

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)
May 19, 2016
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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Issues and Priorities for Student Leaders; Preliminary Thoughts and Priorities for Graduate Education; Legislative Update; Discussion with Provost Hanson, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Decanal Reviews Update; Other Business]

PRESENT: Colin Campbell (chair), Jigna Desai (vice chair), Catherine French, Dan Feeney, Gary Gardner, Kathleen Krichbaum, LaDora Thompson, Susan Wick, Janet Ericksen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Joseph Konstan, Karen Mesce, Chris Uggen, Jean Wyman

REGRETS: Linda Bearinger, George Trachte, Dale Carpenter

ABSENT: Heidi Barajas

GUESTS: Nicholas Goldsmith, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS); Abeer Syedah, incoming president, Minnesota Student Association (MSA); Scott Lanyon, incoming vice provost and dean of graduate education; Executive Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson

OTHERS ATTENDING: Jonathan Borowsky, vice president of grants, COGS; Lauren Mitchell, speaker, COGS; Jon Steadland, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President; Deb Cran, chief of staff, Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

1. Issues and priorities for student leaders: Professor Campbell convened the meeting and welcomed Nicholas Goldsmith, president, Council of Graduate Students (COGS), and Abeer Syedah, incoming president, Minnesota Student Association (MSA) and the other students who joined them, Jonathan Borowsky, vice president of grants, COGS and Lauren Mitchell, speaker, COGS. Before beginning, Professor Campbell called for a round of introductions.

To begin, Mr. Goldsmith said an ongoing priority for COGS next year will be its work on student mental health. Additional priorities will include:

- Gender equity and gender inclusive restroom facilities.
- Parental leave and holes in the current policy, e.g., the language as currently written is gendered.
- Sexual harassment in terms of prevention and support for victims.

Next, Ms. Syedah outlined MSA's priorities for the 2016 – 2017 academic year:

- Student mental health.
- Improving the student academic experience:

- Provide recommendations for improving advising.
- Bring One Stop Student Services back.
- Provide students with information on how to interact with faculty and their classmates.
- Increase access to class and professor information on MyU.
- Promote use of comprehensive professor evaluations, and have this information available on MyU as well as discourage the use of *Rate My Professors*.
- Focus on the student experience outside the classroom, e.g., set up a food shelf on campus and resuscitate the student relationship with University Dining Services.
- Enhance overall student wellbeing.

Professor Campbell thanked Mr. Goldsmith and Ms. Syedah for sharing their priorities, and opened the floor for questions.

Regarding the issue of food, Professor French noted that some universities provide students with opportunities to learn how to cook and give them information about healthy ingredients. In addition to setting up a food shelf, it may be worth looking into partnering with Boynton Health Services to offer these types of services.

Why is MSA interested in bringing back One Stop Student Services, asked Professor Friedemann-Sanchez? Also, what has been the reception to having the student evaluations of teaching made public? Regarding One Stop, said Ms. Syedah, after MyU was launched, students' registration, unofficial transcripts, etc. shifted to MyU. While MyU can remain the center for some student resources, One Stop should be the hub for all campus resources. Professor Friedemann-Sanchez commented that it is extremely difficult to find courses in the new MyU system. Related to this, said Mr. Goldsmith, some graduate students know they can get assistance from the Office for Diversity in Graduate Education but there should be more places within the Graduate School that students can go to get assistance when they have issues.

In response to the earlier question about students having access to teaching evaluations, said Ms. Syedah, most students report not knowing how to access these evaluations. Students want to be able to access the evaluations so they know what to anticipate in a class, but currently most do not know how to get at this information.

In terms of the sexual harassment issue, Professor Uggen noted that the Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine, a standing committee in the Policy and Global Affairs division of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, is putting on a workshop next week at University of California, Irvine where he will be speaking. He said the University of California system is especially concerned about this issue. If anyone is interested in seeing the agenda, Professor Uggen said he would be happy to share it. Following up on this topic, Professor Campbell asked Mr. Goldsmith if he believes there are any easily achievable steps that can be taken related to the sexual harassment issue. Mr. Goldsmith said in conversations with Jan Morse, director and ombudsman, Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC), it is clear from faculty training on sexual harassment that faculty recognize this is a problem somewhere in the ether but many underestimate how looming the problem actually is.

COGS is still trying to figure out where some of the low hanging fruit is in dealing with this problem. After some further discussion on this issue, Ms. Syedah noted that many students are interested in 1) having sexual assault/harassment Crime Alerts include Aurora Center contact information (<http://aurora.umn.edu/>) and 2) offering customized, not one-size-fits-all sexual harassment training in order to meet people where they are at related to issue.

Professor Campbell asked Ms. Syedah to talk more about the issue(s) concerning University Dining Services (UDS) that she mentioned earlier. In the last year or so, the student/UDS relationship has deteriorated, and the students have been told it has something to do with personnel changes. The students have not had a meeting with UDS in the last year and a half or so. Additionally, students have gotten resistance to suggestions they have proposed, e.g., working with the Coca-Cola contract to move towards having reusable water bottles branded with the Coca-Cola name. Anecdotally, said Ms. Syedah, UDS complaints have increased significantly. Mr. Steadland from the Office of the President said he is aware that there are student groups meeting with UDS on a regular basis and he volunteered to find out who the FCC could invite from UDS to come talk about the issues that have been raised. While COGS has not tried to meet with UDS, said Mr. Goldsmith, concerns that graduate students mention are 1) variety of food choices on the St. Paul campus, and 2) limited hours on the West Bank.

Despite the fact that there are no grocery stores in Dinkytown, Professor Campbell said that he has heard progress is being made in this area. Ms. Syedah reported that a grocery store shuttle has been launched, and it runs on Sunday. The funding for this service came from Boynton Health Service (BHS), Cub Foods, and Parking and Transportation Services. MSA is also working with Jacob Frey, City of Minneapolis councilman, who is advocating for there to be a grocery store in the St. Anthony area.

Has the Target Express in Dinkytown helped with the fresh food availability issue, asked Professor Konstan? Ms. Syedah said it has helped significantly and students like it a lot.

In light of time, Professor Campbell thanked Mr. Goldsmith and Ms. Syedah for attending the meeting, and suggested inviting student leaders at least once a semester to future FCC meetings.

2. Preliminary thoughts and priorities for graduate education: Professor Campbell welcomed Professor Scott Lanyon, incoming vice provost and dean of graduate education, to talk about his preliminary thoughts and priorities for graduate education. Professor Lanyon began by saying that he genuinely hopes it will be possible to move forward with a Senate committee on graduate education. He said one of his major concerns about graduate education is its lack of visibility. Having a Senate committee would help elevate the visibility of graduate education, and provide a mechanism to get administration to pay more attention to graduate education issues. Additional priorities include:

- Increasing diversity and equity within graduate education.
- Offering courses/workshops for faculty on how to teach graduate students to write grant proposals in their disciplines, especially for fellowships. Professor Lanyon said he would like to see the number of external fellowships that graduate students are bringing in increase.

- Clarifying the graduate education roles of the Graduate School, the colleges, graduate programs, advisors, and students. There are likely things that are falling through the cracks because people think it is someone else's responsibility.
- Developing a communication campaign in collaboration with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) to explain what graduate education is because it is often misunderstood.

In terms of communicating what graduate education is, said Professor Gardner, he suggests compiling data on the number of graduate alumni who are teaching at Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) institutions. Professor Lanyon agreed, but he would also like to know how many graduate alumni with Master's and PhD degrees are in the Minnesota workforce, but who are not in higher education. Regarding postdoctoral students, said Professor Gardner, the University has all but abandoned them, and this needs to be addressed. Professor Lanyon recalled a conversation with Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Rebecca Ropers-Huilman about where postdocs belong, in the Graduate School or her office, and the conclusion was that they belong in the Graduate School. Along these same lines, there is the question of whether graduate education and professional education should be combined; there is logic for both, combining and not combining. Similarly, regarding postdocs and research associates, there is a tendency to lump them together, and, while there are reasons to do so, in Professor Lanyon's opinion, there are better reasons to keep them separate. He said he has asked one of his staff people to look into best practices at other institutions regarding postdocs.

Professor Wick noted that the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) has made a concerted effort to devote half of its time over the last two to three years to graduate affair issues. If and when a graduate education Senate committee comes to fruition, the SCEP charge will need to change. With that said, however, she thinks SCEP should continue to look at all undergraduate and graduate education policy matters. Professor Lanyon agreed.

Professor Konstan commented that the University has done a poor job knowing what has happened with its graduates, both undergraduate and graduate students, after they leave the University. He said he does not think this responsibility belongs in the Graduate School, but he does think it belongs somewhere in the Provost's Office. Professor Konstan suggested Professor Lanyon advocate for the University to make a concerted effort to not only maintain contact with its graduates, but to do appropriate periodic follow-up for informing assessment with its graduates. Another issue, said Professor Konstan, is the unsustainable financials for graduate education. Professor Lanyon replied by saying graduate education is central to the institution and it needs to figure prominently into the University's Capital Campaign. With that said, Professor Lanyon noted that he plans to strongly encourage colleges to make graduate fellowships and graduate support central in their capital campaigns and to assist them in anyway he can.

Professor Uggen reported recently having had a NSF budget cut, and what would be helpful would be to get a tuition grant so he could hire someone that is not all but degree (ABD) for the research assistantship. He said often he is unable to train students in their first, second and third years because he cannot afford the tuition.

Professor Wyman said there are at least some PhD programs at the University exploring offering online PhD programs. While there would be pros and cons to doing this, has any thought been given to this? Professor Lanyon said he knows this is a conversation that is taking place, but beyond that he does not know more at this time. He added, however, that it is important philosophically that the University design graduate education to serve graduate students. The perception that there is a glut of PhD students on the market is harmful to graduate education, and, if it is true, it is harmful to graduate students. If a graduate program is only training students to be faculty members then graduate programs should be very small, but if this is not the case, graduate programs should be training students for a diversity of careers.

Professor French noted that she liked Professor Lanyon's idea of the proposal writing workshops for fellowships, and thinks it should also be offered for undergraduate students, especially those doing undergraduate research opportunities programs (UROPs). She also suggested creating some online resources for faculty so they can use them within their own discipline.

For some programs, said Professor Mesce, the National Institutes for Health (NIH), for example, rewards programs that have generated students that go on to have academic careers. In some cases, if a graduate student does not go on to have an academic position, programs could be penalized. There have been recent conversations within NIH about the fact that the workforce is changing and students need to be trained to do a lot of different things in a lot of different places. It will be interesting to see what comes out of this internal debate. In Professor Lanyon's opinion, if legislators learned that there was a bias in the NIH for academia that would be an issue. He believes legislators are more in favor of diverse career paths.

3. **Legislative update:** The committee went off the record and received a legislative update from Professor Gardner.

4. **Update on meeting with Dr. Sophia Vinogradov:** Professor Campbell took a couple minutes and provided a brief update on his recent meeting with Dr. Sophia Vinogradov, head, Department of Psychiatry. He reported that she made an enormously positive impression on him, and she requested to meet with the FCC at their first meeting in the fall.

Professor Wyman said she serves on the Community Oversight Board and Mark Paller, interim chair, Department of Psychiatry, presented to them. She said she was very impressed with what that department has done to turn things around, and has heard that communication has improved and is much more open.

5. **Discussion with Provost Hanson:** Professor Campbell welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting. Provost Hanson began with the following updates:

- The Strategic Plan agenda is in the process of being set for next year. She welcomed any thoughts, either positive or constructive, regarding the plan that members have.
- Garry Jenkins has been named the new University of Minnesota Law School dean - <http://twin-cities.umn.edu/news-events/garry-jenkins-named-new-u-m-law-school-dean-0>. Information about his background was shared with the committee.

- The Student Conduct Code has been under revision this term, and there has been a fair amount of attention given to how medical amnesty will get added to the Code. This was an agenda item at the May Board of Regents meeting and will also be on their June agenda.
- The Provost's Committee on Student Mental Health has drafted a white paper. It is a long, thoughtful report that contains a number of recommendations. She added that Professor Campbell has talked with her about a complementary faculty committee to look into this issue.

Professor Campbell said the sense of this committee and the students it has met with is that it would be helpful to convene a mental health task force that would mirror the Special Committee on Graduate Education that Professor Lanyon chaired a few years back. He noted that Professor Wick has volunteered to chair such a task force because she has time and it is an issue she cares deeply about. Provost Hanson noted that while the Provost's Committee on Student Mental Health is led by BHS Student Counseling Services, it does have faculty and student representation on it, but its focus is on mental health clinic services, community therapists, prevention, and early intervention. The goal, said Professor Campbell, will be to draft a charge, recruit volunteers to serve on the task force, then to start meeting in the fall, and have a report completed by the end of the calendar year.

Professor Feeney reported having gone to the Board of Regents budget forum on Friday, May 13 where he briefly spoke about Finance and Planning's concern about the financial sustainability of the institution. However, the arguments about the need for more mental health resources that the students made were moving, sincere and compelling.

Professor Campbell noted that he, Professor Wick and the students have talked about stress and stress management and he believes there needs to be a discussion about where the stress is coming from as opposed to creating heroic people that can withstand it. This issue needs to be looked at from a faculty perspective in terms of what are faculty doing to contribute to this problem, and how faculty can be better informed by means of continuing education and research-based practices.

Regarding the task force, said Professor Friedemann-Sanchez, non-traditional student groups such as veterans and international students should be specifically looked at. Professor Wick agreed and said international students sometimes face additional stigma when it comes to dealing with mental health issues because mental health can be a taboo topic in many cultures.

Professor Campbell said while faculty frequently complain about the difficulties they have engaging with the administration, they also complain about the apathy of their faculty colleagues when it comes to participation in faculty governance. With that said, he asked Provost Hanson her thoughts on what can be done to inspire greater buy-in from the faculty to participate. In his opinion, for example, every faculty member should, to a degree, understand the finances of the institution. There is a great need to develop an infrastructure that provides faculty with a greater understanding of how the institution works. Faculty are intelligent, but not necessarily knowledgeable, and this can be a bad combination. Professor Desai added that there has been a change of culture, which requires more faculty participation in different

domains; however, faculty often do not think about contributing as leaders in shared governance and understanding the issues facing higher education. Just like research ethics needs to be cultivated so does participation in shared governance – this should be established as a norm from the beginning. It is hard to do this though because all the work that “counts” is the other things faculty do, e.g., research and teaching. Faculty citizenship is not rewarded in the same way as research and teaching and this needs to change if the goal is participation in shared governance.

In Professor Konstan’s opinion, because faculty are smart and assume they know how the institution operates and functions this causes two problems 1) it can be difficult to have meaningful consultation with faculty because often their knowledge is dominated by the belief that common sense means something is automatically true, and 2) for all the orientation that faculty get when they are hired, no one tells them how things work and why they work the way they do, which causes smart people to generalize from lack of information resulting in dangerous assumptions that eventually harden into strong convictions.

Professor Campbell asked Professor Ericksen if the Morris campus experiences the same apathy when it comes to participation as the Twin Cities campus. Yes, said Professor Ericksen, and probably even to a greater degree. Because the Morris campus is small, it needs people to participate. One of the messages that the system campuses get from the Twin Cities campus is that if no one cares enough to participate then why should they bother to participate. As mentioned earlier, faculty are not told why participation in shared governance is important and why they should care.

Provost Hanson asked members whether they have talked with their colleagues who do not participate in governance, and wondered how they responded. Professor Campbell said people do not care until they do so at any point in time there are not many people who are passionate about an issue(s). Over time, it may be possible to capture people’s interest if there was web content or a clearinghouse of information to inform people about the importance of shared governance.

Professor Feeney commented on the institution’s failure to instill a sense of what is the academy. Is the academy a department, a college or the institution? As long as faculty continue to be department and/or collegiate-centric, and no one is pays attention to what is going on across colleges then this institution will stay the same. There is little to no encouragement at the department or college level to participate in shared governance, and, in fact, sometimes there is discouragement. Professor Konstan said the culture of academia, unlike the corporate world, for example, does not encourage knowing how the institution works.

Going back to Professor Desai’s earlier comment on outcome measures in terms of where faculty spend their time, said Professor Friedemann-Sanchez, in her opinion, when faculty get promoted that service requirements should go up. She added that the current merit review process disincentivizes participation/service. There is a disconnect between the merit review process and the tenure code process. She said she was told that faculty do service at their own

peril. Professor Campbell noted that he was told that service is what a faculty member's department head protects them from.

Professor Gardner said there is a lack of standardization when it comes to the merit review process. Currently, there is no standard method of translating the point score from the merit review into dollars; each college and sometimes each department does it differently. The current reward system and recognition of quality work needs attention. The faculty want a university that cares about them and the great work they do, and not just the amount of grant dollars they bring in. Professor Gardner suggested contacting any number of large, Minnesota research-based companies and inquiry about how they conduct their merit reviews with their research scientists, e.g., how they evaluate long-term research in their organization.

Professor French asked Provost Hanson if the Salary Equity Review Committee (SERC) process is continuing because she has not heard anything of late about her collegiate SERC. Provost Hanson said she is checking with the Office of Human Resources (OHR) about whether the SERC process can continue while the Maintenance of Status Quo order is in effect. In Professor French's opinion, merit increases should periodically involve looking at faculty member's curricula vitae (CVs) every ten years or so because there could be discrepancies that can compile over time. Most merit increases are based on a one-year snapshot of a faculty member's productivity and if the quantitative productivity is high in a year where funds for merit increases are low, the faculty member may not be compensated appropriately. It may be more appropriate to use a multi-year snapshot. Some departments provide one time compensation for service activities rather than salary increases that can have an impact on long-term compensation. On the other hand, some faculty may be compensated for the number of UROPs advised, etc., which may overly compensate them in subsequent years. There may be other issues such as favoritism, etc. that can have an impact. Professor French said she participated in the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) SERC where the committee only had time to spot-check the data (e.g., salary relative to time since degree) to identify trends/outliers/discrepancies. Departments should look more closely at the data to look for further discrepancies. Provost Hanson agreed and said the practices across campus are stunningly different. Members then went on to share examples of practices used in their departments.

Getting back to increasing shared governance participation, Professor Desai suggested once a faculty member gets tenure that they should be invited sit in on a Senate committee meeting so they can actually see the work getting done.

Sometimes when serving on a committee it can feel as if members are just rubberstamping decisions that have already been made, said Professor French. Recently, however, it seems as if a culture change is underway and faculty are working more with the administration to effect change rather than just listening passively. When people feel their voices are being heard and they are having an impact on the decision-making process, they are more likely not to feel as if they are wasting their time. She said she is hopeful that this culture change will make people feel as if their opinions are being valued and they can effect change.

In light of time, Professor Campbell thanked Provost Hanson for a good discussion.

6. **Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Decanal Reviews update:** Before adjourning, Professor Campbell reported that he, and Professors Konstan, Bearinger and Krichbaum will meet to talk about the decanal review process and provide recommendations to the provost who is interested in receiving this input.

7. **Other business:** Professor Gardner asked if there would be faculty legislative liaisons next year. Professor Campbell said yes, and hopes by the end of May the process for identifying these individuals will be squared away. Professor Gardner said that faculty need to decide if they want representation at the legislature independent of whether the administration wants it to happen or not.

On a different note, Professor Campbell said he hopes to see members at the June FCC meeting, but for those unable to attend he thanked members for their service this past year.

8. **Adjournment:** Hearing no further business, Professor Campbell adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office