

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 16, 2006
3:00 – 4:30
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Carol Chomsky (chair), Gary Balas, Joshua Beiningen, Nancy Carpenter, Jacqueline Cottingham-Zierdt, Stacy Doepner-Hove, William Durfee, Barbara Elliott, Mary Jo Kane, Cathy Marquardt, Judith Martin, Daniel Moore

Absent: Jean Bauer, Megan Gunnar, Emily Hoover, Jeni Kiewatt, Anthony Kouba, Scott Lanyon, Nelson Rhodus, Trent Senenfelder, James Skoog, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor, Margaret Wolff

Guests: Chancellor Jacqueline Johnson (University of Minnesota Morris)

Others: none

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with new Morris Chancellor Johnson; (2) University Senate docket; (3) receiving reports from various groups]

1. Discussion with Chancellor Johnson

Professor Chomsky convened the meeting at 3:00 and welcomed new University of Minnesota Morris (UMM) Chancellor Jacqueline Johnson. She called for a round of introductions and then turned to Chancellor Johnson for comments.

Chancellor Johnson began by commenting on how attractive the Morris campus is. She related that one of the residence halls has been re-dedicated and renamed for former Chancellor David Johnson, and those who visited say it reminds one of an east coast campus in its physical layout; it is an ideal place to do undergraduate education. She also commended the Morris faculty as a talented group of people who are engaged scholars and who also work closely with students; it is different from a Research I university campus.

Chancellor Johnson said she has been on campus for about four months and they have just finished their part of the strategic-positioning process (a year after the Twin Cities campus). Their plan calls for solidifying the niche that UMM has established as a public liberal arts college. There are about 30 such institutions around the country; they offer the same kind of quality education that the private liberal arts colleges do. UMM is in the top 5 of those 30. They also intend to explore the possibility of being designated as a public honors college.

The UMM campus has taken a state and national leadership role on environmental issues. It has, for example, a wind turbine that supplies about 60% of campus power needs; they hope to add another

* 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.

turbine and sell energy. They are also working on biomass power, and want the campus to be energy self-sufficient by 2010.

Chancellor Johnson noted that the campus was originally an Indian boarding school, then an agricultural high school, and chartered as UMM in 1960. About 10% of the students at UMM are Native Americans (among the higher percentage in the country), and Native American students do not have to pay tuition. The strategic positioning document reaffirms UMM's niche, looks to the honors college designation, affirms the diversity of the campus and goal of continuing to provide a high-quality liberal arts education in a small residential setting.

Professor Martin asked if UMM tracks its students after graduation, and in particular students of color. Do they complete degrees at a higher rate than elsewhere? They have looked at graduation rates, Chancellor Johnson said; the Native American graduation rates are not as high as they would like. They will look at what other campuses and institutions are doing but have set a target to increase the graduation rate. In general, the graduation rates at UMM follow national patterns and order effects. She also noted that in terms of recruiting and retention, the more Native American students they have at UMM, the more their budget is affected, given the tuition waiver.

It is an interesting research question, Professor Martin said: the outcome for disadvantaged students where the cost is significantly reduced. Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt said that cultural barriers are much more difficult to overcome than financial barriers; she said she would not expect to see big differences in graduation rates unless there is a strong support program for the students. Both Chancellor Johnson and Professor Martin observed that UMM does have such programs.

Professor Balas asked how the new budget model will affect the Morris campus. Chancellor Johnson said it is not like any budget system she has worked with before and she will have several things to get used to. She said she believed it would work out, although its effects will not be entirely neutral, and any reductions in funding are more difficult to deal with on a small campus. They have faced enrollment challenges in the past few years, but that problem has been turned around and their numbers are up.

Professor Lanyon said that the Committee has been interested in, and encouraged faculty to be in touch with it about, the budget model. They believe there are incentives and disincentives built into the model, that may not have been identified yet, that may work against strategic positioning. The faster those incentives and disincentives can be identified, the better. To the extent she can identify them on the Morris campus, it would help the Committee to know about them. Chancellor Johnson said she appreciated the fact that the Committee would want to know about the impact on the UMM campus.

Professor Chomsky noted that six members of the Committee will be visiting the Morris campus in December to make connections with the Morris faculty and to help keep the interests of the campus in mind.

Professor Carpenter reported that there had been an interesting discussion at the FCC meeting immediately preceding this discussion about the revisions of sections 7.11 and 9.2 of the tenure code. She asked how those tenure code discussions bear on the UMM search for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and in hearing the views of candidates on teaching and its relationship to scholarship. She observed that Morris faculty do research, and do it well, but it is difficult for them to obtain a national

reputation. She asked Chancellor Johnson about her views on scholarship and teaching. Chancellor Johnson began by saying that she has read carefully the minutes conveying the discussions of the tenure code. The relationship between teaching and research, or teaching and scholarship and creative activity in an undergraduate-focused institution must be a balance and integration of the two. UMM is not a Research I university; it doesn't have the labs and facilities that a Research I campus does, and the faculty have a significantly greater teaching load—a very different mission. At the same time, one cannot be an engaged teacher without being an engaged scholar, so there must be time for faculty to engage in scholarship. In her experience in hiring new-Ph.D. faculty, they want very much to stay connected to their discipline, whether they are focused on undergraduate education or at a Research I university. One of the advantages of being UMM, within the University of Minnesota, is the opportunity to make connections with a Research I university. Professors Martin and Kane pointed out that the teaching load in their colleges (4 courses per year) is not so different from the teaching obligations at Morris.

Chancellor Johnson said she was concerned about the proposed language in the new Section 9.2 requiring a national or international reputation for promotion from associate professor to professor. It is not clear that the requirement would be operationalized in the same way at a campus with a focus on undergraduate education. They will need to pay close attention to that language.

When she left her last college, she had been part of an effort to get a grant for a pilot program to bring in postdocs in science who choose to teach in an undergraduate liberal arts college instead of in a Research I setting. The grant was funded by the Carver Foundation; several letters of support for the grant came from the Twin Cities campus of the University. Undergraduate institutions can and do play an important role in research and in the educational and career paths of graduate and post graduate students. Ultimately, however, research and scholarship play out differently at a place like Morris, which they should. Chancellor Johnson affirmed that tenure files from Morris go to the Provost; Professor Martin commented that there must be an implicit understanding in the Provost's office that criteria different from those used on the Twin Cities campus are used to judge the files. Professor Chomsky commented that while there still may be issues to be addressed, there is new language in the proposed tenure code changes allowing for different choices on different campuses. Professor Lanyon added that there is a new (draft) footnote allowing variation in the weight attached to evaluation variables, which implies that there should be a campus statement. Or a mission statement that could be drawn on, Professor Chomsky said, and the committees dealing with tenure code changes need to be sure there is adequate articulation in the code to allow Morris to carry out its mission.

Professor Chomsky thanked Chancellor Johnson for joining the meeting and said the Committee would welcome hearing from her in the future.

2. University Senate Docket

The Committee reviewed and approved the University Senate docket for November 30. Before approving it, however, it discussed a couple of the items.

-- A change in student committee terms from one year to two, in order to try to increase participation and ensure better continuity.

-- A change in how athletic policies are approved: before the new Senate constitution and bylaws were adopted, policy proposals went from the Advisory Committee on Athletics to the Senate

Consultative Committee (for action) and to the University Senate (for information); the provision establishing this process was inadvertently dropped in the new constitution and one item on the docket restores the status quo ante. (A parallel change has already been approved for policies proposed by the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics vis-à-vis the Faculty Senate.)

One question that has arisen is whether this constitutes a change to the charge to the Advisory Committee on Athletics, Professor Chomsky reported; if so, the bylaw change approved at the last University Senate meeting requires that the change be reviewed by the Committee on Committees before it goes to the Senate. Professor Martin argued that this is a housekeeping change and should go forward. The Committee voted unanimously to put it on the docket.

-- A change in the bylaws to address the problem that arises when a committee member or chair is given an interim administrative appointment that would, if the appointment were permanent, render the individual ineligible for Senate committee service: the Faculty Senate adopted a bylaw that allows the individual to continue serving with the consent of FCC; this docket item makes a parallel change for the University Senate and this Committee. The Committee also approved this item unanimously.

On the last item, Ms. Doepner-Hove inquired why the title "attorney" barred someone from Senate committee service; there are attorneys in the Law School, for example, who hold P&A appointments who ought to be eligible. Professor Chomsky agreed and said that the provision was intended to apply to attorneys in the General Counsel's office, so the language may need to be changed.

3. Reporting from Chairs

Professor Chomsky reported that she had been asked about the desirability of having reports from the CAPA, Civil Service Committee, and Student Senate chairs at the University Senate. Is that appropriate, she inquired? CAPA and the Civil Service Committee do not report to the Senate; the Student Senate meets in the morning of University and Faculty Senate meetings. There is an FCC and SCC report to their respective Senates; should there be more reports so there is a more comprehensive picture at University Senate meetings?

Professor Balas urged that the reports be made to this Committee rather than filling up the Senate docket with a lot of reports for information. Often there is insufficient time to discuss action items.

Mr. Moore reported that the Student Senate receives reports from CAPA and the Civil Service Committee, which they find beneficial. He said he would hate to see caucusing by group and that it would be helpful for the Faculty Senate to have an informal update from the other groups. Professor Chomsky noted that FCC has reports from the committee chairs who serve ex officio on FCC; there could be similar reports at this meeting, and the minutes would reflect concerns expressed by all groups. The SCC chair, in turn, could report at University Senate meetings on the conversations. The reports could also be in written form, Ms. Doepner-Hove commented.

Ms. Cottingham-Zierdt reported that the process began last year when CAPA decided it should reach out to the other groups; it offered a spot on every agenda for an FCC representative to talk about common concerns. They also did so for the Student Senate, the Civil Service Committee, and the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. They also sought liaisons with the other groups, and now

have them with all but FCC. They want to avoid polarization and have each group learn about the concerns of the others.

The conclusion at the meeting was that FCC and SCC make reports to their respective Senates because they are the executive/steering committees of those Senates and because they are creatures of those Senates. CAPA, the Civil Service Committee, and the Student Senate are not, and no other committees report to a Senate unless they have action items for a docket. Other mechanisms for communication between groups might be helpful, however, and Professor Chomsky said she would work with others on them.

Professor Chomsky adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota