

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, August 17, 2006
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Carol Chomsky, (chair), Jean Bauer, Nancy Carpenter, Barbara Elliott, Megan Gunnar, Emily Hoover, Mary Jo Kane, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Nelson Rhodus, Steven Ruggles, Martin Sampson, Geoffrey Sirc, John Sullivan

Absent: None counted for a summer meeting

Guests: President Robert Bruininks; Provost E. Thomas Sullivan

Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff); Sharon Reich Paulsen (Office of the Provost)

[In these minutes: (1) congratulations; (2) preview of discussions; (3) legislative liaison position; (4) Edinburgh leave and governance matters; (5) 1997 task force recommendations; (6) discussion with President Bruininks; (7) discussion with Provost Sullivan]

1. Congratulations

Professor Chomsky convened the meeting at 1:15 and began by congratulating Professor Gunnar on being selected for Regents Professor. Committee members gave her a round of applause.

2. Preview of Discussions

Professor Chomsky previewed the topics that the President and Provost would discuss with the Committee when they joined the meeting.

3. Legislative Liaison Position

Professor Chomsky asked Committee members to review the position description for the faculty legislative liaison that had been distributed earlier by email. She noted that it had been drafted last year by Professors Morrison and Sampson and suggested it would be useful to have articulated an understanding of the role, especially as the Committee recruits individuals in the future.

Preamble. The role of Faculty Liaison exists in recognition that:

--faculty can provide a distinctive, cogent contribution to legislative decisions that affect the university;

* 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.

--the well being of a public research university is better served if faculty are well- informed about what is happening at the legislature;

--intra-faculty communication about the legislature has become important to the success of the university's agenda at the legislature.

Role The Faculty Liaisons to the State Legislature

--convey faculty perspectives to legislative staff and representatives with respect to legislation and potential legislation affecting and responding to the needs of the university;

--inform faculty about significant developments at the legislature that may affect the university and its faculty;

--solicit involvement of individual faculty members in the legislative process, including identifying members whose testimony or insights are especially germane for particular issues and asking faculty to contact legislators to address particular issues of concern;

--report routinely to the FCC about legislative developments, as ex officio members of the FCC.

Coordination Although separate from the university's official government relations activities under the Vice President for Community Relations and separate from the Alumni Association's grass roots endeavors, the Faculty Liaisons communicate and coordinate as necessary with the individuals executing those responsibilities.

Term and department compensation. Appointment is for a one-year term by the University President with recommendation from the FCC leadership. It is expected that the effort involved will be the equivalent of one-half time for the spring semester for each of two liaisons, or full time for the spring semester for one liaison, but some of the effort will in fact take place in the fall semester. Central administration provides compensation at a fixed rate to the liaisons' home departments. This may be used for course replacement, for hiring of research assistants, or (for those on B appointments) for shifting effort. It may also be used for certain expenses associated with the position, such as mileage and parking.

Campaign financing restrictions. In accord with the University's rules, financial contributions to political parties or candidates cannot be compensated by or through the university. The Faculty Liaisons represent a public entity, the University, and so are not considered lobbyists under state law.

Professor Sampson said he liked the provision calling for two-way communication, to the legislature and back to the faculty.

Professor Martin noted that historically the position was occupied by only one person (as it is this year), but for the last two years it was held jointly by Professors Morrison and Sampson. Having two people may work better. Professor Sampson agreed, especially, he said, if they are from the two major parties. Professor Martin said Committee members should take the responsibility for thinking about who can take on this position in the future, rather than waiting until the last moment. Professor Sampson said

he was planning to establish an informal legislative committee. Professor Chomsky recalled that last year some faculty had expressed an interest in the position, but not for this year. The informal committee could help develop individuals so they are prepared to take the position.

The Committee unanimously approved the position description.

4. Report on Leave at the University of Edinburgh & Related Governance Matters

Professor Chomsky next asked Dr. Engstrand for a report on his leave at the University of Edinburgh last spring. The highlights of the report were these:

-- He attended meetings of the finance committee, the central officers, the academic policy committee, and the University's governing body (the Court) and interviewed about 30 administrators and faculty on various issues. The vast majority of issues discussed at these meetings were the same issues that have been discussed at the University of Minnesota in the last several years.

-- Edinburgh has a Senate but virtually everyone believes it does not function well. The membership includes all (full) professors and representation from other academic ranks; of the 500+ members, only 50-60 attend meetings.

-- The Court has 23 members, four of whom are faculty, and about 35 people attend the meetings. The Court meetings are not public; they are grateful they do not have to have public meetings. The Court meets five times per year for about 2½ hours. The chair of the Court is the Rector, elected by the students (usually a political figure).

-- The Senate has committees but no equivalent to the Faculty Consultative Committee or to the other major subject-matter committees of the University of Minnesota Senate (e.g., Finance and Planning, Faculty Affairs, Library, Information Technology, Research, etc.). The major emphasis of the Edinburgh Senate is on curriculum and calendar and educational matters. The committees at Edinburgh also have a significant number of administrators as members; there seem to be no or few exclusively-faculty committees and the Principal (the President) does not meet with any only-faculty committee, so on the rare occasion it is needed, no group exists to "speak truth to power."

-- One interesting arrangement they have is a joint governing board-administration-faculty committee (the Finance and General Purposes Committee, a Court committee, has faculty and administrators on it). While there has been no such arrangement at Minnesota, it is conceivable there might be times when an ad hoc joint committee might serve useful purposes; would such a group, for example, have helped ameliorate the dispute during the tenure debate in the mid-1990s?

-- While Edinburgh is ostensibly "private" (its governing board is self-perpetuating, not appointed by the government), it is more tightly linked to the Scottish government than the University of Minnesota is to the State of Minnesota because of the funding arrangements. They have, for example, extremely rigid enrollment controls.

-- Everyone at Edinburgh said they cannot compete for US faculty because of salaries. The salary data, however, do not on their face suggest large discrepancies (at least in competing against US public institutions). Average full professor salary at Minnesota (2005-06) is \$110,300; at Edinburgh it is

\$116,000 (at current rates of exchange). Associate Professor at Minnesota is \$75,600; Senior Lecturer at Edinburgh is \$82,900. Assistant Professor at Minnesota is \$65,400; the two Lecturer ranks at Edinburgh are about \$58,500. The major problem may be cost of living, which is substantially higher in Edinburgh; it is also true that current exchange rates favor the UK at the moment. (Salary data kindly provided by Dr. Peter Zetterberg, Institutional Research and Reporting, and by the University of Edinburgh.)

-- The major focus of the report is on the need for institutions such as Edinburgh and Minnesota to develop a sense of institutional citizenship among the faculty. The point has been made a number of times in the last few years in different articles by different scholars in the British higher education literature. [N.B. The term "academic staff" refers to faculty.] For example:

No academic enters a university with a view to running the whole show, and so it is always tempting for them to simply defend the departmental patch whilst welcoming new departments on board and bemoaning 'the administration.' . . . Such an orientation makes sense from a narrowly academic and departmental point of view, but it leaves someone else to worry about the costs of fragmentation, the stretch on long-term institutional capacity, and the need for an institutional focus in a competitive world where all institutions need an edge if they are not to drift.

Top-down planning involves a control that drives out commitment and trust. . . . Implementation [of strategic plans] must involve real commitment on the part of the troops who actually do the teaching and research.

In this intellectual and organisational situation it is very hard for 'the university' to be much more than the sum of the departments. Devising a strategy for transforming the university is a problem when most academics neither 'think university' nor choose to involve themselves in its governance.

[One author] highlights the importance of developing an 'institutional collegiality' that goes beyond loyalty to a particular discipline to embrace a larger loyalty to an institution. . . . Institutional collegiality is all about academics engaging in 'collective strategy making' with a view to securing 'agreement around organisational purpose' in a way that builds support for a strategy and its implementation.

Persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group.' . . . The problem is that organisational (but not intellectual) leadership tends to be the missing link in universities.

If leadership is the missing link, then getting academics into leading positions throughout a university is proving to be an increasing problem, even though academic involvement in management and governance is fundamental given that institutions geared to teaching and research can hardly bypass the people who do these things.

In worlds that celebrate research over teaching, and teaching over administration, it is scarcely surprising that getting academics to 'do' administration is an increasing problem, and a

problem that some see as best left to the donkeys, so that the stars can get on with their research whilst retaining the right to grumble about administration.

We cannot assume that the manifold activities of the ‘multiversity’ have anything in common. It follows that the notion that there could be a single binding characteristic that all constituent parts of the university share, that there could be an essence, has to be suspect. [Reporting on interview and focus-group research at UK universities, the author reported that] the great majority of interviewees found it difficult to respond to questions that were directed explicitly at a ‘culture’ of their university. One important exception related to research. Interviewees were able, in appropriate institutions, to interpret their institution culture as a ‘culture of research,’ with all the implications this had. . . . [For most all subjects, however] if they could see a culture at all, it was change itself, often instability, frequently confusion and conflict, generated within the institution or by national policies or the interaction of the two. For them stability lay not in the institution, but in the values of scholarship associated with the discipline and the academic profession. . . . [The analysis in the article is based] on the weakness or absence in the range of interviews with academic staff of any sense that the university as an organisation possessed a culture that rested on a community of interest, shared norms, assumptions and even values that were clearly associated with the institution itself.

It is likely that within all institutions the individual academic role will become more polarised as universities make decisions about maximising their research strengths. . . . The ideology of the rounded academic role could take longer to change than the reality, but the trend is there for all to see. As managerialism trumps collegiality in governance terms so the academic labour force will be ever-more casualized as HE [higher education] is commodified.

It is commonplace to speak, often glibly, of a ‘community of scholars,’ implying that university academics share a sense of common values, purposes and identity. The evidence suggests though that there has been a withering of any sense of a common academic ‘culture.’

[To recover] the idea of academic citizenship, there is a need for institutions to place more explicit emphasis on the importance of the service role within reward and recognition structures [because] the perception of academic staff is that such work is rarely acknowledged in recognition and reward structures. [Service, however, has never been only about reward and there is a long tradition] of faculty embracing their citizenship responsibilities as an integral part of their academic identity serving a variety of communities. In this respect, the responsibility for ensuring that academic citizenship survives lies squarely with the senior professoriate.

Because the University of Edinburgh has no faculty governance independent of the administration, he contemplated recommending that they at least think about the value of creating one. Before he made such a recommendation, however, Dr. Engstrand concluded it would be wise to ask those who meet regularly with University of Minnesota Senate committees—the vice presidents—what their views were about the effectiveness of the system. From emails and conversations once he returned, Dr. Engstrand compiled a brief report on the comments and advice he had received.

The discussion of institutional commitment also led him to revive with the Committee the notion of events, sponsored by this Committee and perhaps the AAUP, to introduce new faculty to the role of the

governance system. Professor Chomsky noted that part of this goal will be achieved with the new faculty orientation, which about 90 new faculty have signed up to attend.

Professor Martin suggested that any events should be held for newly-tenured faculty, not NEW faculty. Professor Gunnar agreed that new probationary faculty should not be invited to become involved in governance because it could take time away from scholarly work and thus hurt their chances for tenure. Once they achieve tenure, however, they should be approached because they will likely be at the University for a long time. Professor Gunnar also noted that the orientation of faculty is to their department and that encouraging participation can take place at the department level. In her case, for example, a number of faculty in the Institute of Child Development have always been involved in institutional governance and junior faculty come to understand that such participation is expected once one moves past the tenure decision.

Professor Martin commented that unless the institution gets better at recognizing the role that governance plays, little will change. The administration says it values governance, but in merit evaluations of faculty, participation is not valued. The administration must both say and do.

Professor Rhodus agreed that participation should mostly be post-tenure, but junior faculty must be exposed to governance early or, once they achieve tenure, they will not participate. If they see senior faculty participate, and the chair says it is expected, they will be more likely to do so, Professor Gunnar countered. Professor Chomsky noted that they said to Vice Provost Carney that encouraging participation should be part of what deans and department heads do—they need to be more familiar with, and value, governance. Professor McCormick said that the discussion has always been about protecting non-tenured faculty from governance, but if they are pampered and protected, and never participate, why will they do so once they receive tenure? Junior faculty should not be given onerous tasks but they should be involved in governance. Professor Martin agreed. What the University does not want is a lot of terminal associate professors, Professor Kane observed; faculty must be convinced that they can be in governance and still be superstars, even in the new strategic positioning environment. Those who are distinguished academically must say to the faculty that they can do both scholarship and governance. It was noted that this Committee has typically had at least one Regents Professor as a member (and now has two).

What are the expectations in units, Professor Chomsky inquired? In some, an expectation of more participation in institutional governance might count in lieu of departmental governance. Professor Sullivan said that senior people in his department have always participated; junior people see that and internalize it—and participate when they become the senior faculty. In his department, people have not just focused on their career; they have taken on more responsibilities. They saw a lot of faculty participation in the strategic positioning process, Professor Chomsky noted. If faculty are given a reason to participate, they will. People saw that as a one-time opportunity to have a major impact, Professor Sullivan said, which they do not see in faculty governance, which is more incremental and may not have an effect even with participation. Efficacy is an important issue.

With the extensive new-faculty orientation, Professor Martin said, this Committee should focus on events for newly-tenured faculty. One idea suggested in material from earlier years was to bring them to a committee meeting and let them see that the committees interact with the senior officers and see that there is a dialogue. Professor Chomsky said she also has a note suggesting that administrative reviews should include a question about how well the administrator fosters faculty involvement. It would be helpful if that were part of the review process.

Professor Gunnar recalled that when she was on the Committee on Committees, they would be provided with lists of people who won awards, were on committees, etc., but it was always the same people. It would be useful to ask deans and department heads for the names of people who would be good for committee service in order to get some fresh names. Professor Chomsky suggested that the Committee on Committees could become involved in the process and create the solicitation.

Professor Sullivan wondered what the problem is. One hears that the University has a tremendous governance system; is it broken? (No.) Is the point to maintain it? It is, Professor Chomsky said, and to be sure that it is not lost. Professor Sullivan cautioned that one must keep things in perspective; Michigan and Berkeley are not better because their governance systems.

Apropos the comments and advice from the vice presidents, Professor Chomsky said, some things are being done and some can be implemented by the FCC leadership and Senate staff, and it is her intention to do so. Several of the suggestions relate to how committee chairs operate and communicate, and they will be addressed with the chairs this fall. She did not believe it necessary for this Committee to ADOPT anything. She added that it was good to learn about the positive comments and that the vice presidents generally see governance as a valuable process. Much of what they suggest is a matter of implementation.

5. 1997 Task Force Recommendations

Professor Chomsky turned next to the recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Consultation, a group on which she served. She noted that in 1999 there was a report to this Committee, from Professors David Hamilton and Roberta Humphreys, recommending steps to be taken as recommended by the task force; some of them have been adopted and some not. There are five things that the Committee could follow up on, if it is interested.

-- Adopt a set of guiding principles, a description of the governance system (apart from the constitution, bylaws, and rules), something the Committee could craft, discuss, or adopt. It would not be something sent to the administration but rather the Committee's understanding of what governance does, what value it has, and what it is trying to accomplish. Such a statement would also help colleagues understand what the governance system is doing.

-- Adopt a definition of the responsibilities of faculty senators. Professor Chomsky circulated a draft; Committee members made editorial suggestions. Once finally approved, it will be provided to faculty senators in the fall.

The remainder of the issues from the task force report will be taken up at a later meeting.

6. Discussion with President Bruininks

Professor Chomsky now welcomed the President to the meeting. The President said he looked forward to what he expects will be a great academic year and said he wished to put on the table a number of complex issues that will be taken up in coming months.

-- The biennial request and the case the University needs to make. Even with good support in the most recent years, the University still does not have state funding equal to what it had in 2000, after the deep cuts of a few years ago. The President emphasized that the University cannot retreat from its partnership with the state; he pointed out that it takes a \$100 million endowment to generate \$5 million in annual income; the University would need to generate, overnight, a \$2 billion endowment to replace the income that was cut by the state in the last few years. It is not realistic to say that the University can become private—even though the private funding it receives is essential and must be increased. He urged that this Committee and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning look at the study of the return on investment the University has commissioned. There is a need to look at revenue sources over time and identify important trends; it is also important to save money internally. The University must, for example, manage its 28 million square feet of space more prudently and productively.

-- The discussion at the "intellectual future" meeting in October.

-- The new Big Ten network for football, basketball, and other sports: it will substantially increase exposure for Olympic sports and will bring money to the University and help balance the budget in intercollegiate athletics. In addition, each Big Ten university will have 66 hours of non-athletic, nationally-broadcast programming. "What does the University want to put on its own Discovery channel," the President asked? The best ideas for this programming must come from the faculty and academic leaders.

Professor Chomsky thanked the President for joining the meeting.

7. Discussion with Provost Sullivan

Professor Chomsky next welcomed the Provost to the meeting.

The Committee discussed with Provost Sullivan highlights of the strategic positioning process and their status, including the investment in interdisciplinary research and the recommendations of the faculty culture task force. With respect to interdisciplinary research, Professor Martin commented that it would be helpful if junior faculty know that such work will receive appropriate consideration.

Professor Chomsky thanked Provost Sullivan for joining the meeting, briefly reviewed the agenda for the FCC retreat at the end of the month, and adjourned the meeting at 3:30.

-- Gary Engstrand