

AHC FCC

December 14, 1999

Minutes of the Meeting

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 view of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

PRESENT: Muriel Bebeau (chair), James Boulger, Timothy Wiedmann

REGRETS: Dan Feeney, Robert Miller, Kathleen Krichbaum, Judith Garrard, Stephanie Valberg, Patricia Ferrieri

[In these minutes: Job descriptions for the deans and department chairs; crafting a vision for the AHC; update on Faculty Affairs Committee; five defining questions raised by SVP Cerra during state of the AHC address]

JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR THE DEANS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Members spent some time reviewing the job descriptions before engaging in a discussion about them. The job descriptions are important in terms of the review process, it was pointed out. Professor Bebeau then reported that she received an email from a faculty member suggesting that the job description for the dean reference his/her role with alumni or the Alumni Society. Members then talked about whether there are other constituencies that ought to be specifically identified in the description. It was recommended that:

- The job description reference the dean's role with the alumni or the Alumni Society and;
- That the description define "various public constituencies" (Section I. General Responsibilities).

Next, attention was drawn to Section IV. Governance. Those present were in agreement that the section needed to be developed and that one bullet point stating that it is the dean's responsibility to lead the faculty of the school in the context of shared academic governance did not suffice. It was recommended that a statement about governance fall under "General Responsibilities" as well as a separate section called "Governance." It was recommended that the following language be considered under "General Responsibilities."

- Establish effective mechanisms and assure implementation for faculty input and involvement in the activities of the departments, facilitate appropriate governance on matters relating to the school/college's mission, and facilitate consultation on collegiate policy development, strategic planning, and implementation of plans. And, secondly (under Section IV. Governance) ask that language be incorporated to specify the activities expected of the dean with respect to governance.

It was pointed out that nothing is mentioned about the chairs in the job description for the dean. A question was raised about whether heads of centers ought to be included. The detailed description of the job responsibilities and areas of accountability of the department Chair appear quite comprehensive, one said. However, the introductory paragraph only describes an administrative role of the Chair and fails to recognize the more important role of the Chair. That is, the Chair is the leader of the department, the fundamental unit of the university, and therefore the introductory paragraph should contain language that places the needed emphasis on this aspect of the job description. In addition, it is essential that the department leader have the support of the faculty to carry out its mission. As such, the appointment and continued service should not be given exclusively to a Dean who often will not have the same disciplinary background as the department faculty/chair. The following language is recommended for the introductory paragraph:

- The general role of the Department Chair is to serve as the leader of the department. As leader, the Chair is responsible and accountable for the performance of the department in all aspects of its mission: education; research; service to the university and department's discipline; and where applicable, clinical service. The Department Chair serves as the chief administrative officer for the department and reports directly to the Dean of the College/School. The appointment and continued service of the Chair must take into consideration the view of the department as well as the Dean.

Professor Bebeau will prepare a draft set of recommendations on behalf of the committee, distribute them for comment, and then forward it on to SVP Cerra.

PROCESS FOR CRAFTING A VISION FOR THE AHC

Professor Bebeau reported that Professor Marty Dworkin has accepted a half-time appointment to work with Terry Bock on designing a process for crafting a vision for the AHC. After a process has been developed, it will be brought to the FCC for its review and endorsement.

SVP Cerra, Terry Bock, Muriel Bebeau and Marty Dworkin met with Regents Reed, Baraga, Larson and Neel on December 8. At this meeting, Regent Reed took the initiative on discussing the purpose and the scope of the group's work. It will meet monthly to assist with the development of the vision and a strategic planning process for the AHC. The group sees itself as assisting the AHC faculty and staff rather than determining a vision and plan. They expect to reflect on the plan as it develops and to assist by providing their perspectives on issues. They will assist the AHC faculty and staff by communicating the plan to the larger University community and then garnering support for its implementation. It was emphasized that the Regents want to make sure that this process is not an empty exercise but that action would result from the effort. This group will also reflect on the appropriateness of the defining questions put together in SVP Cerra's address and then to partner with the faculty in defining and refining the vision. These four Regents indicated that they were interested in attending faculty sessions in order to learn about faculty concerns and perspectives.

Professor Bebeau moved on to talk about various strategies they discussed with respect to the visioning process. Professor Dworkin will begin by having conversations with deans and various department heads and center directors, etc. It is essential to have an effective communication plan, she said. One suggestion was to develop a website in which issues would be listed and then an opportunity for people to communicate their concerns or ideas. Some of the faculty will be concerned about anonymity and the security of a website, one member commented. It is a felicitous assumption that a website would cover communicating to everyone. Professor Bebeau asked for suggestions as to how to involve people in the visioning process.

- It is the responsibility of the deans and department heads to consult with the faculty on developing this vision.
- Utilize the Council of Deans and the Educational Leaders Forum.
- Consider holding open forums.
- People are very busy so provide as many avenues as possible to obtain input.
- The process needs to be a grass roots effort.

Members talked about whether students should be involved in the visioning process and if so, at what level. There was some uncertainty about student involvement. It was agreed that staff ought to be engaged in the process.

Next, the group talked about clinician representation in the visioning process and agreed that the clinicians should be consulted about who should represent them. It was noted that it is very difficult to access clinicians as a group. Is there a head of the clinician's group? What about a Regents' Professor, another suggested. Does SVP have an advisory group that could make suggestions?

UPDATE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Professor Bebeau reported that Ted Oegema has agreed to chair the Faculty Affairs Committee. On behalf of the FCC, Professor Bebeau will ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to take on the task of reviewing schools/colleges policies and procedures for post-tenure review and annual reviews. SVP Cerra has requested the Deans to provide him with this information. Vet Med and Nursing have turned in their documentation. After all of the documents are in, Faculty Affairs will review the materials, conduct a comparative analysis of them and then prepare a report detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the various documents with recommendations for any corrective actions. It was suggested that the final report be distributed to the various collegiate consultative committees in the AHC for input.

Professor Bebeau asked that members review and reflect on the five questions raised by SVP Cerra at the State of the AHC address to determine if these are the appropriate questions to ask or if they are others that should be included. The questions follow:

What is our role in the health of Minnesotans--our land grant mandate?

- Can we continue to train two-thirds of Minnesota's health professionals? Do we focus on specialists or primary care? Are we ready to care for an aging population? How do we pay for it?
- In addition to how to care for the sick and injured, what do we teach? Wellness/prevention with treatment? Complementary therapies? Business skills? Team care?
- How do we deliver education where the care is delivered--in the community?
- Will we be able to maintain the essential connection between innovation and education?

Will we lead or follow in the marketplace?

- Will UMP become truly integrated and compete effectively? Metro area and/or statewide?
- What is the optimum relationship with Fairview? With community partners?
- How full does FUMC need to be, and what are the implications for the composition of the faculty? Of UMP?
- How do we develop a service culture that meets the benchmarks?
- How do we provide education base today that prepares the leaders of the care delivery system tomorrow?

How will we support research?

- Can we be top ranked nationally in all areas? If so, how do we support it? If not, how do we choose our priorities?
- What is the future of clinical research and industry partnerships? Will there be an interest in funding initiatives for economic development?
- How do we build infrastructure and an environment that rewards innovation?
- How do we build Biomedical Alley?

Will we meet the challenges of the electronic age?

- What courses and degrees should be on-line or web-based?
- How are education, research and clinical services strengthened (or weakened) by communication technology? How do we pay for it?
- Do we want high-tech or high-touch education and care?
- How do we build life-long learning and self-education into our programs and support systems?

How do we develop a culture of accountability in an environment of good communication and consultative decision-making?

- What are the right formulas for effective communication and collaborative decision-making?
- How can we be certain that the governance processes are representative of the opinions and principles of the constituencies?
- Are we willing to engage in responsible decision-making and be accountable for our actions?

Before adjourning, the issue regarding members attending the Dean's Council meetings was raised. Early in the fall members decided to attend the meetings on an ad hoc basis because of so many conflicts with the schedule. Professor Bebeau indicated she would like the committee to discuss attendance at these meetings at an upcoming FCC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Vickie Courtney

University of Minnesota

AHC