

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 17, 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: University of Minnesota Alumni Association; Regents Scholarship Program; Updates – Duluth Representative on FCC, All Faculty Email Soliciting Input, Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence, Whose Diversity, Upcoming Meetings; Committee Chair’s Meeting Update]

Present: Colin Campbell (chair), Jigna Desai (vice chair), Catherine French, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Gary Gardner, Kathleen Krichbaum, Scott Lanyon, LaDora Thompson, Susan Wick, Janet Ericksen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Joseph Konstan, Karen Mesce, Chris Uggen Jean Wyman, Marlene Zuk

Regrets: Linda Bearinger, Dan Feeney, Dale Carpenter

Others attending: Jon Steadland, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President

Guests: University of Minnesota Alumni Association representatives: President & CEO Lisa Lewis, and Senior Director of Campus Engagement Erin Strong

1. University of Minnesota Alumni Association: Professor Campbell convened the meeting, welcomed those present and called for a round of introductions. He then welcomed guests from the University of Minnesota Alumni Association President & CEO Lisa Lewis, and Senior Director of Campus Engagement Erin Strong.

Following introductions, Ms. Lewis provided a snapshot of the Alumni Association to members and provided the following statistics:

- There are 455,000 living University of Minnesota alumni around the world.
- On average, 10,000 to 12,000 students become alumni each year.
- Approximately, half of the alumni live in the Greater Minneapolis/St. Paul area.
- Roughly two thirds of alumni stay in the State of Minnesota and the rest are living around the world.
- Roughly one third of the alumni population has graduate degrees and two thirds have undergraduate degrees.

Ms. Lewis said, generally speaking, the broader an alumni’s undergraduate experience, the more these individuals connect with the University as a whole and this will shape how they reconnect as alumni. The Alumni Association’s goal is to understand the wants and needs of its alumni and to try and serve them because in doing so they will engage more, give more and be a more integral part of the University community; its philosophy is alumni-centric and is focused on three key things:

1. To enrich the lives of alumni by helping them network and connect with each other.
2. To support student success and work to connect alumni talent with student aspirations.
3. To advance the University of Minnesota and the value of their degree.

New areas of growth in the past year for the Alumni Association include:

- International alumni.
- Career services for alumni.
- Life-long learning for alumni by keeping them connected to the excellence of the University.

Ms. Lewis then asked Senior Director of Campus Engagement Erin Strong to provide information on the Alumni Association's new products. Ms. Strong highlighted the following:

- Webinar series – The first installment of the webinar series was in 2014 – 2015 and connected more than 5,500 alumni in 45 states and 15 countries. Topics included timely issues that were in the news, career topics and interest-based topics, e.g., diets, Ebola, admissions.
- Gold Mind – A dedicated page on the Alumni Association's website (<http://www.minnesotaalumni.org/s/1118/noMenu.aspx?sid=1118&gid=1&pgid=5286>) that showcases online talks by staff and faculty. Currently, there are 90 pieces of content, which is updated quarterly.
- Minne-College – An event that is offered in conjunction with the University of Minnesota Foundation held each year in Scottsdale, Arizona and Naples, Florida (usually in January and February). Minne-College features 15 sessions of 45-minute talks by faculty.
- Alumni chapters that are located around the world.
- Publications: 1) *At the U*, which showcases events happening on campus and 2) *Alumni Angle*, which focuses on faculty stories as well as 3) a monthly electronic newsletter.

Ms. Strong added that the Alumni Association is also looking for ways to support the University's Strategic Plan such as sponsoring interdisciplinary panel discussions.

In terms of how faculty can help, Ms. Strong suggested members could:

- Nominate faculty to participate in webinars, a chapter event, or Minne-College.
- Submit content for Gold Mind that currently lives on a University website.
- Send events or stories that highlight faculty for *At the U* or the *Alumni Angle*.

Following their presentation, members' questions/comments were solicited. Professor French asked how the Alumni Association interacts with colleges and the Foundation. Ms. Lewis noted that the Alumni Association is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, which means technically it is independent of the University. The Foundation is the Alumni Association's partner, which is also a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. The Alumni Association represents the alumni and its goal is to engage them and connect

them back to the University. One outcome of a good alumni relationship is giving. The Foundation is the philanthropic arm of the University and one of its audiences is alumni. The Alumni Association, on the other hand, is a constituency with one outcome being philanthropy. Therefore, while the Alumni Association and the Foundation are connected, they have two different missions that are advancement missions for the institution. The connections to the colleges are strong and each college has an alumni relations officer or multiple alumni relations officers. The structure in terms of whom they report to and how they work varies by college.

Professor Gardner mentioned CFANS' (College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Sciences) international agriculture alumni who hold positions of power around the world, many in developing countries. He suggested more be done to build relationships with these alum. Ms. Lewis agreed and said that is the reason the Alumni Association plans to do more for international alumni.

Professor Uggen asked if a central database exists for alums who are looking for interns, for example. Ms. Lewis said the Alumni Association is working on having this capability, but it is not there yet. A technology solution needs to be found in order to make this connection happen. With that said, in the meantime, the Alumni Association has decided to use the philosophy "fish where the fish are," and they are using the Alumni Association's LinkedIn website. Over 30,000 alumni are on its LinkedIn website, and the Alumni Association is working on developing a sub-site of its LinkedIn site where alumni can go and volunteer.

Professor Desai said she continues think about retiring faculty who want to maintain a connection to the University. Could there be a way to engage these individuals? This has recently been discussed, said Ms. Lewis, and the Alumni Association is interested in engaging these individuals and tapping into their talent.

Regarding Professor Uggen's earlier comment about a database for connecting alums and students for internships, Professor French suggested using GoldPASS as a tool for making this connection. Ms. Lewis said the Alumni Association looked into GoldPASS and found that not every school uses it and the feedback from alumni was that it was not user-friendly. At this point, the feeling is that it may be easier to have students go on LinkedIn than to have alumni re-create their whole profile on GoldPASS.

Professor Gardner asked what the Alumni Association is doing to encourage alumni to talk with their state legislators. Ms. Lewis noted that the Alumni Association works closely with Government and Community Relations and they actually share a position that does grassroots advocacy with alumni. She added that she sees opportunities for growth in this area and said there is mobilization, which is done on a year by year basis, but there is also the need for relationship building that must happen in order for there to be mobilization. This position needs to do both, long-term building of the base and relationship building so people are ready, willing and able to advocate on behalf of the institution. The University has traditionally focused on mobilization, and not invested enough in building the base of long-term relationships. Professor Gardner suggested holding constituent meetings now before the legislative session starts so that personal

relationships are developed with the legislators. Ms. Lewis agreed that this is a piece that is missing.

Professor Mesce noted at the FCC retreat in August the committee talked about how it could better showcase what the University does in an effort to demonstrate its value to the community. She suggested having alumni tell their success stories and share their thoughts on what the University means to them. Ms. Lewis said she sees this as a University marketing strategy to tout the success of its alumni rather than an alumni engagement strategy, at least to a degree. She thinks it would be possible to have a conversation with University Relations about the opportunity to showcase the alumni story as well.

What are the Alumni Association's aspirations for its travel program and what is the faculty role in this program, asked Professor Lanyon? With the recent hire of a full-time person who will focus on developing international alumni relations and travel, there will be an opportunity to explore different travel options than had previously been offered such as experiential travel.

Would there be a way for the Alumni Association to work with University Relations to showcase more faculty research in Gold Mind, asked Professor Desai, to allow alums the opportunity to better connect with faculty, e.g., deeper talks featuring research? Ms. Lewis said the way the Alumni Association looks at Gold Mind focuses on the learning component and not the fact that research is done here, but the actual product. Ms. Strong added that Gold Mind has been very well received. She said she is working on capturing faculty talks and recording them, but has realized in doing this that not a lot of lectures are recorded. Professor Lanyon concurred that not a lot of presentations are recorded and the attitude has been it is up to the people doing the presentation to figure it out for themselves. Both Professor French suggested letting departments/colleges know that the Alumni Association would like these talks video captured because they probably do not know.

In light of time, Professor Campbell thanked both Ms. Lewis and Ms. Strong for the information and a good discussion. He added that if members think of other questions to email him or Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, and they will follow up with the Alumni Association. Ms. Lewis and Ms. Strong in turn thanked the committee for their time.

Members then took a few minutes to debrief following the Alumni Association discussion. Professor Campbell said he wonders whether the Alumni Association is limited in what it is able to do by lack of resources. Professor Wyman noted that the Alumni Association compared to a number of other Big 10 schools does not get a lot of money from the University. Professor Thompson added that in her opinion the goals that the Alumni Association sets for itself should be strategic and focused.

2. Regents Scholarship: Professor Campbell provided the committee with some background information related to the Regents Scholarship issue. He noted that both the Professional & Academic Consultative Committee (PACC) and Civil Service Consultative Committee (CSCC) would like to re-engage a conversation about reinstating

the Regents Scholarship to cover all classes employees want to take regardless if they already hold a degree or not. Professor Campbell rhetorically asked if the issue is lack of money, could there be a way to use a tuition waiver to solve the problem. He then solicited members' thoughts.

As a former department head, said Professor Gardner, the Regents Scholarship was a great program for employee career development and training. It is in the University's best interest to have better trained employees for their jobs. Forcing employees to pay for the courses they take not only hurts employees but the University too. As he recalls, when the Regents Scholarship was at 100%, there was never a requirement that an employee had to be admitted into a course. If a new section does not have to be added then the net cost for that person to take the course is zero. Since a new budget model has been put in place there is the need to transfer money around, but, in Professor Gardner's opinion, this is not real money. It is clear the University is not interested in developing its workforce.

Professor Uggen said there is the perception by some that employees need to have "skin in the game" when taking courses at the University. If this is true one could argue that any fee associated with taking a course could be nominal and not 25% of tuition.

Staff, said Professor Desai, have indicated that the Regents Scholarship is one of the top four issues for them. All education is valuable and if courses are being offered at the University they are educational or they would not be offered. A number of employees want to take University courses not only for professional development purposes but intellectual curiosity, which is a good thing.

Professor Campbell said the "skin in the game" language is offensive to some staff and he hopes this language is not used because it is not helpful.

Career development, and the betterment of the workforce, said Professor Gardner, is not valued anymore. If workforce betterment were valued, then employees would not have to pay for courses.

Professor Lanyon noted that because a number of staff are not compensated competitively in the marketplace, the Regents Scholarship is a benefit that could help with recruitment of employees.

Based on the comments that were shared today, said Professor Campbell, there appears to be faculty support for reinstating the Regents Scholarship at 100%. He promised he would keep the committee updated on what progress is made on this issue and thanked members for a good discussion.

3. Announcements/updates:

- Professor Campbell reported that there is supposed to be a Duluth representative on the FCC, but this seat has been vacant for over a year now. He noted that the Duluth Medical School and College of Pharmacy are part of the Academic Health Center in the Twin Cities and their faculty are not unionized. The rest of

the Duluth campus is a separate entity and its faculty are unionized. There seems to be a sense that if faculty are unionized that they cannot participate in faculty governance. In Professor Campbell's opinion, he does not necessarily believe this is true, but said there is a strongly held belief by a lot of people that it is true. With that said, he said he is working with Professor Ben Clarke on the Duluth campus to try to identify a Duluth faculty member to serve on the FCC. He added that if any FCC members have ideas for possible candidates to email him with names. Professor Krichbaum, chair, AHC FCC, noted that the AHC FCC will be traveling to Duluth on October 6, 2015 and this item is on their agenda for discussion.

Professor Gardner said it is his understanding that faculty governance is an issue for collective bargaining. If in the bargaining unit agreement it is agreed that they could have representatives in faculty governance, it could happen. He suggested the union representatives be contacted to discuss this matter.

- Professor Campbell also reported that an all faculty email was recently sent out to solicit input from faculty about issues the FCC should address this year. The de-identified input will be shared with members for their review once it is compiled.
- Next, Professor Desai reported that a number of students are upset about the Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence (MCAE) staff changes that have taken place. Approximately five staff have either been let go or left the University, including a staff person who had been here for over 20 years that worked with the Hmong community. Faculty have met with Shakeer Abdullah, assistant vice president, Office of Equity and Diversity (OED), to discuss that due to these changes that students are not feeling supported. This is an ongoing issue, noted Professor Desai, which the FCC will be kept apprised of.
- Professor Desai reported that on Tuesday this week a group of Whose Diversity students interrupted Dean Coleman's presentation at the CLA Assembly to talk about the disciplinary charges that are still pending against them (the criminal charges were dropped). She added that the students received the pre-hearing date information on short notice. Apparently, the hearing notice may have sat in someone's draft box for a while before being sent out, but that the process itself has been long and drawn out as the incidents happened early in the year. The FCC may want to invite Vice Provost and Dean for Student Affairs Danita Brown Young to an upcoming meeting to talk about what, if any, changes have been made around disciplinary actions against student protests that the FCC discussed with her and her staff last year. Lastly, she added that a petition related to this matter is being circulated and the FCC may be asked to address it.

Professor Campbell said that the Whose Diversity matter is a complex issue pertaining to civil disobedience that is provoking confrontation. He said he has a sincere desire to solve this problem without anyone feeling like they lost, but he

is not sure this will be possible. Part of the question is also whether there was timely notification of the hearing. Jon Steadland, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President, reported that the hearing is not until next week. Professor Desai said it is her understanding that the hearing was originally set for today, September 17, but was pushed back due to the lateness of the email notice. Professor Ropers-Huilman suggested members review the minutes from last year where this issue was discussed to understand what the FCC requested the Office for Student Affairs do. The November 13, 2014 minutes are available at

http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/169367/14_11_13_FCC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y and the March 5, 2015 minutes are available at http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/171171/15_03_05_FCC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

Professor Wick asked what office MCAE reports to. Professor Desai said the office reports to the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED). She added that she and Professor Campbell have a meeting with OED Vice President Katrice Albert tomorrow to try to build new bridges after the conversations that took place with OED last year around the advertising of the panel discussion *Can One Laugh at Everything: Satire and Free Speech After Charlie*. The minutes where this matter was discussed can be found at

http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/174635/15_05_28_FCC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y and http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/174636/15_06_04_FCC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

Professor Ropers-Huilman commented that it is important to remember if diversity is really a University goal then faculty need to know what is going on in order to help with the its diversity agenda. She suggested Professors Campbell and Desai talk with Vice President Albert about the need for OED to consult broadly with faculty on its diversity agenda. Professor Desai agreed that she also believes OED needs to do more faculty consultation.

- Professor Campbell reported he and Professor Desai have meetings set up with Brian Steeves, executive director and corporate secretary, Office of the Board of Regents, and Ann Aronson, chief of staff and chief marketing officer, and Chuck Tombarge, deputy chief of staff and chief public relations officer.
- Professor Desai informed members that she and Professor Campbell as well as leaders from the Institute for Advanced Study and the Minnesota Student Association have been invited to work with the Provost's Office on continuing the conversation that started last year when the Provost's Office hosted a community forum entitled "Speech, 'Civility,' and Academic Freedom." Following up on questions that arose last year out of the advertising of the panel discussion *Can One Laugh at Everything: Satire and Free Speech After Charlie*, there are plans to continue the forum series with a conversation on trigger warnings and another that will give students the opportunity to talk about campus climate and other

issues they want to discuss. There may be other conversations as well, noted Professor Desai, and welcomed topic suggestions from members.

4. **Committee Chair's meeting:** Professor Campbell reported that there was a committee chair's meeting yesterday and the overall theme was communication. It is clear that sharing inter-committee information is critical. He requested the chairs of Senate committees send him a list of the items their committees plan to take up this year as well as any issues that may have fallen through the cracks since last year or even beyond.

With talk of unionization, Professor Lanyon suggested documenting the effectiveness of faculty governance. He said some of the discussion about unionization has to do with the concern by faculty that faculty governance is not productive, and it is not having an impact on guiding the institution. Faculty governance successes need to be better communicated. Is there a way to document whether faculty participating in faculty governance are spending their time wisely? In response, Professor Campbell provided a recent example of a faculty governance success story that came out of this year's retreat, which was to get a faculty seat on the Oversight Committee for the external review of issues related to sexual harassment and the Athletics Department. Professor Lanyon clarified and said outside of this room he does not believe a majority of faculty are aware of these successes because they are not being communicated. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she has a folder with the FCC chair's reports to the Board of Regents dating back to 2007, which would contain information on what issues have been addressed. Professor Lanyon said while it is clear what issues the committee's have worked on, it is less clear what impact they have had. Professor Ropers-Huilman agreed with Professor Lanyon but added that faculty governance actually does a lot in partnership with administration, some of which can be put in a report and others not so much. Professor Lanyon then suggested asking both President Kaler and Provost Hanson how faculty governance has helped them with various decisions they have had to make. Professor Desai added that in her opinion there is no way to convey all the work being done in faculty governance back to the colleges; there is no pipeline/mechanism for doing this. Professor Mesce also raised the issue of faculty apathy, which impacts faculty governance participation. Professor Wyman agreed that faculty apathy may be part of the problem, but she agrees with Professor Lanyon that more can be done to improve communication about faculty governance and its accomplishments.

5. **Adjournment:** Professor Campbell thanked members for a good discussion. Hearing no further business, he adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate