

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 17, 2007
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Carol Chomsky, (chair), Gary Balas, Jean Bauer, Nancy Carpenter, Barbara Elliott, Marti Hope Gonzales, Megan Gunnar, Emily Hoover, Kathleen Krichbaum, Judith Martin, Nelson Rhodus, Steven Ruggles, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor, Becky Yust

Absent: William Durfee, Mary Jo Kane, Scott Lanyon, Richard McCormick, Martin Sampson, Geoffrey Sirc

Guests: Senior Vice President Robert Jones, Senior Vice President and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Vice Provost Arlene Carney; Senior Vice President Frank Cerra

Other: Deb Cran (Office of the Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration)

[In these minutes: (1) committee business; (2) copyright policy; (3) issues from the Morris campus; (4) tenure procedures; (5) discussion with Senior Vice President Cerra]

1. Committee Business

Professor Chomsky convened the meeting at 1:20 and welcomed Professor Yust, a newly-elected member of the Committee. She extended congratulations to Professor Sullivan on the occasion of his election to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; the Committee gave him a round of applause.

The comments by the members of the Board of Regents about the revisions to the tenure code were very complimentary and positive, Professor Chomsky reported, and Board members took note of the unanimous vote of approval by the Faculty Senate. The Board recognized that there is significant change in the code, in keeping with strategic positioning. The Provost told the Board that the outcome was a result of the process used, Professor Chomsky added.

2. Copyright Policy

Action on the copyright policy has been delayed to the fall, Professor Chomsky told the Committee; after this Committee as well as Academic Freedom and Tenure and the Research Committee asked that the process be slowed down, the Provost agreed it should receive further discussion. Revisions will need to go back to those committees; should it also go to the Senate for review? She has told the Provost the policy could come to the Faculty Senate on October 4, and that there are so many different things the faculty produce that the discussion cannot be limited to a few people participating in governance.

* 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.

Professor Ruggles said that if the intention is to keep the provision that takes away faculty ownership of instructional materials, there will be trouble. He said the discussion at this Committee had been similar to that at the Research Committee, and while the new draft of the policy is better, it is still unacceptable.

Professor Krichbaum said she would rank this with tenure in terms of its importance. The difference is that with tenure the Faculty Senate can vote, it was said; with the copyright policy, all it can do is complain. This Committee can raise the question of whether there should be a Senate policy and a Regents' policy, Professor Chomsky said; should it be suggested the policy go to the Senate for approval? The Committee reached no conclusion about whether to bring the policy to the Senate for action but it did conclude the draft should be sent to all faculty to invite them to comment on it. Faculty on 9-month appointments may not get to it until August, Professor Martin observed, which is another reason to slow the process down.

3. Issues from the Morris Campus

Professor Chomsky turned now to Senior Vice Presidents Jones and Sullivan for a discussion of issues related to the Morris campus. She recalled that several Committee members visited the Morris campus in December and had extensive conversations with committees and faculty and prepared a report (a copy of which is appended to these minutes). There were three overarching issues: resource concerns, strengthening academic relationships between Morris and the Twin Cities campus, and administrative structure and reporting clarity for the Morris campus.

The Committee agreed that the discussion would be off the record in order that it be frank. The Committee and the Senior Vice Presidents discussed:

- financial issues (the Native American tuition waiver, the impact of the budget model)
- faculty salaries
- administrative reporting (As delegated by the President, Morris reports to Senior Vice President Jones. However, as Provost, Tom Sullivan is responsible for matters of tenure and promotion, approval of new academic programs and curriculum changes. All other academic matters, programmatic, personnel, budget issues, and day-to-day administrative oversight are Senior Vice President Jones' responsibility.)
- involvement of the Morris campus in strategic positioning
- communications
- linking Morris and the Twin Cities more closely; collaboration between the two campuses
- access to library resources on the Twin Cities campus (an issue that is being addressed)

Dr. Jones said he would work with Vice Provost Carney and Provost Sullivan to try to address the issues raised in the report from the Committee. It was agreed that the Committee would revisit next year what had happened with the recommendations it had made.

4. Tenure Procedures

Professor Chomsky noted that the tenure procedures document has been redone by the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. She said she has asked the chair of the Committee, Professor Clayton, if this Committee should look at the revised document before it goes to the faculty as a whole. Would it

work to bring the document to this Committee, even though that would delay action until the July FCC meeting?

Vice Provost Carney said she would be glad to walk through the changes with the Committee. She reported that she plans to send out a document identifying what is different about the new procedures. They are much clearer, she said. The Committee agreed to consider the Procedures in July, after Professor Clayton returns and is able to join the discussion.

5. Discussion with Senior Vice President Cerra

Professor Chomsky welcomed Dr. Cerra to the meeting for his biannual discussion of issues related to the Academic Health Center. Professor Balas started the conversation by asking Dr. Cerra what he thought of the proposal for a medical school at St. Thomas.

Dr. Cerra noted that the proposal is that Allina and St. Thomas will jointly form a new medical school next to Abbot-Northwestern hospital. It is their view that they must address three major areas: prevention, chronic disease management, and end-of-life care (issues that all medical schools are focused on) and that there are not enough primary-care physicians, so they need to start a new medical school. The boards of the two organizations are doing a feasibility study.

They will need a lot of money, Dr. Cerra observed, and must learn what a medical school is and is not. The question of whether Minnesota needs more family-practice/primary-care physicians is a good one, he said. There are parts of Minnesota that are classified federally as facing a shortage of doctors and those areas need family-practice physicians. If, however, one looks at the ratio of doctors to people in the state generally, supposedly Minnesota has a sufficient number of doctors, so the issue is distribution and how far someone should have to drive to see a doctor. Moreover, the University's family-practice programs are not full (a phenomenon true across the country); if there is a shortage of family-practice doctors, why don't Allina and St. Thomas work with the University to fill those programs?

If the two organizations really want to focus on prevention, chronic disease management, and end-of-life care, one can question whether that is best accomplished with physicians. The expertise of nurse-clinicians and clinical pharmacists is more effective in both outcomes and costs. That is the path the schools of the Academic Health Center are looking into.

The operating cost of a medical school is about \$1 million per student per year. Instructional costs alone are \$200,000 per year per student, fully loaded. If the plan for the new school is to graduate 40 students per year, it would have 160 students, so would cost about \$160 million per year. Primary-care/family-practice physicians leave medical school with a debt-to-income ratio of about 2:1: they have about \$180,000 to 200,000 in debt and their average starting salary is \$80,000 - \$100,000. It can take 25-30 years to pay off the debt. That is one reason the slots in the family-practice programs are not full, Dr. Cerra concluded. Others include lifestyle, reimbursement for services, and geographic challenges.

So how will a new medical school be financed? If by endowment, and one assumes a 5% return on the endowment, there will need to be an endowment of \$20 million per student. There would need to be lots of money, Dr. Cerra said, and if the donor community put that kind of money in a new medical school, "what is left for the rest of us?" Those are the problems for the community but Minnesota is not

that big a place. With about 5 million people it has done amazing things, but it can water down its accomplishments.

Professor Gunnar said she thought there were programs that would support physicians who agree to go to outstate Minnesota. There is not much money in those programs, Dr. Cerra said. If they do open a medical school, will the University offer a plan to provide the training more cheaply? It already does at the Duluth campus, Professor Elliott pointed out, and it is done exceptionally well. A lot of Morris students go to the Duluth medical school, Professor Carpenter said; Dr. Cerra added that they would like to establish pipelines with other campuses as well.

If one considers the physicians in Minnesota, over 70% received their ability to be licensed from the University; in greater Minnesota, over 80% received their training at UMD. That sounds like a better deal for donors, Professor Gunnar said.

How much of this is about the need for family-practice physicians and how much is about St. Thomas wanting another professional school, Professor Martin asked? Dr. Cerra said he did not know, although he has not been successful in his attempts to contact St. Thomas. There is speculation concerning the production of providers in the future so Allina went to St. Thomas; they saw the University is linked to Fairview, and with federal funds for graduate medical education declining, they believe that tuition and health-system payments will fund medical schools. If that is the model, how can they not also do something for nursing, pharmacy, public health, and so on, Dr. Cerra asked? That is an argument for partnering with the University. Dr. Cerra said he did not understand how the nature and values of a full-service health-care system and a faith-based university would mesh. He learned in the University-Fairview discussions that if the values do not match the partnership cannot work.

There is no accreditation prohibition on the establishment of the new medical school, Dr. Cerra said, but he does not understand why the American Association of Medical Schools keeps saying there is a terrible shortage of physicians and medical schools must increase enrollment or the number of medical schools must be increased. That is not true in Minnesota or in most areas of the U.S. and what is driving the call is the increase in osteopathic schools. There are osteopathic and allopathic medical schools; Minnesota's is allopathic, as are the ones at almost all major research-intensive universities. Osteopathic schools are private and are accredited by the same bodies and processes as allopathic schools.

Dr. Cerra said he is not saying he would not support the new medical school but that he does have a lot of questions about it, since the question about the workforce in those areas of treatment has been raised. Why only solve the problems with physicians? If they can be addressed with other providers, it is not clear there is ANY physician shortage except perhaps in a few specialty areas.

Professor Balas thanked Dr. Cerra for the explanation and commented that it seemed to be an odd time to think about a new medical school when the University's budget does not look that good. This is another time when someone is saying the University is not delivering what the state needs, when it is. Dr. Cerra agreed and commented, by way of example, that the University probably doesn't talk enough about the 180 pharmacists who will graduate this year, most of whom will stay in Minnesota. They will also solve the Occupational Therapy/Laboratory Science problem, which no other place has done.

Dr. Cerra moved to more general comments.

-- There are some exciting things going on in the health sciences that include collateral issues that will come to this Committee. There will be a spirited discussion and the issues will be resolved.

-- The decision to do interdisciplinary research is paying off because that is the biggest growth area of federal funding, and the research reaches well beyond the Academic Health Center to include CBS and IT, for example.

-- The research corridor, to connect basic research to new ways to treat disease, including the new centers (Center for Translational Neuroscience, Center for Translational Medicine, Institute for Clinical and Translational Research), provide platforms for people to work, including opportunities to work in partnership with industry. The Center for Translational Medicine connects discoveries to animals (research on which is required for FDA approval). The Center for Clinical Trials provides support services for clinical research.

-- The CMRR (Center for Magnetic Resonance Imaging) will have a major upgrade, going to a 16-Tesla magnet. This facility is used by over 500 faculty across the University. It is still the world's best facility and will have a major upgrade.

-- There have been several developments in education. They have an increasing number of new or revamped degrees and inter-professional degrees, the creation of which is driven by what students and faculty want as the AHC has moved to capability-based, competency-based degrees (which is in response to accrediting agency direction). It is tradition in the health sciences that they function on the Roman Legion four-year march; that has worked but it is not ideal in the development of the individual and the integration of information—and the public would like a different kind of provider. What is wanted is more public engagement, evidence-based medicine, team-training, systems orientation, and life-long learning. Those factors led to a need for more inter-professional education, which all of the health sciences colleges have approved and which reconnects education to care delivery. They have established a faculty council to vet new degree programs and classes to see how they fit with the mission, consider whether faculty can carry the load, and to consider their financing. The final proposal comes to him and, if he approves it, it is forwarded to the Provost and the Board of Regents.

-- The AHC FCC has a program to recognize academic excellence in health research and will begin a parallel program for excellence in education next year. The recipients will receive a title to add to their professorial title, a plaque, and \$10,000 per year for five years. The AHC FCC retreat is on mentoring, which they are very excited about and there are a lot of good ideas.

-- The list of issues that has not been solved includes research space to recruit people to—recruiting faculty is not an issue and they can usually get who they want. It's the lack of space that's the problem. The units are all developing new 7.12 statements for promotion and tenure, which raise a lot of issues as the programs move in to new learning platforms.

Professor Gunnar said she was excited by the corridor that will translate basic research to medical devices but that she gets nervous: when basic scientists get close to a lot of money, they have to remain objective. What is being done to ensure that happens? Dr. Cerra said the AHC has 98% compliance with voluntary disclosure of conflicts of interest, 100% compliance with financial disclosure, and over 95% compliance with HIPPA education. There are better oversight functions than was true in the past but in the final analysis the University cannot and should not look over the faculty's shoulders. To attain those

levels of compliance, they have done a lot with values and pitfalls and there is greater awareness of potential problems than there was in the past. The University will never be incident-free, but when incidents do occur there must be a no-nonsense reaction.

Professor Chomsky thanked Dr. Cerra for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

REPORT ON FCC VISIT TO MORRIS CAMPUS (3/15/07)

Several members and staff of the FCC (Carol Chomsky, Gary Engstrand, Scott Lanyon, and John Sullivan, plus Nancy Carpenter as the Morris campus FCC representative) visited Morris in December 2006, affording the faculty of the Morris campus the opportunity to share their thoughts and views regarding faculty governance and issues relevant to the Morris campus. The group met with several constituencies, including Division Chairs; Chairs of UMM's Campus Assembly committees; the Faculty Development, Executive and Faculty Affairs Committees; the Constitution Revision Task Force; the faculty members of UMM's Consultative Committee; and an open meeting with faculty. This memo summarizes issues, concerns, and suggestions that emerged from those meetings. The FCC would like to explore these matters with Provost Sullivan, Senior Vice President Jones, and Chancellor Johnson.

A variety of issues was discussed, clustering around three overarching concerns: 1) inadequacy and inequality of resources, 2) uncertainty about the division of responsibilities for UMM in central administration, and 3) the need to strengthen the relationship of the Morris campus to the Twin Cities campus and more fully define UMM's role in the University. Below we have summarized both the concerns expressed and suggestions about what can be done to address the second issue.

Resources. There is a strong sense on the Morris campus that insufficient resources are being provided, making it difficult for the campus to thrive, let alone maintain its reputation as a national leader among public liberal arts colleges and as a "jewel" in the University of Minnesota system. Overall, the squeeze on resources has had a strongly demoralizing effect on the faculty and staff of the Morris campus. Particular concerns mentioned include:

- The Native American Tuition Waiver, a desirable mandate for Morris and for the state, but one that is funded only locally, not centrally, which places stress on all portions of the campus budget.
- Inadequate funding for faculty development (including travel to conferences and hiring meetings).
- Stagnant SE&E budgets (requiring some faculty to purchase their own supplies).
- As is the case for all U of MN faculty, UMM faculty salaries are low compared to their cohort --- and also substantially lower than UM-TC faculty (seen as a statement on the relative importance of undergraduate education).
- A concern that the campus is moving towards replacing tenure-track with non-tenure track hires as tenured faculty leave.

Relationship. The Morris campus often seems “out of sight, out of mind” when it comes to planning and policy-making and when resources, honors, and programs are distributed or administered. Examples cited:

- Both the Strategic Positioning process and the more recent required revision of the University tenure code were presented to the Morris campus very late – long after the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses were informed.
- There seems to be little, if any, interest in coordinating efforts so that a synergy results; instead the Morris campus input seems to be solicited almost as an afterthought. For example, the discussion of an “Honors College” (UMM) vs. the honors program (Twin Cities) became a contentious issue instead of a developmental, collaborative effort.
- Policies discussed in the various University Senate committees often center around the Minneapolis campus and fail to consider the implications of implementation on other campuses. This is a widespread problem, exacerbated by the minimal representation of other campuses on senate committees.
- Failure to include Division Chairs in the compact process, or have them (or the Dean/Interim Dean) on the DDD distribution list
- Rarely do Twin Cities academic units consider involving Morris faculty or students in programs or events, something that would benefit both campuses. When UMM faculty have attempted to connect with such programs (for example, by connecting U of MN Health Career Center workshops with UMM students via ITV), these efforts have faced roadblocks.
- While Morris campus faculty members are often recipients of the Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Award, no UMM faculty member has ever been recognized as a Regent’s Professor, despite impressive accomplishments.
- While the Morris campus, like other campuses, is assessed for University-wide resources (e.g. libraries), Morris faculty are not allowed to access many resources reserved for “Twin Cities faculty only.”

These concerns are exacerbated by the faculty’s uncertainty about the division of responsibility between Provost Sullivan and Vice President Jones with respect to UMM. That lack of clarity means they don’t know who to approach with concerns or solutions, including those articulated to us at our meetings.

What Can Faculty Do (and Administration Facilitate) To Strengthen the Relationship? Instead of competing against each other, it would benefit the University as a whole if the various campuses of the system worked *with* each other. Morris campus personnel feel strongly that they are a part of the University of Minnesota, yet are frequently left wondering if the feeling is mutual.

Just as we are recognizing the benefits of interdisciplinary work in teaching and scholarship, similar benefits could be realized from minimizing the barriers to exchange between the various campuses of the University of Minnesota – including Morris, Minneapolis and St. Paul. It is the sense of the FCC that there are many promising ways to promote greater interaction between the UMM community and Twin Cities faculty, staff and students. Ideas mentioned by faculty at Morris include the following:

- More interaction through Preparing Future Faculty (having UMTC students teach at Morris and interact with Morris faculty)
- Research collaborations

- Institute for Advanced Studies
- Seminar series
- Dual degree programs and/or graduate school application fee waivers
- Short-term housing for research trips to take advantage of Twin Cities campus facilities
- Have open house events (e.g., biannual Computer Science event) include UMM
- Invite UMM faculty to give colloquia at UMTC.
- Use ITV connection more extensively to connect UMM and UMTC events.
- Have grad students from UMTC present dissertations at UMM.
- Ensure that policy consideration by administration and faculty governance includes consideration of and by UMM.
- Encourage faculty visits from UMTC to UMM and vice versa.
- Formalize relationships between related departments/divisions/faculty on the two campuses.
- Regularly introduce new UMM faculty to their counterparts in the Twin Cities.
- Have more UMTC graduate students visit Morris for a period of time.
- Have more UMM faculty serve on graduate committees.
- Have a room (with internet access) on the Twin Cities campus for visiting Morris faculty to use during the work day, between meetings.
- Identify who can facilitate effective connections between the campuses (e.g., who to call when a department says “no, you can’t connect to our event using ITV”).