

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, September 20, 2001  
12:00 – 2:15  
N202 Mondale Hall**

Present: Joseph Massey (chair), Wilbert Ahern, Muriel Bebeau, Susan Brorson, Les Drewes, Arthur Erdman, Dan Feeney, Richard Goldstein, Marti Hope Gonzales, Candace Kruttschnitt, Marvin Marshak, Judith Martin, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Charles Speaks

Regrets: Paula Rabinowitz

Absent: Billie Wahlstrom

Guests: Professors Edwin Fogelman & Harry Boyte (Task Force on Civic Engagement); Executive Vice President Robert Bruininks

Other: Florence Funk (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost)

[In these minutes: (1) civic engagement; (2) resolution on attacks; (3) discussion with Dr. Bruininks (civic engagement, compact planning, legislative riders; (4) election of FCC vice chair; (5) report from the Regents' meetings]

**1. Civic Engagement**

Professor Massey convened the meeting at 12:10 and welcomed Professors Fogelman and Boyte to discuss the topic of civic engagement.

Professor Fogelman provided the Committee with background information. On July 4, 1999, college and university presidents adopted a declaration on the civic responsibilities of higher education, a statement that was later endorsed by several hundred institutional presidents, including President Yudof. The statement saw colleges and universities as "vital agents and architects of a flourishing democracy." There has been a decline in civic engagement, a serious problem in higher education. The presidents who signed the declaration made a commitment to do something about that decline.

He and Professor Boyte have been involved in civic engagement because they are the co-directors of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship and were involved in the activities that preceded the statement signed by the presidents. They discussed with Executive Vice President Bruininks what the University should do. It seemed that a task force was reasonable if proposals for long-term change were to be made. The task force was appointed in October, 2000, composed of faculty, staff, students, and administrators from across the University; it also had an advisory panel of about 150 members drawn from the community. The task force was organized into six working committees; the charge to the task

---

\* 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.

force was to clarify the meaning of civic engagement and to recommend how to incorporate it across the full range of University activities.

The final report of the task force was presented in mid-May, 2001; it defined civic engagement as "an institutional commitment to public purposes and responsibilities intended to strengthen a democratic way of life in the rapidly changing information society of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." The report lists these public purposes and discusses the implications for research (public scholarship), teaching (civic learning), and outreach (community partnerships). The general goal is to reaffirm the University's public purposes and civic mission, which is especially critical for a land-grant institution.

The civic engagement initiative also grew out of the tenure struggle and the accompanying debate over the University's identity and mission. Professor Fogelman said he was concerned when, last spring, this Committee adopted a resolution supporting the view that the University should move toward becoming a more privatized, hybrid, market-driven university. That will happen, no doubt, but it is important for faculty to affirm the University's public purposes even if the institution moves in that direction. That is what the task force was addressing: how to renew the University's civic mission.

The task force acknowledges that much civic engagement now occurs in the University; in fact, those activities must exemplify the institution, be made a model. Right now they are not always seen as legitimate, people are shy about admitting they do them, and the public significance of what someone is doing is rarely considered when decisions are being made about salary and tenure. Civic engagement raises profound questions about the relationship between research, teaching, and public concerns.

This year the task force would like to see its recommendations institutionalized, through the administration and by through faculty governance. The task force wants its recommendations taken up within structures where they will be carried out, because it does not want them to die. This is not a short-term project; the Kellogg Foundation talked about an eight-year cycle for implementing civic engagement. The task force has raised the issues and is now trying to hand off the ball; the task force will self-destruct at the end of the year but wants to be sure the work goes on, Professor Fogelman concluded.

Professor Boyte then commented that there is broad concern with civic engagement in higher education generally, fed by the alarm in many public settings--government, libraries, schools--over the sense that public purposes are in danger in the face of marketplace dynamics. There is also an epistemological issue: some of the best scholarship and research comes from public concerns. There is a sense that huge, public, pressing issues need a response and that the University should play a leadership role in addressing them.

The Center for Democracy and Citizenship has been active in civic engagement; what is distinctive at the University (there is much civic engagement occurring across higher education in the United States) is that it is the only one looking at it in comprehensive and systematic way, as a question of institutional identity. This approach positions the University to be a national leader in the field.

Professor Massey recalled that at the FCC retreat, a draft resolution had been turned back for refinement. Professor Fogelman said he had not expected FCC to adopt it without changes but only to review it for further action. Professor Massey noted that the institution had been given a mandate by the Board of Regents to look at the subject of civic engagement.

Professor Ahern said it is important that FCC take up civic engagement quickly: if in favor of it, wonderful; if it has reservations, it must make them clear, inasmuch as the chair and vice chair of the Regents, the President, and the Provost think it is important. The last thing wanted is a major initiative without faculty support and participation.

The Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) met with Professor Boyte the previous week; a big concern expressed by SCEP members was that it not duplicate the work of the task force (which is emphasizing institutionalization and community partnerships). SCEP is modifying the charge from the Civic Learning Working group to put more emphasis on clarifying the meanings of civic engagement and to examine what is happening across the University. It will then move to policy recommendations on the place of civic learning. This work will be effected through a subcommittee.

Professor Ahern said he was struck by the importance of the need for wider discussion about issues that go beyond civic learning, such as public scholarship. The report asked this Committee and SCEP to take up the recommendations; FCC must be involved because they include more than educational policy. FCC should superintend the structured discussions of civic engagement in the University, he suggested.

The resolution that FCC considered at its retreat, Professor Ahern pointed out, emphasized a broad definition of civic engagement. As it is talked about, people tend to think of it as service learning, but the terms of the resolution and the task force report make it clear that it is much broader than that.

Professor Martin said she was not opposed to the idea of civic engagement; there is much of it going on at the University that is not high-lighted but is valuable. She said she hoped SCEP would high-light the activities. The University has had for several years a requirement that students take course work in citizenship and public ethics; she said she is hard pressed to tell the difference between those hundreds of courses and civic engagement.

Professor Ahern pointed out that that requirement is for the Twin Cities only. That requirement, however, might be a place to begin examining civic learning.

A number of the people involved in civic engagement are also members of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers, Professor Martin observed, and the civic engagement initiative seems parallel to the Academy issue of how to get teaching taken more seriously in the promotion and tenure process. The Academy ran up against a wall: no one wants seriously to consider changing the tenure regulations. The result is a feeling of frustration: one can SAY there should be more attention paid to teaching and civic engagement, but the University pays most attention to research.

Professor Gonzales agreed. She said she does civically-engaged research but that faculty pay a tremendous price for doing so. One cannot bring in subjects, run them through the lab, and write an article; this kind of research takes several years. One needs to get the words to deans and senior faculty. There are also tensions produced by the Internal Review Board (IRB), especially in the social sciences. Civically-engaged research often involves research with the stakeholders in the community, who suggest modifications to what one is doing. It can take six months to obtain IRB approval for changes. There is a need to rethink University structures that make this kind of research more difficult.

Professor Fogelman said that Professor Gonzales was "exactly right." The same is true at other institutional levels, he said. The Carnegie Foundation is considering including civic engagement in its scheme of evaluating institutions, which would be a tremendous help to the University. With respect to her other point, about informing deans and department heads, he said there is no reason changes cannot be made if the President, Provost, deans, and department heads favor them; if they do not, that is where change must take place. The Provost might be willing to consider civic engagement in tenure decisions--if research is of public importance, for example. There is no need to change the tenure regulations for this to happen. He agreed with Professor Gonzales's observation that there has to be a change in mindset, however, of those interpreting the regulations.

Professor Ahern said there is civically-engaged work being done but that it is not valued. In addition, over the last 10-15 years there has been a shift in the quality of the evaluation of teaching that affects promotion and tenure. Who pays attention, Professor Martin asked?

How did the experience of the Twin Cities campus with the requirement of citizenship courses work into the discussion of civic learning, Professor Ahern asked Professor Boyte? The Center was involved in the development of the requirement and the criteria for the courses, Professor Boyte said. They pushed for faculty development support for courses; it requires infrastructure support for faculty.

Professor Speaks offered two examples of the difficulty of changing mindsets. First, research on pedagogy is not seen as legitimate research. Second, there is the view that teaching a foreign language, if it is the native language of the instructor, should not count for much. Actions follow those perceptions.

Professor Fogelman said he knew there are objections to what the task force was doing; they did not see the report as the last word on the subject. The idea was to get the discussion going. There are misconceptions about civic engagement--that it is not basic research (not true) and that it is only service learning (also not true). There are a number of such preconceptions and misconceptions. He said he hoped the discussion would go forward; the idea came from the faculty, it was essentially a faculty task force with sympathetic administrators, pushed by the faculty.

Professor Bebeau said she supported the concept of civic engagement and the way it has been defined and believes that it is what a public research university should be about. But she had a tremendously negative response to the tone of the task force report, which criticized the University constantly. In the current political climate, the University is criticized a lot. The report high-lighted the activities of other universities; it should high-light all of the things being done at the University as well as indicate what more it could do.

Professor Fogelman said he agreed that many excellent things are happening at the University and the task force spent \$100,000 to support them. But the faculty should not be complacent; one should hear what legislators and others have to say about the University's civic engagement, he commented. The report was not intended to denigrate or dismiss what is being done, but it did not say the University is basically doing the job so "what's the question?" There is a problem; the report talks about change and the need to get people to recognize the NEED for change.

The broad strategy is to build on the work that is already going on, Professor Boyte said. There is an inventory on the civic engagement web site. Professor Speaks said that the message from this Committee is that the report should define what civic engagement is (it does that), it should explain the

need for it (it does that), it should identify ways the University has been fulfilling its obligations (it does not do that), and ways it must do more. The report is a work in progress, Professor Boyte said; the Committee has made good suggestions.

Professor Ratliff-Crain said he also supported the concept of civic engagement. He noted that supportive people on this Committee, however, reacted negatively to the report of the task force. The use of a new lexicon to describe what people are doing, and the structure of the report, made civic engagement activities appear as add-ons.

What part of this falls to SCEP and what part to FCC, Professor Ahern inquired? There is a big issue of scholarship and faculty rewards that is really outside the purview of SCEP. He suggested that FCC return to this subject at its next meeting.

Professor Massey thanked Professors Boyte and Fogelman for joining the meeting.

## **2. Resolution on Terrorist Attacks**

Professor Massey drew the attention of Committee members to a draft resolution that both this Committee and the Student Senate Consultative Committee were to consider recommending to the Senate. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the resolution.

## **3. Discussion with Executive Vice President Bruininks**

Professor Massey welcomed Dr. Bruininks to the meeting.

Dr. Bruininks commented that he had planned to raise the topic of civic engagement with the Committee because he wanted to get a sense of the concerns expressed by FCC members. The Task Force on Civic Engagement was one of several task forces appointed amidst a growing concern about the University's public responsibilities and uncertainty with respect to the future. In the past, many activities related to civic engagement were cross-subsidized. He said he believed the University should have a discussion of civic engagement in light of the work of the Kellogg Commission on the topic.

The task force created a lot of energy and agreed to broaden and deepen the dialogue this year, Dr. Bruininks said. Tidiness is not the most important goal right now; richness of discussion is more important. And it is important to have the discussions; he said he would bring ideas back to the Committee. In recent discussions with leaders of the local African-American community, he concluded this was a subject the University better talk about. The University will not be well-served if it looks like most other institutions in 10-20 years and loses its sense of public purpose and mission.

Professor Martin noted that Dr. Bruininks had created a new award, for community service, but the award is not noticed in the report. It sounds as if, from the report, no one is doing anything in terms of civic engagement. One avenue to pursue this might be for him to pull together the individuals who have won the award and who have been nominated for it to form a cadre of people who can work on civic engagement. Dr. Bruininks agreed.

Professor Speaks said the Committee does not want the legislature and others to come away from the report thinking the University is doing nothing. Professor Bebeau commented that her college is

extremely engaged with the community--but reading the report suggests there is nothing happening and people are now being asked to do more with less. There needs to be more attention paid to public relations, she said, because it would not be difficult to use this report against the University, as it is written. The report is primarily for internal use, Dr. Bruininks commented; it is a progress report, a working document. It is also a "preliminary report," according to Professor Fogelman.

Professor Massey then asked Dr. Bruininks about a point that the Committee had raised earlier with President Yudof: FCC review of the compact planning process. Dr. Bruininks agreed it was worth looking at. He said they try each year to improve the planning and accountability processes of the University; the emphasis in the compact process, from day one, was consultation. He said he believed the compact plans had had prior discussion by the faculty. This comment elicited several nods "no" from FCC members.

Dr. Bruininks said the process has been very positive. He said he has seen a lot of University planning processes with a beginning, a middle, and an end--which produced reports which sat on shelves. This process has continuity, emphasizes what is important, it is dynamic, with results that can be measured, and with something one can refer back to. He said he did not want to change the collegial nature of the process, where six or seven people sit around a table and talk about a plan that contains much data and refers to what was done in the last year and what went into bringing ideas forward.

There are two important areas to look at with respect to consultation: the evolution of ideas and priorities and a prospective and retrospective view of the priorities that emerged from the process. A review should include understanding how the processes work in the colleges and on the campuses.

Professor Marshak said there are two particular concerns about the compact process: (1) the consultation within the colleges on development of plans, and (2) the applicability of the process to non-academic units. Things seem to just grow out of the soil, with priorities driven by dollars; who, for example, decides who gets land, a very valuable commodity on the Twin Cities campus?

Dr. Bruininks said he insisted that non-academic units must go through the process and there must be more accountability in it. Some things, he conceded, do seem to elude the process. He said, however, that he did not want to get rid of the process and that it can lead to creativity.

How does he know the process has been interactive, with faculty involvement, and the compact is not just something the dean drafted, Professor Drewes asked? They start with issues from the previous year, Dr. Bruininks said, although he agreed he did not know about the interactions that may or may not take place at the local levels. He said, however, that he felt good about the major investments that were made; every one has been tracked and a public report issued, and there is an attempt to build continuity into the evaluation. Under the old method, the administration allocated funds and prayed for results, and when cuts were made, they came in the priorities that were just funded. That is not true now.

The Committee presented Dr. Bruininks with a number of criticisms of the lateness of the salary decisions.

The Committee and Dr. Bruininks held a short off-the-record discussion about the state of the economy and likely legislative reactions to changes that are occurring.

Dr. Bruininks also spoke briefly about security of the University's information technology systems.

The Committee and Dr. Bruininks discussed the timing of responses to and consultation about the accountability riders. In general terms, the administration's intention is not to create a new set of committees to deal with the riders but rather to use the normal governance system. Dr. Bruininks also informed the Committee of the appointment of an administrative advisory committee to take up issues of outreach. He said he would prefer that any reports be brought into the governance system, probably to this Committee, and that FCC might also wish to meet with Dean Casey.

Professor Massey thanked Dr. Bruininks for joining the meeting.

#### **4. Committee Business**

Professor Massey now welcomed Professor McConnell, as the new chair of the Senate Research Committee.

The Committee next held an election to determine its vice chair for the remainder of the 2001-02 year. Professor Feeney was elected.

#### **5. Report from the Board of Regents' Meetings**

Professor Massey asked the chairs who attended the Regents' meetings to report.

-- Professor Speaks reported that the Finance and Operations Committee spent much time on its work plan and when it should receive reports from the administration. Mr. Pfitzenreuter reported on the University budget and emphasized how his office works collaboratively with the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning. He was welcomed by Regent O'Keefe and invited to join in the discussions as he wished, Professor Speaks said.

-- Professor Erdman reported that he was acknowledged at the Facilities Committee meeting. There were a number of reports about the Crookston campus (which is where the meeting was supposed to be held, before the events of September 11 disrupted plans); there was no mention of a stadium and Regent Metzen warned about budget creep in construction costs.

-- Professor Goldstein said he was not introduced at the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee meeting but was told he would be in the future. There was little of relevance to the faculty governance system brought up at this particular meeting, he reported.

Professor Massey adjourned the meeting at 2:20.

-- Gary Engstrand