

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, January 26, 2006
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Jean Bauer (chair), Gary Balas, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Barbara Elliott, Dan Feeney, Megan Gunnar, Morris Kleiner, Kathleen Krichbaum, Scott Lanyon, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Fred Morrison, Terry Roe, Steven Ruggles, Martin Sampson, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor

Absent:

Guests: President Bruininks, Provost E. Thomas Sullivan

Other: Sharon Olson

[In these minutes: (1) Search Committee Process; (2) President Bruininks; (3) Provost Sullivan

Professor Bauer convened the meeting at 1:15 pm.

Professor Martin brought to the committee's attention that a hard copy of the university budget seems no longer to be available in the archives. Professor Gunnar asked for clarification as to whether the budget was available on-line. The general consensus was that it was, but difficult to access. Professor Martin asked the committee if it agreed that the budget ought to be available in printed format and a copy available in the archives. The committee discussed the issue and a motion was put forth that a hard copy/printed version of the university budget be available for public perusal. The motion was seconded and carried.

Professor Chomsky raised the issue of taping of classes, and pointed out that the committee may play a role in helping faculty understand the constraints of the current policy. Professor McCormick clarified one new aspect of current policy, namely that faculty has discretion to regulate personal electronic devices in the classroom. A discussion ensued regarding the copyright implications of taping classes and lectures, and subsequent issues of doing so. Professor Martin brought up the issue of fair use and making students aware of this. Professor Chomsky raised the issue of privacy as well. Professor Balas asked about video classes that are offered daily, and Professor Morrison said that if faculty participates in the video classes program, one signed over rights. Professor Chomsky said that the issue was worth opening to discussion because of the implications. Professor Bauer said it should be put to Senate Committee on Educational Policy.

1. Search Committee Process

Professor Bauer distributed a statement on search committees that is on the Office of Human Resources website, entitled Appendix D: Getting the Most from the Search Committee Process. The document addressed questions that the committee had posed to Carol Carrier and Julie Sweitzer. Ms.

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Carrier and Ms. Sweitzer agreed to meet with the committee if its questions were not answered fully by the document. Professor Bauer reminded the committee about their previous discussion regarding search committees, and the various issues that were addressed in the document.

The committee discussed the various aspects of the document. Professor Martin referred to the sentence which reads "The responsible administrator has access to all applicant files and may choose to select additional applicants from the pool for further consideration." She expressed concern that this usurped the Search committee's role in the first place. Professor Roe concurred, adding that it obviates the need for a search committee. Professor Morrison added that it leaves the faculty out of the process, and he would like to see the statement encompass the tradition of faculty being part of the process. Professor Lanyon highlighted number five under the heading Possible Models for Expanded Participation, which states: If a department wants to designate a search committee of the whole, all faculty need to participate fully in the review of all candidates. Professor Lanyon said that he had been told he could not involve faculty early in the process. Professor Ruggles also referred to the clause, asking about mega-searches in which everyone participates on every level in searches of a very large scope. He felt faculty should not be involved in that level either. Professor Sullivan pointed out that some points of the policy appear to conflict with other points. The discussion continued regarding a dean's role in a search, and Professor Sullivan said that he felt the language of #5 should be changed. Professor Balas asked why the deans get to decide which search processes are allowed. Professor Chomsky said that the policy seems to describe a default process, and the deans are permitted to choose a different method.

Professor Morrison said that conspicuously absent from the statement is that faculty must vote for tenure-track faculty. Professor Lanyon added that the way the policy read now it seemed that the search committee could just be ignored. Professors Morrison and Gunnar agreed that number four under Possible Models for Expanded Participation is the normal model. It reads: "Appoint a search committee to select semi-finalists, and use the entire faculty of a department to select a finalist." Professor Morrison also cited an example of his search committee experience when teaching in Germany, which allowed for pursuing applicants who had not applied for a position. He said that a way to seek out applicants was important to consider in the goal of being a top three institution. The committee went on to discuss targeted searches. Professor Feeney asked for clarification as to whether the search committee was an active or passive group, pointing out a search can be open but a targeted search can also be effected. Professor Windsor said that she felt that the document was trying to give flexibility to different types of searches, and trying to cover a range of search options.

Professor Bauer said that she concluded from the committee's discussion that Ms. Carrier and Ms. Sweitzer should meet with the committee to address governance policy and to address the points raised in this meeting. Professor Martin added that it seemed that the policy in place did not reflect the previous discussions with Ms. Carrier and Ms. Sweitzer.

2. President Bruininks

Professor Bauer welcomed President Bruininks to the meeting. President Bruininks discussed the capital funding bill and the governor's recommendations. He distributed a summary of the capital request and gave an overview of the HEAPR requests. He pointed out that the governor recommended funding most of the other projects, and but did not approve the request for Research Centers and Field stations with the understanding that rural legislators would address that. President Bruininks went on to discuss the state's long-term resource strategy and that the University was trying to model long-range

strategy for the University on bio and medical sciences. President Bruininks said that rationales and strategies were being discussed, and that they were working toward building support with key groups in the community.

Professor Bauer thanked President Bruininks for the information.

3. Provost Sullivan

Professor Bauer welcomed Provost Sullivan, who discussed strategic positioning with the committee.

The meeting concluded at 3:30 pm