

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, December 18, 1997
1:00 - 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall

Present: Victor Bloomfield (chair), Kent Bales, Carole Bland, Gary Davis, Virginia Gray, David Hamilton, Russell Hobbie, Laura Coffin Koch, Leonard Kuhi, Michael Korth, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Harvey Peterson, Matthew Tirrell

Absent: Mary Dempsey, Gary Gardner, M. Janice Hogan

Guests: Professor Carol Chomsky (Law; Task Force on Faculty Consultation); President Mark Yudof

Others: Professor Charles Campbell, Martha Kvanbeck (University Senate)

[In these minutes: Faculty representation to the regents; health care; role of the General Counsel; information technology charges; faculty ambassadors; recommendations of the task force on faculty consultation; discussion with President Yudof (the budget, balances, position of Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School)]

1. Various Items of Business

Professor Bloomfield convened the meeting at 1:00, and turned first to Professor Marshak for a report on the legislature and the University's request. The Committee went off the record for this discussion; it touched on legislative and gubernatorial views of the University's capital and supplemental request, the state of the economy, issues that may be contentious, and related matters. Professor Bloomfield suggested, as Professor Marshak concluded, that it would be worthwhile to develop a set of talking points for faculty on those issues that may turn out to be controversial.

Professor Bloomfield then touched on several matters. First, he reported that prospects are getting better for faculty participation in regents' meetings. While granting ex officio faculty seats on regental committees has not been approved, there is talk of inviting faculty presentations to the committees when issues of broad concern arise. Examples would include graduate education, or research, or outreach, or health insurance coverage. He said that progress on this issue has been satisfactory.

Second, the state has invited the University to add two additional representatives to the health planning committee (not the negotiating committee); one person would come from the faculty and one from the P&A staff.

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Third, he has spoken with General Counsel Mark Rotenberg about the role of the General Counsel in academic misconduct. Mr. Rotenberg has distanced himself from the implications in the draft policy about the role of his office. He said the General Counsel will not advise an accused faculty member, but will not advise the accuser, either, and will play more of a referee role. The policy is being redrafted accordingly. Mr. Rotenberg also said he would try to draft a statement on the position of the General Counsel's office with respect to the defense and indemnification of faculty.

Professor Bloomfield next turned to Professor Hobbie for a brief comment on information networking, following up on two emails that he (Hobbie) had sent to FCC members. Networking and Telecommunications Services has developed a cost model, which it says is required by OMB circular A21; if adopted, it would likely mean telephone costs would decline, but there would be charges (about \$10) for 20,000 Internet nodes that have not before carried charges. This would have a severe effect on colleges and departments with large computer labs, he pointed out; they would save a little money on telephones, but see a significant increase in other charges. The Senate Committee on Information Technology (SCIT) is concerned about this issue.

It was agreed that the issue should be taken up by other committees, particularly SCIT and the Finance and Planning Committee, and recommendations should thereafter be brought to FCC.

Professor Bloomfield then asked Professor Bland to report on faculty ambassadors. Professor Bland reported that the program is ready for implementation; the purpose is to showcase the University through the faculty by having them share their expertise and at the same time build grass-roots support for the University (e.g., the capital request). To begin, Professor Bloomfield and President Yudof will invite a pilot group of faculty to participate, and a group of speakers will be advertised, by topic--topics that the News Service or External Relations receive requests about. Later, all faculty will be invited to participate. The program will be run by External Relations. This program, Professor Bloomfield reported, has been mentioned to the Board of Regents as part of the communications plan.

2. Task Force Report on Faculty Consultation

Professor Bloomfield now welcomed Professor Carol Chomsky to the meeting to lead a discussion of the report of the task force on faculty consultation. He began by thanking Professor Chomsky and the task force members for their hard work, and asked her to highlight the points, what needed attention, and said the Committee would return to the report in January to prepare for presentation of materials to the Senate in February.

Professor Chomsky began by reviewing the charge and history of the task force (primarily the need for a new consultative structure, given the reorganization of the central administration) and the premises upon which the task force worked. The latter included the proposition that valuable consultation occurred through the provostal consultative committees, and that the benefits of that consultation should be retained but that multiple committees doing the same things should not. The task force consulted with the deans and central officers (current and former) and received useful recommendations from them.

The task force recommends removing reference to the provostal consultative committees from the Assembly bylaws. The Academic Health Center committees wish to continue; the Senate Consultative Committee should support that request and acknowledge the AHC committee by working it into the

consultative structure, even if it is not formally chartered by the constitution and bylaws. The other two provostal consultative committees should not continue, but their functions should be picked up by the Twin Cities Assembly Steering Committee (the Twin Cities faculty members of the Faculty Consultative Committee).

Professor Chomsky then highlighted the principal recommendations of the task force. (The report is available on the Senate web page, www.umn.edu/usenate/reports/facgovernance.html); the abstract of recommendations appears on pages two and three of the report.) In brief, they are:

- FCC should adopt a set of principles for governance and consultation
- Senators should be expected to communicate on a regular basis with college faculty and governance bodies; they are the primary representatives and should be a vehicle for communication; they should be given priority for participation on Senate committees, and should be provided easily-accessible material on issues coming before the Senate
- Senate committees should circulate drafts to Senators as early as possible, and to permit wider consultation, should where possible bring proposals in conceptual form to the Senate, ex officio representation should be reviewed, and representation from the Academic Health Center should be considered
- Faculty should be provided with photographs and statements for candidates for FCC
- Twin Cities FCC members should consult with the Provost, and the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences, about issues of concern to Twin Cities campus colleges, perhaps in clusters; the Twin Cities FCC members should meet occasionally with senators from the colleges; there should be more joint meetings of standing committees and more use of joint administration-faculty ad hoc task forces to deal with specific issues
- Each college should look at its governance structure and try to make it more effective; there should be an independent consultative committee which should meet regularly
- College consultative committee chairs should be ex officio members of the Senate, and FCC should sponsor an annual workshop for them
- The chair of the AHC FCC should be an ex officio member of the Senate, and should meet quarterly with the FCC
- Performance reviews of administrators should include evaluation of consultation performance, and deans should be encouraged to attend Senate meetings (as ex officio members)
- There should be an orientation session on governance each fall for all new faculty and administrators; FCC should request an opportunity to meet with new regents to introduce them to the governance and consultation system.

Professor Bloomfield suggested that FCC members send comments to the staff, and that the Committee then review the comments in January, in preparation for recommendations to the Senate in February.

In response to queries, Professor Chomsky said the task force did not envision more Senate meetings, that there may be some additional work required of FCC members (in connection with consultation on Twin Cities matters with Provost Bruininks), and that alerting people to issues that may require their attention will mean distributing agendas more broadly.

Professor Bloomfield thanked Professor Chomsky for her presentation.

3. Discussion with President Yudof

Professor Bloomfield next welcomed the President to the meeting.

Dr. Yudof said he did not have a great deal to report on; he started with a discussion (off the record) about the legislature, relationships with MNSCU and the private colleges, and state budgetary matters. He reported that he and Professor Morrison would be working together on budget issues, and asked the Committee to give them time to do so; he expressed the hope that progress could be made.

The President also spoke about the need for legislators to hear from their constituents, and commented that thus far the University's request is being well-received by the legislature. He commented on the University's plans with respect to working with the legislature.

Professor Peterson inquired how the President felt about a cooperative arrangement with one of the North Dakota tribal colleges. Dr. Yudof said it was the faculty's job to decide if such programs were academically valid; if the dollars involved are reasonable and the faculty support them, the programs would be implemented and are good outreach efforts.

The President also announced that the Budget Office, headed by Mr. Pfutzenreuter, would now report to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, with a dotted line relationship to the President. The President said he wanted direct access to the budget officer, he hoped the faculty approved the change, and that this would embed budgeting in the academic side of the house.

Asked how it was working with having so many units report to Dr. Bruininks, and if he was overloaded, Dr. Yudof said that Dr. Bruininks has appointed four very good vice provosts, but that it may be necessary to make changes. Some responsibilities could perhaps, for example, be picked up by the Vice President for Research.

Professor Marshak then led for a few moments an off-the-record discussion of account balances, speaking of why they were building up (e.g., departments see them as required under IMG) and why they needed review.

One suggestion for the uses of balances that departments might have in mind is to fund sabbaticals. President Yudof said sabbaticals must be a priority, and he is thinking about them in connection with the possible upcoming capital campaign. Professor Gray earlier suggested raising private funds to supplement faculty salaries as one way to be more competitive, he recalled; it would be very useful if funds could also be raised for sabbaticals, freeing up funds in the departments that could be used for other purposes.

Discussion then turned to the role of the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, and specifically whether or not the two positions should be separated. Professor Kuhi raised questions about the responsibilities of the two positions; Professor Hamilton called the present position "schizoid," and said the two sets of responsibilities are almost incompatible.

President Yudof said he had heard these sentiments expressed before, but had concluded he would

not hold the search hostage to a decision on these issues. He asked the Committee how it felt about the possibility of separating the two positions, and what process should be used to do so. In response to this question from the President, Committee members offered views that all supported separating the two positions:

- (Tirrell) It is worth thinking about, and there are arguments each way, but the research/intellectual property enterprise is getting bigger, and could reasonably be split off from the Graduate School; the philosophical argument is about the link between graduate education and research, but it could be argued that the Vice President for Research handles the business side of the research enterprise.
- (Kuhi) The research enterprise is growing, and the University has given away a great deal of intellectual property; that argues for a separate research vice presidency.
- (Hamilton) Supported the separation, and suggested the President ask a group of faculty to draft a proposal and consult with the administration on it.
- (Bales) It makes sense to have two positions; the term "schizoid" is accurate. The Graduate School must have an academic view, and it must have money to provide to programs that do not generate a lot of external funding.
- (Morrison) The two positions should be separated, and the current one is "schizoid." The incumbent must spend most time on the research enterprise, and little on graduate education. One could also ask if responsibility for graduate education could be transferred to the deans or elsewhere.
- (Marshak) The regulator function makes sure things are done within the guidelines; the entrepreneur promotes the academic mission; it is not clear which is which in the current structure. There is tension, and since the office is overloaded with the regulatory function, the entrepreneurial function is lost. Michigan emphasizes the entrepreneurial function, which Minnesota has lost.
- (Koch) Splitting the positions would be desirable, but with a new structure, one of the two new officers must not become the little sibling. The role of the Graduate School should not be diminished.

Professor Campbell recalled that he had served as chair of the planning task force and said he supported the split. He said the task force had recommended creation of the vice presidential position in order to ensure a proper presence for research in the central administration. He expressed the hope that any restructuring would be cost-neutral.

The President said that he would think about the possibility of dividing the two positions, and that if it were done, it would be a cost-neutral change if done right. Asked if the campus would be divided about such an action, Professor Bloomfield suggested there would be different opinions, but none overwhelming. He said that consultation with the Senate would be appropriate, although formal consent would not be required.

Professor Bloomfield thanked the President for joining the meeting, and then adjourned FCC so

Faculty Consultative Committee
December 18, 1997

6

that it could reconvene in a joint meeting with the Committee on Faculty Affairs to discuss post-tenure review and other matters.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota