

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs**Tuesday, November 28, 2006****2:30 - 4:15****238A Morrill Hall**

- Present:** Geoffrey Sirc (chair), Matthew Britzner-Stull, Arlene Carney, Tom Clayton, Janet Ericksen, Erin George, Kathryn Hanna, Morris Kleiner, Theodor Litman, Steven McLoon, Kelly Risbey, Roderick Squires, Oriol Valls, Virginia Zuiker
- Absent:** Carol Carrier, Dann Chapman, Vladimir Cherkassky, A. Saari Csallany, Jane Miller, Luis Ramos-Garcia, Larry Wallace, Timothy Wiedmann
- Guests:** Nan Wilhelmson, Joe Kelly (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources), Associate Vice President Geoffrey Maruyama (Office of the Vice President for Academic and Multicultural Affairs)

[In these minutes: (1) report of the chair; (2) national survey of junior faculty (including MN data); (3) employee work-life and personal leaves policy; (4) faculty culture task force recommendation for "senior faculty"]

1. Report of the Chair

Professor Sirc convened the meeting at 2:35 and reported on a few items.

-- There have been slight revisions to the recruitment and retention policy discussed at the last meeting.

-- The discussion of tuition benefits that appeared in the minutes of the last meeting elicited a comment from a faculty colleague in Medical School: "With regard to tuition benefits, most of the schools that I have interaction with have a benefit for children of faculty that is attractive to faculty and faculty retention. If you believe that "the apple does not fall far from the tree," then encouraging children of faculty to attend undergraduate and graduate programs should be a benefit to the University as a whole. This is not a move to lower the bar for children of faculty but to retain those who meet admission requirements. For the most part this is a small investment over the academic life of active faculty."

A representative from CAPA has informed him, Professor Sirc reported, that he will speak on the floor of the Senate in favor of the tuition-benefit resolution.

-- The faculty compensation policy, which needs to have the policy on endowed chairs incorporated in it, will be on the next agenda for review and discussion.

* 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.

2. COACHE Survey

Professor Sirc turned to Vice Provost Carney to lead a discussion of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey of probationary faculty. Dr. Carney distributed two large handouts, one a copy of the electronic survey itself and one a summary of results. The full report is 627 pages long; Dr. Carney said she was providing to the Committee key highlights; this is the second group to hear about the report, after the Twin Cities deans. The reason the University participated, she said, was to find out the level of satisfaction of probationary faculty at the University of Minnesota and what improvements it can make to improve the level of satisfaction.

The study was developed at the Harvard Graduate School of Education; the co-investigators are Richard Chait and Cathy Trower, and includes 51 colleges and universities (including liberal arts colleges as well as large public universities and both small and large private universities). The survey was administered in December, 2005, and had five categories: tenure; nature of work; policies and practices; climate, culture, collegiality; and global satisfaction. The survey was given to all University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) probationary faculty (who were full-time, hired before summer, 2005—that is, had not just started at the University—not clinical faculty, and who were not in a terminal year after being denied tenure). These were the standards used at all institutions, in order to ensure comparability of the data. On recommendation of the investigators, the coordinate campuses were not included because of the nature of the data being gathered; restricting the respondents to the Twin Cities campus permits comparisons with research university peers

At the University of Minnesota the survey was sent to 433 tenure-track faculty (264 males, 169 females; 319 white faculty and 106 faculty of color). Of the 433, 249 responded (143 males, 106 females; 201 white faculty, 47 faculty of color). Overall response rate was 58%, comparable to other institutions; the lowest response rate by category was faculty of color (44%). This survey had a higher response rate than the Pulse survey, discussed at the last meeting. Of the respondents at the University of Minnesota: 75% were white non-Hispanic and 25% were faculty of color (18% were Asian-Pacific Islander, with low response rates among the under-represented faculty). 73% were US citizens, 27% were not.

The age distribution of these probationary faculty was interesting, Dr. Carney observed.

6%	under 30
21%	31-35
39%	36-40
25%	41-45
10%	46+

The mean age of the respondents was 39. It appears that the sample of faculty was not just out of graduate school, but may have had other experiences before coming to the faculty. For 89% of respondents, the position at Minnesota is their first tenure-track appointment; 50% had held a postdoc.

83% of respondents have a spouse/partner; 44% have no children while 56% have one or more children.

The University was asked to identify 5 peer institutions with which it would be compared; the choices came from a list of other institutions participating in the COACHE study in the 2005-2006

academic year. The University selected Ohio State, Arizona, Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Virginia—all large public research universities. Dr. Carney explained, in response to questions from Committee members, that Michigan and Wisconsin did not participate in the survey and were not part of the choice set of institutions, and Berkeley was part of the beta group, so did not survey its probationary faculty again so soon. She and Provost Sullivan picked the five institutions that seemed to be most appropriate for Minnesota, given the choices.

Dr. Carney presented a graph profiling thematic clusters of issues (the five categories) comparing Minnesota with its five other peers. Probationary faculty were asked to rate their institution "better than peers," "about the same as peers," or "worse than peers." About 30% rated the general category of **tenure** (which included issues of clarity, reasonableness, and expectations) worse than peers, about 10% better, and the remainder about the same. About 25% rated the **nature of work** (type of work, control over teaching and research, access to support, etc.) at Minnesota worse than peers, between 5 and 10% rated it better, and the rest rated it about the same. A little over 20% rated Minnesota **policies and practices** worse than peers, a little less than 20% rated them better, and the rest rated them about the same. Nearly 60% of respondents rated "**climate, culture, and collegiality**" worse than peers, about 10% better, and the rest about the same. In terms of **global satisfaction**, none ranked the University worse than its peers, 20% ranked it better, and 80% ranked it about the same. Professor Sirc asked how she and the Provost interpreted the climate and collegiality results; Dr. Carney said the 60% who say the University is worse on climate and collegiality is significant and disturbing and it flags areas that need attention (illustrated in other data in the survey).

Dr. Carney next discussed the questions asked about tenure clarity. Questions were asked about how clear the process, the criteria (what things are evaluated), the standards (performance threshold), and body of evidence are. For all probationary faculty in the COACHE study, they were most clear about the tenure process and least clear about the standards (on a scale of "very clear—fairly clear—neither clear nor unclear—fairly unclear—very unclear," the mean response did not reach "fairly clear" for either process or standards. Minnesota faculty scores were slightly above the COACHE average, but some of its peers (from among the five) were higher. Minnesota faculty were less clear about the standards than peers: they were clear on the process and the criteria but not the bar. (Committee members discussed with Dr. Carney what the thoughts of those who had been denied tenure might be, but the sample would be very small because few are actually denied tenure—a number leave before the tenure decision is made, either because they know they will not achieve tenure or because they leave for another position. The respondents, Dr. Carney emphasized, are tenure-track faculty in years 2-5 of the probationary period and would not include those who had been denied tenure.)

Among all the COACHE probationary faculty, (1) women found less clarity than males in the process, criteria, standards, and evidence, and (2) white faculty found less clarity for standards than faculty of color. At Minnesota, however, there were no significant gender differences or for white faculty/faculty of color. In a related article, Cathy Trower has asked (apropos the entire pool) whether the results for women faculty reflects a lack of clarity or a lack of confidence.

In terms of tenure expectations, there can be clarity (or not) about expectations as a scholar, teacher, advisor, colleague (service, committees), and member of the community (outreach). Dr. Carney focused on the first two.

All COACHE participants saw scholar and teacher expectations as clearest, the others neither clear nor unclear, but there were significant race and gender differences. For Minnesota probationary faculty, expectations as a scholar were clearest and even clearer than several of their peers and the COACHE sample; expectations as a teacher were much lower (in the 11th percentile for all schools). At Minnesota, however, there were no significant race or gender differences. On the teaching expectations there is a dichotomy between Minnesota and other schools, Dr. Carney commented, and this may be related to the teaching evaluation process at Minnesota. Most teaching evaluation is based on the questions in the forms; some departments do more (e.g., peer review), but there is an extraordinary range in department practices, so she said she is not surprised at the lack of clarity about teaching expectations.

In terms of the reasonableness of tenure expectations, all COACHE probationary faculty saw them reasonable as a department colleague and teacher but least so as a scholar. At Minnesota the perceptions were somewhat reversed: probationary faculty saw tenure expectations as fairly reasonable as a scholar and teacher but least reasonable as a department colleague (Minnesota's responses were more than one standard deviation from its peers). This is another indicator of the collegiality problem at the University. Females at Minnesota see tenure expectations as less reasonable than do males—one of the few gender differences at Minnesota.

In terms of the perception that tenure is based on performance, Minnesota probationary faculty are in the 97th percentile in their belief that it is. Dr. Carney said the University can feel good about this datum. The perception is even higher among faculty of color at Minnesota.

The top three factors that are important to probationary faculty, but where Minnesota is ineffective, are in professional assistance in obtaining externally-funded grants, formal mentoring for junior faculty, and child care. Dr. Carney related that she had lunch with 15 new faculty (from across the campus) following the new faculty orientation last August; assistance in obtaining grants was the sole topic of discussion: they said they struggle to learn what to do to get their first grant and needed more assistance. She said she is hosting two more lunches with new faculty that will be focused on how to get geared up for research and how to get grants submitted.

The factors that Minnesota is seen as ineffective in vary only slightly by gender. For males, the top three (in order) are formal mentoring, grant assistance, spousal/partner hire, and childcare. For females, they are grant assistance, formal mentoring, and financial assistance with housing. It is not possible to tell from the data the reasons for the absence of childcare from the factors cited by females, Dr. Carney said; perhaps it is because a significant proportion of the female probationary faculty at Minnesota do not have children. In terms of the differences between white faculty and faculty of color, both listed mentoring and grant assistance among the top three; white faculty listed childcare while faculty of color listed financial assistance with housing.

In terms of family friendliness of the institutions, both the COACHE respondents and the Minnesota subset neither agree nor disagree that their institutions, departments, and colleagues make having a family and succeeding on the tenure track compatible. No one is seen as helping, particularly, but also not hurting. So one does not see a family-friendly climate across higher education or at the University for probationary faculty, Dr. Carney concluded.

In terms of work-life balance, the University does not come off well. The Minnesota respondents are again more than one standard deviation below the COACHE results and the five peer institution

responses, and female faculty see much less balance than do male faculty. This is one of the other gender differences at Minnesota, Dr. Carney said, and this issue elicited quite a number of open-ended comments. Minnesota is seen by some respondents as a "brutal" place to work, probationary faculty are stressed out, there is no let-up, and graduate students see what their mentors face and conclude they do not want to be in the academy.

(At this same meeting, the Committee was provided a copy of a letter from three senior faculty in one department (including the director of graduate admissions and the director of graduate studies); the letter to Graduate School Dean Dubrow expressed alarm at a "fundamental shift in the attitudes of our graduate students": in the past, many wanted professorial jobs; today, few do. The letter came from a field in the biological sciences; Professor Hanna wondered if faculty in the social sciences and arts & humanities are hearing the same message from graduate students. Professor Zuiker said she has heard it said before by some graduate students (Family Social Science), but Professor Squires said they do not hear it in his field (Geography). Professor McLoon said he believed the letter was "right on" and they see the same reaction in their graduate students. There is something culturally wrong here and something needs to be done. Professor Valls asked why graduate students should want to be professors. Professor McLoon asked why things have changed. Professor Valls said that becoming and being a faculty member is harder than it was 20 years ago; people must spend more years in temporary appointments, such as postdocs, but the decline in interest in the professoriate has brought supply and demand into line; instead of receiving 200 applicants for a position, they may receive 10-20, and there is nothing wrong with that.)

Professor Kleiner wondered how these results would compare with results from surveying the tenured faculty. Dr. Carney said she did not know but is aware that there is one "lost group" at the University—associate professors—and she is doing a short survey of them and will try to address their problems. Professor Kleiner commented that in some professions (e.g., law, medicine) the first years are the most stressful, and later years are less so. Dr. Carney pointed out that the data in the COACHE survey are comparative—these numbers suggest Minnesota probationary faculty have a very different view of the work-life balance than do their peers at other institutions. Why do Minnesota faculty feel so much more stressed?

On global and cultural issues, in relationships with their colleagues, Minnesota probationary faculty are less satisfied than elsewhere with the interest senior faculty take in them and in the collaboration, personal, and professional interactions with senior faculty. Minnesota probationary faculty, however, were more satisfied than peers elsewhere with professional and personal interaction with their junior colleagues. Minnesota faculty also rated more than one standard deviation below their peers in other climate issues: "sense of fit" in their department, intellectual vitality of senior faculty, unity and cohesion among faculty, and fair treatment of junior faculty in comparison to one another. On the last point, Dr. Carney reported, there were gender but not race differences: female junior faculty felt that female junior faculty are treated differently, and the difference is striking in comparison to peer institutions.

The best aspects of the University of Minnesota are seen to be the quality of colleagues, the geographic location, support of colleagues, and the "sense of fit." If one likes it here, and things are going well, these factors show up. The worst aspects of Minnesota are compensation, geographic location (there was a bimodal response on this item!), the quality of graduate students, and too much service/too many assignments. The last point is related to the proposed new language in Section 7.11, which

indicates that while institutional service is expected of all faculty, such expectations should be modest for probationary faculty.

Despite the warts suggested by responses to some of the individual items on the survey, Minnesota probationary faculty are in the 70th percentile in satisfaction with their departments and the 89th percentile in satisfaction with the institution. Despite what they see as problems, they are on the high end in terms of satisfaction with the University. Asked if they will stay at the University post-tenure, 17% said they would for the rest of their career, 53% said for the foreseeable future, 10% said for 5 years, and 21% said they haven't thought that far ahead. The biggest difference among subsets was for faculty of color, who are less committed to staying at Minnesota; there were no gender differences. Asked if they had it to do over again, Minnesota probationary faculty were in the 73rd percentile in responding affirmatively, and not different from their peers.

Dr. Carney also provided a table of responses of probationary faculty when asked if they would strongly recommend, recommend with reservations, or not recommend coming to the University, with responses broken down by academic areas (humanities, visual and performing arts, biological sciences, business, education, etc.). The areas do not map to colleges, she observed, although in some cases there is a close correspondence (e.g., engineering/computer science/math/statistics, business). Professor Sirc asked about the responses in visual and performing arts, where 0% of respondents would strongly recommend coming to Minnesota and 89% only with reservations; the responses in the other fields ranged around 50% (plus/minus 10%) who would strongly recommend the University. Professor Brititzer-Stull said the responses in visual and performing arts may reflect the special considerations that performing arts departments require in terms of research and other activities. Professor Sirc also wondered if the number of respondents in that area might be low.

Dr. Carney noted there were an above-average number of "not recommend" responses (21%) in "health and human ecology." Professor Zuiker said that may reflect the implications of strategic positioning and where the University is putting its resources. Dr. Carney agreed that there had been a lot of upheaval in those fields last year and the satisfaction suggested is actually high, given a topsy-turvy year for faculty in some fields. She said that she has had a concern that the University would be viewed more negatively than its peers because the 2005-2006 academic year was unusual (with the changes in some of the colleges).

One open-ended question in the survey (designed by the University) asked how the institution does in orienting new faculty. For Minnesota, many of the responses were "what orientation?" At the time the survey was administered, the central administration had had a very brief orientation for new faculty, with introductions of and welcomes by senior administrators and a reception and orientation at the collegiate level varied from a comprehensive program to no orientation. The departments may have had the same range. The data arrived AFTER the three-day new faculty orientation program begun this year, and they suggest it was a good thing they initiated the program.

Ms. Risbey asked what the next action would be; would they look at the written comments and would the results be disseminated? They will, Dr. Carney said; they are approaching the results in stages. She has told the probationary faculty she would provide them the results; there will be three open forums to provide the information to them. She also agreed that the data can be put on the faculty affairs website.

Ms. George asked if Dr. Carney had considered conducting a similar survey for faculty-like P&As with continuous appointments. Dr. Carney said she had not, at this point, and pointed out that these results were part of a national study. She would, however, like to identify the issues for that group as well. She also reported that the President's Emerging Leaders want to work on mentoring for assistant professors and to identify what they want to know about.

Professor Sirc thanked Dr. Carney for the presentation.

3. Employee Work-Life and Personal Leaves Policy

Professor Sirc turned next to Ms. Wilhelmson and Mr. Kelly to present a proposed new Regents' policy on Employee Work-Life and Personal Leaves.

Ms. Wilhelmson explained this draft policy, going to the Regents in December for review, fits with other types of Board of Regents policies dealing with human resources topics. She emphasized that Regents' policies are written to set a tone and direction. This policy is an umbrella document covering leaves for many reasons; the draft policy supersedes six current Regents' policies that deal with personal and family leaves. There will be administrative policies that implement this Regents' policy and applicable leaves.

Ms. Wilhelmson reviewed the guiding principles set forth in the policy:

Section III Guiding Principles

- a) The University fosters a productive, healthy, and safe workplace that helps employees effectively integrate and manage their work and personal life responsibilities.
- (b) The University provides leave opportunities that contribute to employee well-being, support family care concerns, align with legal requirements, and are appropriately benchmarked and consistent with peer institutions.
- (c) The University strives to provide for a responsibly managed workplace through careful selection, preparation, and accountability of supervisors, managers, and leaders.
- (d) The University expects employees to demonstrate behaviors that contribute to a productive, healthy, and safe workplace.

The workplace provisions are these, drawn from the faculty culture task force and the literature in the field:

Section IV Workplace Provisions

Subd. 1. Policies and Programs. The University shall have policies and programs that engender employee well-being, permit flexibility, provide employees options to help in managing work and personal life responsibilities, and are appropriate to the work to be done.

Subd. 2. Flexible Work Arrangements. If appropriate, the University shall support flexible work arrangements as an effective management tool in building job satisfaction, improving productivity, and retaining employees.

Subd. 3. Healthy Behaviors. The University recognizes the importance of healthy behaviors in creating employee well-being by supporting employee wellness initiatives and employees in developing healthy behaviors.

An important part of these provisions, Ms. Wilhelmson said, is that the University will study what changes in policy are needed and where it is not reaching its goals.

Professor McLoon said that the "flexible work arrangements" provision will not matter. It comes from human resources people because it is popular in business, but it is not practical in an academic environment. A major part of our job is interacting with students, staff and faculty. They can only do that when these people are here, which pretty much means that they need to be here during regular business hours. Ms. Wilhelmson pointed out that this policy applies to the entire range of employees; in some areas, there is less flexibility appropriate to business needs.

Professor Sirc asked what safe in "(d) The University expects employees to demonstrate behaviors that contribute to a productive, healthy, and safe workplace" means. People can't smoke? It means that the University wants to create a work environment to allow flexibility and leaves so that people can be productive and attend to a sick child or a seriously-ill family member, Ms. Wilhelmson said; "safe" was added because the Regents identified it as a factor that should be included in a policy that deals with the environment. Employees should feel safe coming and being at work. The policy tries to get at the idea that employees are responsible because one unsafe employee affects others, Mr. Kelly added. Both management and employees have responsibilities. Professor Sirc said he asked because he wondered how personally-intrusive the policy would be.

Professor Kleiner asked if violation of (d) would be grounds for disciplinary action; can one be disciplined for not contributing to a productive workplace? One could not be disciplined on the basis of this policy, Mr. Kelly said; one would be disciplined under more specific administrative policies. If the supervisor says one is not productive, Professor Kleiner asked? It would be very difficult to uphold such a decision, Mr. Kelly said; the supervisor would have to cite more specific workplace rules or policies. He said it would be extraordinarily rare for anyone to be disciplined on the basis of broad regental policy that is intended to set direction and tone. When such discipline occurs it is tied to the failure to meet specific expectations and job requirements Professor Kleiner said he had problems with this language. Mr. Kelly asked if Professor Kleiner disagreed with the proposition that employees should be productive. Professor Kleiner said he would rather see clearer language; this is nebulous. They could try to make it clearer, Mr. Kelly said, but this is Regents' policy; the units set more specific policies. Professor Sirc asked if this were analogous to a policy requiring a "proper attitude of industry and cooperation."

Professor Valls asked for examples of IV(3), health behaviors. Mr. Kelly said it is not healthy to sit at one's desk all day, and people need to take advantage of leave opportunities and flexible work arrangements (because, for example, it is not particularly productive to be at work when one is worrying about a family emergency). Does it mean no more artificial sweeteners in pop, Professor Valls asked? Professor Squires interjected that this kind of language has been part of public policy for 30 years and there is nothing wrong with it. The statement could be written in the negative, but it is intended to

promote healthy behavior. Mr. Kelly said that there has been a wide variety in Regents' policies in terms of their specificity; this proposal represents one more step in the effort to have Regents' policies cover the institution across-the-board and to have more specific administrative implementing policies.

Professor Sirc thanked Ms. Wilhelmson and Mr. Kelly for joining the meeting.

4. Faculty Culture Task Force Recommendation: Senior Faculty

Professor Sirc recalled that Professor Litman had, at the last meeting, drawn the attention of the Committee to the recommendation to create "Senior Faculty" status:

"12. The University must create programs for faculty as they transition from tenured faculty lines and into retirement, including a new faculty status such as "Senior Faculty" that would offer salary for teaching, advising, consultation, and service but that also would be distinct from phased retirement.

"Senior Faculty could return 50 percent of their salary for recruitment purposes while continuing to contribute to the department's research and teaching mission; (additional language describing our idea of a Senior Faculty designation can be found in Appendix M). The University also should improve its programs for emeritus faculty, including mechanisms by which emeriti can teach, offer community programs, utilize office space and receive limited administrative staff support. To support these changes, an emeritus faculty program might be created within an existing office dedicated to faculty support, such as the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs."

Does the Committee wish to endorse this recommendation, Professor Sirc asked?

Professor Valls said he had asked colleagues if they were interested in the possibility; what they were interested in, he said, was the health insurance. The rest doesn't matter, and no one would take the position without the health insurance. Professor McLoon said he thought that health insurance could drive the program, which could be a problem in the long term. There may be faculty who cannot afford to retire because of the cost of health insurance. Some faculty keep a position at 50% time in order to have the income to pay for health insurance. This could come back to haunt the University as prospective retirees see it as an easy way to pay for health coverage.

The only way one can retain health insurance now, Vice Provost Carney pointed out, is by going on a phased retirement, which is a maximum of five years.

Professor Kleiner reported that Harvard has a policy for senior faculty that is in between phased retirement and emeritus status. Professor Hanna suggested the Committee should find out what other plans exist before endorsing this one. There are a lot of questions about it, Professor Kleiner agreed, but the proposal also offers real opportunities for the University to take advantage of senior faculty and it allows them to maintain a financial connection to the University, and yet frees up University resources for other purposes. Professor McLoon said that some departments do take advantage of retired faculty by hiring them back. This task force proposal, however, gives them tenure. He said he would like to see the University use senior faculty but that this proposal is a real gamble for a department. Professor Valls said the tenure provision could haunt the University; what does a department do if someone very aged shows up every day but does nothing? At present, Vice Provost Carney reminded the Committee, one does not retain tenure with an appointment of less than 67% time, except for phased retirement.

Professor Sirc asked if this recommendation is receiving any attention from the administration. Dr. Carney said they have looked at it. Once the tenure code discussions have been completed, items such as these can be discussed. It is important but it is not a high priority right now.

It was agreed that the Committee should put this item back on the agenda at a future date and should also be provided with information about programs at other institutions. Professor Sirc adjourned the meeting at 4:20.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota