

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, July 20, 2006
1:15 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Carol Chomsky, (chair), Jean Bauer, Nancy Carpenter, Will Durfee, Barbara Elliott, Mary Jo Kane, (Lois Heller for) Kathleen Krichbaum, Scott Lanyon, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Nelson Rhodus, Steven Ruggles, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor
- Absent: none counted for a summer meeting
- Guests: Vice Provost Arlene Carney (Academic Affairs); Associate Vice President Donna Peterson (University Relations); John Engelen (Director, Federal Relations, University Relations)
- Other: Jon Steadland (Office of the Board of Regents); Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) welcome; (2) new faculty orientation; (3) Regents' policy on appearances before public bodies; (4) meeting with gubernatorial candidates; (5) discussion with the Director of Federal Relations; (6) a large number of other items of business]

1. Welcome

Professor Chomsky convened the meeting at 1:20 and welcomed new members to the Committee: Professors Durfee, Hoover, Kane, and Rhodus.

2. New Faculty Orientation

Professor Chomsky then welcomed Vice Provost Arlene Carney to discuss the expanded new-faculty orientation, which will, among other things, address two concerns raised by the FCC in the past—the need for new faculty to be more connected to the University and to know about faculty governance.

Dr. Carney began by relating that it became clear to her, when she started in her position as Vice Provost, that there was a need to enhance the new-faculty orientation. (This is a Twin Cities program.) In the past, it had been held in late September and was a one- or two-hour event with low turnout. The Faculty Culture task force concluded that new faculty do not identify with the University—with their departments, and sometimes their college, but not the University. She met several new faculty during the last year and asked how things were going; their responses suggested that they were encountering problems they should not. As a result, she began working on a revised new-faculty orientation. One of her colleagues pointed out that the University of Washington has a five-day new-faculty orientation; Dr. Carney said she thought that was too long but did decide to set up a three-day program. During the orientation, new faculty will see all three parts of the Twin Cities campus, because each of the three days

* 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.

will be held on different parts (St. Paul, West Bank, East Bank). Dr. Carney distributed copies of the tentative schedule for the orientation and added that she has a faculty and staff advisory committee, formed in April, that provided a great number of suggestions.

In brief, the tentative agenda calls for welcoming remarks by the President (day one) and the Provost (day two), and then a number of sessions that consider who the University's students are, human resource issues, teaching and learning, public engagement, diversity, mentoring, the University's organizational structure, faculty governance, research issues, fiscal responsibility, and (last, by design), promotion and tenure. There will also be an information fair the first day, with representatives from many campus offices. The University will pay for parking for those who attend and will also pay them \$200 per day (the dates of the orientation are before those with nine-month appointments begin work, but all will receive the stipends); the money may be added to their salary or placed in a department account for their use.

Professor Lanyon inquired how many new faculty there are. This year they have sent invitations to 135 faculty; they are planning on about 100, Dr. Carney said, and have received very good cooperation from the colleges. They are inviting visiting, clinical, and permanent (tenure-track) faculty. At this time they are not inviting P&A faculty.

Professor Martin, noting that Mr. Langley, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, will speak to the new faculty about "Taking Teaching Seriously," said that that is fine but that unless the message is reinforced by the chairs and deans, it will go in one ear and out the other. Dr. Carney agreed but said they could not deal with that issue at the orientation. Professor Chomsky said it helps that Provost Sullivan is providing the welcome immediately before the discussion on teaching and learning. Professor Rhodus asked if the Bush faculty development opportunities will be mentioned; Dr. Carney said it will be the sponsor of one of the receptions and that each participant will receive a 3-ring binder with handouts about all the information they need. Each individual will also receive a copy of his/her department's (tenure code) 7.12 statement, the tenure regulations, and so on.

Professor Chomsky wondered if the new faculty would be provided an organizational chart and information about the entire University, not just the Twin Cities. Dr. Carney said that Associate Vice President Maruyama would talk about the system—and it may be that the order of the presentations should be changed in the future. Professor Lanyon noted that there are field stations and research centers around the state and that people can be at the University for several years and not know about them; it would be helpful if someone could speak briefly about them as well. Professor Bauer pointed out that the University's new website is better in that regard but said that it would be helpful if Dr. Maruyama could touch on the outstate facilities in his remarks. Dr. Carney agreed.

Professor Kane said there appears to be no place to let new faculty know that they are coming to the institution at a moment of significant or even historic change due to strategic positioning. Dr. Carney said that the President and the Provost will both emphasize that point in their comments and will cover issues of strategic positioning.

What about those who come in mid-year, Professor Windsor asked? Some of those who are not starting at the University until January 2007 are nonetheless coming to the orientation, Dr. Carney said, and if not then, they will be invited for fall, 2007. Some new faculty who started last year are coming this fall. Some AHC faculty have trouble with a three-day event, given their clinical duties, but Senior Vice

President Cerra and Associate Vice President Brandt have been very supportive of AHC faculty attending.

Professor Martin suggested it would be helpful to check back with the new faculty in the spring. Dr. Carney said she will be focusing on the new faculty during the year as well. There will be two lunches for them that focus on specific topics and there will be two lunches that are open so that new faculty can meet with her and discuss how their year is going. They are also adding a web page for new faculty to the Provost's website, and a new faculty email address where individuals can ask questions and get answers. (They are also doing a research project on the orientation: exploring how faculty are connected to the University and the problems they face, learning whether the "treatment" (the orientation) had an effect, and will do the same thing again next year to see if problems identified this year are addressed). (They are seeking IRB approval.)

Are faculty at the other campuses being invited, Professor Heller asked? There is much that is important that these faculty also need to know. Dr. Carney said she had no problem with inviting faculty from the coordinate campuses, although she has been told that Morris offers an extensive orientation of its own, at about the same time as the Twin Cities program, but faculty from Duluth and Crookston would be welcome to attend if it fits with their own campus orientation plans. Professor Carpenter suggested one compromise might be that Provost Sullivan and the Center for Teaching and Learning Services each host a reception at the Morris campus, similar to the ones they are hosting for the Twin Cities orientation. (Professor Chomsky pointed out later in the meeting that it will be necessary to be mindful of union issues for the Crookston and Duluth campuses.)

Professor Lanyon recognized that perhaps the President and Provost would cover the topic, but many of the new faculty will not have been exposed to a land-grant university; it would help if that role were emphasized as well. And the University's relationship to the legislature, Professor Durfee added, so that if they read the newspaper, they'll be interested in what happens at the legislature. Dr. Carney said these topics will be part of the presentations.

Professor Durfee raised a question about the allocation of time at the orientation: there is almost an entire day devoted to teaching but only 90 minutes to research. Dr. Carney said that she and her colleagues had gone round and round about this issue. Vice President Mulcahy and his staff thought that 90 minutes was sufficient, and the reception on the third day is hosted by the Office of the Vice President for Research (and all the McKnight Professors and Regents Professors have been invited). She agreed that there should not be a full day on teaching and only a small time on research, but said that one of the focused lunches later in the year will be on research. They will also look at other ways to orient faculty to research. Professor Durfee suggested that grant-writing could be part of one of the orientation days. [Following the meeting, Dr. Carney pointed out that the time devoted to research is 90 minutes and to teaching 110 minutes, and 30 minutes have been added about research in response to comments, so the disparity between teaching and research is not as great as appeared.]

Professor Sullivan observed that it would help if Dr. Carney could find more time for research; this is a research university, he said, and it aspires to be among the top three in the world, so it is important to spend time on the subject. There could, for example, be sessions with faculty who are doing leading research of the kind the University wants to encourage. There could be representatives from interdisciplinary centers to talk about what they are doing. These would help people THINK research. The promotion and tenure presentation will need to be relevant to the University's aspirations.

Dr. Carney said she would provide the Committee with the PowerPoint slides she used to discuss promotion and tenure with the Board of Regents. She reported that the tenure rate at the University is 58% per cohort, comparable to both Penn State and the University of Michigan. Professor Sullivan opined that the numbers may be the same at Minnesota and Michigan, but they mean different things. At Minnesota many of those who leave go to better institutions but that that is not true at Michigan. Dr. Carney said that institutions will never report the numbers who did not get tenure and the number who left for other reasons as separate data points. Professor Sullivan maintained that it would be a mistake to conclude that Minnesota is as "tough" in tenure decisions as Michigan purely on the basis of these data. Dr. Carney said she was only making the point that the University's tenure rate is consistent with that at peer institutions.

Professor Bauer suggested that the list of community resources being provided include the alumni legislative network and the Alumni Association. Dr. Carney agreed and added that one of the sponsors of the second-day reception is Hennepin County, which wants to have people present to talk about interactions with the county.

Professor Kane wondered if the presentation by Vice President Mulcahy and others on research might not be oriented too heavily to medical and biological sciences. They must be sensitive to the fact that not all research is funded by large grants to support labs. Dr. Carney said that social scientists and those in the arts and humanities are making more and more use of the IRB and grants, but said that Vice President Mulcahy did a spectacular job of addressing the full range of research activities at the University. There will be break-out sessions for different research activities and it may be worthwhile to have one for the arts and humanities and social sciences.

Professor Rhodus recalled that last year the Twin Cities AAUP chapter (of which he is now president) and this Committee co-hosted lunches for new faculty. He asked if it would be possible to do such luncheons at the orientation or later in the year. Professor Chomsky said that the topic of events for new faculty is on the agenda of the next meeting, so his suggestion can be taken up at that point.

Dr. Carney thanked the Committee for its time and said that if Committee members have any ideas they should let her know of them. She said she hoped that some Committee members would attend the events at the orientation designed for discussion with more senior faculty, such as the receptions. Professor Martin said the expanded orientation is a terrific idea and that it would be helpful if Dr. Carney's office were to be perceived as the place where faculty in their third and fourth year could also check in. Dr. Carney said she describes her office as one of faculty advocacy and wants to learn what it is valuable for her to do. They are also revising the orientation for new department chairs, she said, and she will also go to each of the campuses to talk about faculty development. Professor Chomsky thanked Dr. Carney for joining the meeting.

3. Regents' Policy on Appearances Before Public Bodies

Professor Chomsky next welcomed Associate Vice President Donna Peterson from University Relations to discuss a revised regental policy on "Appearances Before the Legislature and Other Public Bodies." Professor Chomsky explained that the version before the Committee today was the result of several discussions by a small group that included her as well as Professors Martin and Sampson with Ms. Peterson and Ms. Cieslak and Mr. Steadland from the Regents' office. Some difficulties were ironed out,

and Board consideration of the policy was deferred so that the draft could be presented to the Committee for full discussion before it was taken up by the Board.

Associate Vice President Peterson told the Committee that the primary change from the existing 1957 policy and the revision is that it extends beyond the legislature to "public bodies," defined as "governmental organizations and agencies, including, but not limited to, federal, state, regional, county, or municipal legislative bodies, governing boards, councils, or commissions." The guiding principles are the same as before; the changes come in the disclosures required:

Subd. 4. Disclosures. University employees shall:

- (a) make clear whether they are appearing as a private individual or as a University representative when appearing before the legislature and other public bodies;
- (b) inform the president or delegate when appearing before state and federal legislative bodies on matters regarding University business or the University's legislative program; and
- (c) inform the president or delegate if named to serve on a committee or commission appointed by the governor or the legislature.

Ms. Peterson said that (a) requires that individuals MAKE CLEAR whether or not they represent the University; (b) applies only to appearances before the state or federal legislatures or their committees, and (c) is clear.

What mechanism should be used if one receives a call from legislative staff asking that someone appear in 30 minutes, Professor Hoover inquired? In general, the person calls her office and lets her know, Ms. Peterson said. Professor Hoover commented that she did not believe faculty know they should alert anyone, although they are often called on short notice to testify before a committee. Ms. Peterson emphasized that the University is not trying to stifle testimony; the point is that individuals must be clear whether they are testifying because of their specialized knowledge or there representing the University.

Professor Chomsky observed that the idea is coordination; there is no punitive mechanism in the policy. There will be communication to University employees to identify their responsibilities and whom it is they should call. Professor Hoover agreed that the phrase "University business" is sticky. Ms. Peterson said they want to use the policy as a foundation for letters to deans or department heads to identify a process to be used if individuals are appearing at a legislative body. She repeated that this is not an attempt to stifle; rather, often the University can help by providing information about the committee in question, the context of the issue, and the like. The University WANTS its faculty and staff to be called as experts, and the point is simply that in those cases they are not presenting a University position but providing expertise. Individuals from the University, through their testimony, can also help educate committees about what they do and why they are experts and how the University is important to the state. They want to encourage the legislature and its staff to think of the University as a resource.

Professor Chomsky said it would be helpful, in any letter that is sent out, to give examples of when faculty and staff should call about an appearance—and when a call is not necessary. Professor Lanyon noted that there are three categories in 3(a) but only two categories in 4(a). Professor Chomsky said one appears either as a private citizen or a University representative; it could be that one appears as a private citizen with expertise because of the person's job at the University.

What about private meetings with legislators, Professor Lanyon asked? Those are not covered, Ms. Peterson said; the policy only speaks to appearances before legislative bodies. Any follow-up letter should make that clear, Professor Lanyon suggested.

Does "inform" in Section 4 mean "inform in advance," Professor Durfee inquired? And if so, does that mean the University might say "no"? Ms. Peterson said that the intent of (c) is if one is NAMED, not just invited. Professor Chomsky noted that an earlier draft of the policy said the University should be informed before appearances whereas this draft does not; the ambiguity is intentional. She added that she did not believe the University would ever say "no." Would 4(c) apply to individuals serving as private citizens on such committees or commissions, Professor Ruggles asked? If someone is on a committee or commission appointed by the governor or legislature, they are probably serving as private individuals, Ms. Peterson said; that is the intent. Most people would be appointed because of their relationship to the University but not because the group is dealing directly with University business. The University welcomes its faculty and staff serving on committees and commissions.

One serves as a representative of the University if the University asks someone to testify, Professor Chomsky clarified, in response to a question. Professor Kane noted that she is asked to speak on Title IX because she is an expert, but she does not say she represents the University unless the University asked her to speak. She said she thought the criteria for representing the University are pretty clear.

Professor Sullivan asked about the higher education commission the Governor appointed. University faculty testified before the commission. Is that a public body because it was appointed by the Governor? Or is it non-public because it was not elected and not legislative? If it is considered a public body under the provisions of the policy, are there free speech issues that arise? This is not clear, he said, because in one case the higher education commission thought the individual was speaking for the University (when he was not). Professors Chomsky and Martin expressed the view that the higher education commission was a public body, as defined by the policy. What about the Itasca Group, created by the Minnesota Business Partnership? Ms. Peterson said that if the Governor appoints a commission, that is a public body covered by the policy. The Itasca Group, in contrast, is not, even if the Governor asked for its advice.

This policy, Ms. Peterson affirmed again, is in no way an attempt to stifle faculty from giving their opinions. They just want (1) it to be clear, for the policy-maker, if the individual is presenting a University opinion or his or her own view, and (2) to help faculty or staff who are asked to appear at a hearing. It also helps them when they know that a legislative committee or legislator respects someone at the University; that person could develop a relationship that will help the University work with the legislature to clarify issues. Professor Martin thanked Ms. Peterson for listening to their concerns and not trying to write a policy that would "bar faculty from yelling at their local government" for something they found problematic.

Professor Ruggles said that the old policy was clearer about what Ms. Peterson just said about intent; it explained the rationale and made a request. He regretted the loss of the language in the older policy. Professor Chomsky suggested that Ms. Peterson may want to think about putting some of the language back because something may have been lost (in part, perhaps, due to the process of streamlining Regents policies). The letter can also convey that intent, Ms. Peterson added.

Professor Kane commented that in the last year she has worked with Ms. Peterson and her staff at the legislature, something she had not done before. She said she wanted on record her thanks for the hundreds of hours they put in and the amount of work they do.

Professor Chomsky asked that Committee members email her if they believe there is language in the draft policy that still needs discussion or if questions will be answered in a follow-up letter to deans and department heads. She thanked Ms. Peterson and said the experience had been a good introduction to working with Ms. Peterson's office and the Regents' office; the conversations have been helpful, she said.

4. Meeting with Gubernatorial Candidates

Before Ms. Peterson departed the meeting, Professor Chomsky reported that she (Ms. Peterson) had raised the issue of possible informal meetings of the Committee with gubernatorial candidates after the primaries. Ms. Peterson suggested a small committee to meet individually with the candidates. The discussions would provide an opportunity to inform the rest of the faculty about the candidates' opinions about higher education as well as provide an opportunity to inform the candidates about higher education issues and to engage them on those issues as well. No matter who wins, such conversations would provide the opportunity for a voice for the University.

5. Discussion with the Director of Federal Relations

Professor Chomsky next welcomed John Engelen, Director of Federal Relations, to provide an update on federal and Congressional matters. (Later in the meeting, one of the new Committee members inquired who Mr. Engelen is; he explained that he works with the federal government although he has his office on the Twin Cities campus, he does not have an office in Washington although some universities do, his office has someone in Washington about 60% of the time, they represent the entire University, they are generalists who bring in specialists as they need them, and they belong to a number of consortia that deal with higher education issues. He said that the amount of time he spends on general higher education issues versus issues specific to the University of Minnesota varies—is increased funding for Pell Grants a University issue? Minnesota's representatives are leaders in the national associations, and part of being a top-three university is leadership. Universities are very collegial with respect to what is going on in Washington; if something comes up, his office will usually be involved in it, whether a national issue or a UM issue.)

Mr. Engelen began by noting that there are about two months' left in the current Congress and the clock is ticking. He reviewed Congressional developments since February, when President Bush sent a budget request for \$2.7 trillion in federal spending. Of that amount, about \$871 billion is discretionary for Congress. In that \$870 billion, for the first time in U.S. history, the President asked for more than 50% of discretionary spending for one agency, the Department of Defense. That meant that all other agencies were cut. The result was that it was difficult sledding from the get-go for higher education and everyone else. The proposed budget included a projected deficit of \$450 billion. There were a few kernels of positive news, such as the American Competitiveness Initiative, which proposed to provide additional funds for NSF and other agencies.

Congress has since worked on its own budget; both houses passed budget resolutions that used the President's numbers, but with different emphases. One Senate proposal would have doubled education spending (it failed; Senator Coleman supported it). The Specter-Harkin amendment added \$7

billion in education funding; that passed. The House proposal was sparser, but moderate Republicans wanted more spending for education; the Minnesota delegation helped lead that effort, but it failed. The House, however, has indicated it will support in a conference bill \$4 billion more for education. No conference has been held. So the House has moved ahead and divvied up money among subcommittees. The House has passed all appropriations bills; there are no cuts but also no big increases. Mr. Engelen commented that for those who use NIH funding, a flat budget is a cut. The Senate is way behind on appropriations, although it is moving forward. He said he did not expect great things from the Senate.

What does this mean? Congress will be back after Labor Day and then recess at the end of September, so there is only a short period of time for it to act. It could come back after the elections, when the Republicans might be a lame duck party of control, or may not be, and decide to do one big omnibus bill. Mr. Engelen cautioned that no one should expect pennies from heaven; the budget is driven by the war in Iraq, tight fiscal times, and the fact that Republicans are not in complete control (because moderates in the party are occasionally challenging the leadership).

Congress has not acted on the Higher Education Act reauthorization. The House approved reauthorization and there was a "McKeon" provision, but not the original one (which proposed loss of federal student financial aid if an institution violated federal caps on tuition increases). The most recent version calls for institutions to be placed on a watch list if they increase tuition beyond certain levels, but there is no enforcement provision or repercussions. There were also non-binding resolutions on academic freedom, transfer of credit, and accreditation. It is still a troubling bill, Mr. Engelen concluded. The Senate has not done much on it, and wants information on tracking students (what they study in college and what they do after graduation—the latter provision would require that the University begin tracking its alumni). The Senate bill would be better than the one approved by the house, but time is higher education's friend in this case, because they will have to start all over again next year if this Congress does not act on the reauthorization.

There is also a higher education commission, chaired by Mr. Miller from Texas, one of the prime movers behind No Child Left Behind. The commission is a very large and diverse group that includes representatives from all levels of higher education. The first draft report from the commission was very troublesome, with very inflammatory comments; the later draft did not include the inflammatory comments but seems to believe that universities are insulated from cost decisions because of tuition and donors. The commission also believes there should be better student data collection, there should be tuition benchmarks, and the student financial aid system should be redone. The final draft is due in October, but the question is what impact the report will have on Congress next year. Professor Martin asked who the commission talked to; Mr. Engelen said it had a series of meetings in the spring and Mr. Miller had dinner with the AAU presidents, including President Bruininks. Both former Michigan president James Duderstadt and former Wisconsin chancellor and ACE president David Ward have been strong voices on the commission.

The President vetoed the stem-cell research bill, which would have meant more funding for research. It was a symbolic gesture. The positive news is that both houses of Congress passed the bill by large majorities with support from a variety of quarters. If one favors federal funding of embryonic stem-cell research, one can take comfort from the fact that the walls blocking it are eroding and that public opinion supports it. The Congressional bill and the veto got the issue back on the front pages.

One big issue that could affect the University is net neutrality. In the case, the institution is caught between Google & Yahoo versus the telephone companies. If a telephone company had a music service, could it make its own service available faster than one from its competitors? If there are tollbooths, consumer access to the web could be affected. The University has taken a position on the issue but it is caught between a battle of the titans. Mr. Engelen said he believed net neutrality would disappear but that there would be rules on what providers can do. On the other hand, there is a huge coalition working on this issue, a coalition that has the Christian Coalition on the same side as Moveon.org, both siding with Yahoo. It is a big battle.

There is also troublesome language in the House version of the Homeland Security appropriation, Mr. Engelen said: it bars a university from receiving research funds if it has received funding for three years; the proposal comes from states with universities that do not compete well for funds. The provision will get knocked out, he predicted.

Following discussion of a few specific legislative matters, Professor Chomsky thanked Mr. Engelen for joining the meeting and providing his report.

6. Committee Business

Professor Chomsky begin the discussion of a number of items by commenting that now that she has seen the amount of work being chair of this Committee involves, she again wants to extend thanks to Professors Bauer and Sullivan for their work last year.

-- Professor Chomsky reported that FCC has been asked to name a faculty member to serve on an advisory committee for the 2008 food and beverage RFP. Committee members agreed on the names of individuals who might be asked. This contract, Professor Hoover said, has big implications for the Arboretum and the Bell Museum. It is important that the individual who serves represent all the faculty, Professor Martin commented.

-- She receives reports on administrative hires that the administration wants the Committee to know about, especially exceptional hires. There are two such hires to report on: one, assistant vice president for multicultural affairs (Kris Lockhart), and two, associate vice president for planning (Robert Kvavik). Professor Hoover asked that the Committee be provided a new organizational chart of the University administration so it could see where everyone fits in and what these units cost. Professor Bauer pointed out that the new budget model will provide information on how much colleges will be paying for these units.

-- Professor Sullivan asked if the Committee should look at the TCF contract in light of the newspaper article about it. Professor Chomsky recalled that there was a letter in the paper from Vice President Thrane indicating that everything in the contract was public and these provisions had been discussed.

-- A last appointment matter is Associate Vice President for International Programs; there was a search but it failed, so the administration is now making an interim appointment. Professor Martin said it is worrisome that the University conducts a search and is unable to find people able or willing to do the work. Professor Chomsky agreed but added that it is also good that the University admits a search has failed.

-- Committee members periodically have lunch with department chairs. Three lunches have been scheduled for this fall; Professor Chomsky asked Committee members to indicate which of the lunches they could attend. She said she has reviewed the lists of issues that were mentioned in past lunches with chairs and there are themes that emerge.

-- She and Professor Lanyon will meet with the chair and vice chair of the Twin Cities Deans Council to talk about communication between the two groups.

-- The President has responded to recent Senate actions. The administration does not support tuition benefits for dependents of University employees because it would impact a small percentage of University employees compared to other benefits such as the expanded scholarship initiative. The administration agrees that the waiting period for the Faculty Retirement Plan for faculty should be eliminated and they are looking at elimination of the waiting period for P&A staff.

-- The Committee had a brief discussion of the distribution of its minutes.

-- There will be a message to faculty, in the name of the Committee, about Senate policies (primarily on teaching and education) that faculty should know about. She and Professor McCormick are working with David Langley, of the Center for Teaching and Learning, to develop a message that can be used as an email message at the beginning of the year and handed out at the new-faculty orientation. Professor Chomsky said they would run the text of any message by the Committee for its review.

-- The Committee agreed on the nomination (to the President) of individuals to serve as Clerk and Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate next year.

-- Professor Chomsky noted the handout proposing bylaw changes clarifying that final authority for the Faculty Senate docket rests with this Committee, in its role as executive committee of the Faculty Senate. There were difficulties last year, she recalled, about what should be on the Senate docket, which led to the drafting of language that would make it clear where final authority rests. If the Committee believes this is desirable, parallel language can be drafted for the Senate Consultative Committee vis-à-vis the University Senate. The idea is that the Committee should be able to say what should be on the docket. Professor Bauer commented that had this provision been in place last year, it would have saved a lot of time and effort.

The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal.

-- A question arises from time to time about individuals continuing to serve on Senate committees after they have been given interim administrative appointments. The informal practice has been that individuals who are not candidates for the permanent position may continue to serve on Senate committees; the question has been resolved on a case-by-case basis. There is a Senate rule that administrators cannot serve if they hold administrative appointments of more than one-third time, but the rules say nothing about interim appointments.

It was agreed that the Committee would consider a set of general guidelines at its next meeting, perhaps with the assumption that committee service would end for individuals given interim

administrative appointments but that the FCC chair could grant exceptions upon request of the committee in question.

-- Professor Chomsky noted that this Committee has responsibility for naming or nominating people to various committees and other bodies. It has been difficult for this Committee to carry out that function and perhaps it should be delegated to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees could bring names to this Committee and could suggest a rank-ordering. Professor Lanyon said the ultimate responsibility would remain with this Committee, and FCC could generate its own names in addition to those provided by the Committee on Committees.

The Committee agreed without dissent to this proposal.

-- Professor Chomsky provided a brief report on the Regents' meetings. Normally she will attend meetings of the full Board and Professor Lanyon will attend meetings of the Board's Audit Committee; because he was unable to do so in July, she attended in his stead. The committee received a final report on the Regents' fiduciary responsibilities and how to execute them and the consultant discussed the culture of the University and how it is more difficult to manage faculty than corporate employees. The Board discussed the review of the President (a copy of the report was provided to Committee members and Professor Bauer noted that she had been interviewed, as FCC chair, about the President's performance). There was also a report from Provost Sullivan on strategic positioning (the report contained interesting items, such as that the libraries have jumped three places in national rankings and that the administration was committed to returning the libraries to the position they occupied in the 1950s and 1960s, they have hired someone to align capital outlays and facilities with academic priorities and that in September there will be a report on graduation rates, that the University is intent on keeping its promises to students about that issue). One student spoke and said that strategic positioning was going in the right direction and the University must continue to emphasize graduation rates and not let research drive everything.

Professor McCormick reported that at the Board's Educational Planning and Policy Committee, the item that filled the room was the University being major shareholder in a new business dealing with macular degeneration.

Professor Chomsky said that Professor Hendel, incoming chair of the Capital Projects and Campus Master Planning Subcommittee, attended the Facilities Committee of the Board. He noticed that there is an enormous challenge in finding space for new activities.

-- She attended a meeting of the Alumni Association Advocacy Committee, at which Vice President Thrane talked about "Driven to Discover" and the need to obtain funding from the Regents to support the effort. The group has an active network around the state and one focus of discussion was what it should focus on next year (it was the stadium last year). The group wants to focus on academic issues this year and decided to focus on the biomedical bonding effort—but there were questions raised about the effects of this issue on arts and humanities programs. There is recognition that there is a bigger university beyond the biomedical sciences.

-- Professor Chomsky reviewed the agenda for the next meeting, which includes governance issues and discussion with both the President and the Provost. She welcomed suggestions for issues to bring up with the President and Provost. Professor Hoover mentioned that the Committee has discussed the dean-

review process and the faculty role in evaluating the dean. Faculty must be evaluated by students in every class they teach; faculty should be provided the opportunity to evaluate the dean each year and those evaluations should be taken into account when the Provost reviews the dean. Professor Chomsky reported that Provost Sullivan and Vice President Carrier made a presentation to the Regents about supporting deans, and the question of their review could be revisited.

The issue of anonymity in faculty evaluation of deans was raised. There was some confusion about whether a dean could request faculty comments, with names. It was reported that, although some faculty members assumed anonymity of comments, others did not. It was commented that under Minnesota law deans may have the right to request the comments and the names. It was agreed the Committee needed to find out the facts of the matter.

(Following the meeting, Professors Chomsky and Lanyon met with Vice President Carrier and raised the question of anonymity in reviews. Under the rules of the reviews, comments by those who report directly to the person being reviewed are guaranteed confidentiality. Comments by those who have an indirect report (as with faculty members and their dean if they report to a department chair, not directly to the dean) are not guaranteed confidentiality if the dean himself/herself asks to see the full reports. BUT no dean under review did ask to review the comments in that form, so confidentiality was not breached in any case in the reviews completed this past year. There have been discussions centrally about the issue of confidentiality for even indirect reports and the desirability of changing the rules so that all comments would remain confidential (which would mean the identifying x500 data would be stripped from the comment at the outset and not retained.) Professor Chomsky noted that there are potential downsides to doing that (lack of accountability, and uncertain credibility of the commenter) as well as benefits (willingness of the commenter to be honest and complete if assured there could be no retaliation), and the benefits may be more important. She suggested that it was worth conducting at least one set of reviews with total confidentiality and then evaluating whether there were problems due to that decision.)

Professor Chomsky thanked everyone for staying for a long meeting and adjourned it at 4:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota