information about each of these courses visit

<http://undergrad.umn.edu/curriculum/grand-challenge.html>.

Dr. Nichols said the Grand Challenges Research Strategies Team has also been formed. This team is led by Raymond “Bud” Duvall, former interim dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and is comprised of 30 research faculty. After its first meeting, the team formed a subcommittee to strictly focus on identifying means to collect broad-based input from faculty and others on the Grand Challenge Research topics that the team is expected to recommend in the fall.

Next, said Dr. Nichols, given the significant amount of public engagement activities that takes place on this campus, a workgroup has been formed to explore how best to showcase and support these activities. The workgroup is made up of a number of faculty and staff who are actively involved in public engagement work, along with several deans for whom public engagement is central to the mission of their college.

In addition, reported Dr. Nichols, a Strategic Plan Continuity Team was formed in January. It is made up of 17 people, 15 faculty, one P&A representative and one Civil Service representative, most of who were involved in the development of the campus Strategic Plan. The Continuity Team is advising the administration on implementation plans and priorities, etc.

Provost Hanson, noted Dr. Nichols, presented to the Board of Regents in March on the Strategic Plan and provided information on the Strategic Plan metrics that will be used for measuring progress, which the Office of Institutional Research helped develop. The Board was very supportive of the progress that had been made and the direction things are moving.

Dr. Nichols spent the remaining time highlighting future plans. She noted that a significant focus will be on more effective communication about the implementation of the strategic plan. While Provost Hanson has been sending out regular monthly communications outlining what is being done, it is apparent that not everyone reads these communication pieces, said Dr. Nichols. Therefore, more effort will be spent on identifying different communication strategies.

Dr. Nichols added that a Strategic Plan website is also in the process of being developed with the help of University Relations. It will be an interactive website where people can ask questions, find potential collaborators, and learn about the University’s many strategic plan initiatives.

Another focus moving forward will be to engage department heads and chairs in the strategic plan implementation process. Three open meetings have been scheduled in

which Provost Hanson will talk with department heads/chairs about leading change efforts in their respective departments.

Dr. Nichols said that in meetings with Provost Hanson, Professors Ropers-Huilman, Uggen and Durfee urged the provost to remember the important role department administrators play in helping faculty get things done. As a result, there are plans to engage department administrators in the early stages of strategic plan implementation as well.

With regard to reciprocal engagement, the Strategic Plan calls for a large public engagement event. Discussions are underway to think about what such an event should look like.

Then, in the curriculum area of the Strategic Plan, a call has gone out for Grand Challenge course applications for courses that will be offered in spring 2016. Additionally, conversations are taking place about developing interdisciplinary minors.

Dr. Nichols concluded her remarks and called for questions/comments from members. Professor Konstan asked: 1) are there plans to improve upon communications to faculty about developing and proposing Grand Challenge courses, and; 2) how can the work of the Grand Challenges Issue Teams can be transitioned into existing parts of the governance structure. Dr. Nichols responded that there needs to be a balance between moving quickly in order to generate momentum around the initiatives that have already been launched and engaging with the community more broadly in the long-run so that these initiatives become institutionalized over time.

In terms of rejecting complacency, Professor Konstan asked whether support units and facilities will be re-engineered to better support the priorities of the Strategic Plan and the academic mission. As an example, he cited the Office of Information Technologies' efforts to solicit feedback from various groups across campus on technology priorities. Dr. Nichols reported that Provost Hanson has asked each of the senior leaders for their Strategic Plan implementation plans. She added that the senior leaders are eager to help with the implementation and are asking what they can do to help. It is clear, the desire and willingness is there to move the Strategic Plan forward.

Regarding the Grand Challenge courses, Professor Erbsen said he heard from some of his colleagues that it was difficult to know what the courses were supposed to be about. He suggested putting the syllabi for each of the Grand Challenge courses on the Office of Undergraduate Education's website to give faculty a sense of what a Grand Challenge course is. Dr. Nichols noted the suggestion and acknowledged it is a great idea.

In Professor Desai's opinion, it is difficult to make all the Strategic Plan initiatives equally accessible to everyone. Often, the 'usual suspects' spearhead initiatives, which limits access to only a handful of departments. For example, she said she knew of faculty who were interested in doing a Grand Challenge course on immigration, which is a really important topic, but they were unable to maneuver through the system. The process

needs to allow for broader participation, which will require shaking things up a bit rather than always going for quick wins. Secondly, regarding reciprocal engagement, said Professor Desai, things are already entrenched in place and the same path continues to be followed without looking at how to do things differently and creatively. She said she is concerned about departments that are doing innovative work and who would like to participate, but are under-resourced. Dr. Nichols said this is an interesting observation about organizations that are going through change, and agreed that there needs to be an eye toward avoiding the ‘usual suspects.’ She agreed that in the long-term the Strategic Plan will not be successful if it is strictly top down. The good news, however, is that there is a lot of interest bubbling up at the local level. Unique processes need to be created in order to institutionalize the initiatives that are being launched as part of the Strategic Plan. Professor Desai suggested establishing something like the City of Minneapolis’ 311 initiative for getting information and services to people that need help navigating the system.

An issue that has plagued faculty for a long time now, said Professor Krichbaum, has to do with offering courses across departments and colleges in terms of who gets the credit and money, and asked if this has been or is being addressed. Dr. Nichols said recognizing the sharing of resources was going to be a barrier for Grand Challenge courses, ideas for addressing these challenges were developed and brought to the Dean’s Council for discussion. There is now a methodology for figuring out how the tuition will flow, which Dr. Nichols briefly summarized. Professor Krichbaum suggested distributing the methodology more broadly.

What are the incentives for students to enroll in the Grand Challenge courses, asked Professor Mesce? What are the predicted enrollments for these courses? Dr. Nichols admitted that not all students will be interested in taking Grand Challenge courses, but, of course, some will. All the courses are designed to fulfill the Liberal Education requirements in different areas, and they are all spectacular courses. There is great awareness in the Office of Undergraduate Education that the courses need to work into students’ demanding schedules. Projected enrollment for the courses is anywhere from 60 – 90 students per course. Deb Cran, chief of staff, Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, added that Provost Hanson met with student leaders earlier this month to talk about the Strategic Plan, and Grand Challenge courses was one of the topics they discussed. The students are going to be bringing back their suggestions for future course ideas. Ms. Cran said that the students will continue to be part of the strategic plan implementation process.

Hearing no further questions, Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Dr. Nichols for the update.

**2. FCC priorities update** - Professor Ropers-Huilman distributed a handout outlining the proposed agendas for the remaining meetings for this academic year. Professor Cohen interjected to ask if Professor Ropers-Huilman had prepared a list of topics to be discussed with Regents Beeson and Johnson when they attend the committee’s April 30 meeting. Historically, asked Professor Konstan, how much has FCC set the agenda when

they meet with the regents? Professor Durfee said last year when the FCC met with the regents there was not an agenda, and, in his opinion, the meetings could be made more effective if topics are identified ahead of time. At the conclusion of a brief discussion, members agreed that setting an agenda would be a good idea and tossed around a few ideas. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she would send out an email message to members with ideas and ask for input. Once the topics have been finalized, she said she would send them to Regents Beeson and Johnson so they have time to reflect on them before the meeting.

Professor Ropers-Huilman then walked members through the document she distributed earlier that outlined the proposed agenda items for the remainder of the year. Regarding the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey agenda item, Professor Konstan suggested in the interest of time that rather than having a presentation to simply distribute the materials that Vice Provost Levine has compiled on COACHE. Vice Provost Levine recently presented COACHE to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) and the materials are straightforward and self-explanatory. In his opinion, this agenda item could be removed to make room for more pressing, time-sensitive topics that the FCC needs to address before the end of the year. Members agreed and Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, volunteered to distribute the COACHE materials to members for their review. Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members if they approved the proposed agendas and topics and they did.

**3. Approval of the April 30, 2015 Faculty Senate docket** – Professor Ropers-Huilman reported that a revised docket was sent to members this morning given there were a few last minute additions to the agenda since it was initially sent out. She walked members through the docket. Regarding the approval of faculty senate officers (Clerk, Parliamentarian and Faculty Senate Vice Chair), Professor Ropers-Huilman reported that Professor Christopher Roberts has agreed to continue as the Parliamentarian, but that the committee needs to identify nominees for the other two positions. Professor Ropers-Huilman solicited members' ideas for the Clerk and Faculty Senate Vice Chair positions. Members took a few minutes and brainstormed ideas for these two positions and generated a few names. In the interest of time, Professor Ropers-Huilman said this discussion would need to be continued online.

Professor Ropers-Huilman explained that within the last 24 hours three resolutions had been submitted and include 1) a resolution on faculty development leaves, 2) a resolution on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and 3) a resolution on involvement of Duluth and Crookston faculty in governance. The FCC thoroughly discussed each and concluded:

- Faculty development leaves resolution – Members decided to not put this resolution on the docket, but rather to allocate time on the docket to update the faculty on the work of the SCFA Subcommittee on Faculty Development Leaves as it relates to this issue. A SCFA working proposal on faculty development leaves will be distributed to senators prior to the meeting to demonstrate that progress is being made related to this issue.

- SLOs resolution – Members decided not to put this resolution on the docket for action, but to put it on for discussion instead so the resolution can be refined and brought back at a later date for action.
- Involvement of Duluth and Crookston faculty in governance resolution – While members agreed with the spirit of the resolution, rather than putting the resolution on the docket for a vote, the FCC committed to taking the issue up next year.

Regarding the human subjects review, Professor Ropers-Huilman said Vice Presidents Herman and Jackson have agreed to report on the Human Subjects Review Implementation Team at the April 30 Senate meeting. She said she plans to provide the introduction for this item and set the stage for a discussion about moving forward and the need to put in place systems that align with the recommendations coming from the external review committee's report. Then, Vice Presidents Herman and Jackson will provide an implementation team update followed by questions and a discussion from the floor. With that said, she asked members whether the FCC should bring forward a resolution that would include language reassuring faculty oversight and involvement in the human subjects research process moving forward. Copies of a draft resolution were distributed to members. Professor Ropers-Huilman reported that she and Professor Uggen shared this draft version of the resolution with President Kaler when they met with him the day before. In Professor Uggen's opinion, President Kaler is clearly concerned about this issue. He added that even if structural changes are made to improve things, the University is likely to still suffer some reputational damage. The FCC has some moral authority and legitimacy as it relates to this issue and should act accordingly.

Professor Erbsen made two points, first, the language in the resolution about all committees formed to oversee human subjects research will include at least 40% faculty representation should be clarified to allow for the University to create an external committee because it is his understanding the Board wants to create an oversight board. Secondly, regarding the portion of the resolution talking about a faculty ombudsperson, while he agrees completely with the idea of having a prominent faculty member in this role, it concerns him that this person is the investigator, the person who decides if the concerns raised are valid as well as the person who imposes the remedy. This language raises due process concerns. The resolution would need to be more specific about the ombudsperson's powers, penalties for non-compliance of their demands, remedies the person can impose, etc.

With regard to the ombudsperson, Professor Cohen liked the idea and said new mechanisms need to be identified going forward to make sure the mistakes of the past are not repeated. The language, however, is awkward and he proposed a few changes.

Professor Campbell explained his vision for the ombudsperson and said he sees this person as having a moral authority. He added that he believes the FCC should select this person.

Members spent the remaining few minutes wordsmithing and clarifying aspects of the resolution, e.g., reports by the ombudsperson need to be public, and that the administration needs to provide the resources to support an ombudsperson office.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said given members were wordsmithing the resolution, she sensed members were generally supportive of putting forward a human subjects research resolution at the April 30 Faculty Senate meeting after Vice Presidents Herman and Jackson speak. With that said, she proposed the specifics of the resolution be finalized over email after the meeting.

4. **Personnel matter** – The committee went off the record for the remainder of the meeting to discuss a personnel matter.

5. **Adjournment** – Hearing no other business, Professor Ropers-Huilman adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate