Minutes[*]

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, October 1, 2002
2:30 – 4:30
238A Morrill Hall

Present: John Fossum (chair), Carole Bland, Carol Carrier, Terence Collins, A. Saari Csallany,
             Jesse Daniels, Richard Goldstein, Darwin Hendel, Robert Jones, Theodor Litman, Cleon
             Melsa, Kathleen Sellew, Carol Wells, Aks Zaheer

Absent: Kent Bales, William Garrard, Dwight Purdy, Wade Savage, Larry Wallace, Thomas
             Walsh, Timothy Wiedmann

Guests: none

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) Faculty Development Working Group report (on what the factors that create highly
research-productive departments); (2) institutional electronic privacy policy; (3) upcoming issues (with a
discussion of post-tenure review]

1.   Faculty Development Working Group Report

        Professor Fossum convened the meeting at 2:30 and turned to Professor Bland to lead a
discussion of the report of the joint SCFA-administration Faculty Development Working Group
(hereinafter FDWG). Professor Bland distributed copies of a set of slides and said she was excited to
have the work done and be able to present a final report.

        Professor Bland spoke about the charge to the FDWG, its members, its activities, and the
products of the group. There were two primary products: (1) an exit survey of faculty who left the
University for other academic positions, and (2) a resource book for department leaders to help facilitate
research. An edited text of her presentation to the Committee follows.

        The SCFA/administration joint FDWG was established by Richard Goldstein, then chair of
SCFA, and Robert Jones, the Vice President for Campus Life and Executive Vice Provost. The impetus
for the working group was a perceived need by both the Senate and the administration to seek ways to
support faculty success and be more productive**.** The working group was comprised of 12 faculty
members representing administration and faculty across the 25 colleges at the University of Minnesota.
The initial charge to the working group, as stated in a March 28, 2000 letter from Jones and Goldstein
was to "... to recommend what new initiatives should be implemented by the University, or what actions
should be taken to remove barriers, to help faculty be most productive (i.e., meet their individual goals
and collectively the university's goals) and enjoy high morale."

The working group began its deliberations on this broad charge by reviewing 1) the work of past institutional task forces on faculty development, of which there have been several that are exceptional. One was a report under the leadership of Professor Pat Swan, another from a committee chaired by Professor Jack Merwin, and there were a set of Pew Roundtable discussions on how to help faculty be productivity. More recently, Professor Vic Bloomfield was responsible for a report on the future of the research university when he was chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee.

The FDWG also looked at past surveys of faculty, most recently one conducted by Professor Darwin Hendel on climate at the University. They looked at these because they did not want to repeat what had already been done and wanted to know what had been useful in the past. It was also rewarding to find that most of the recommendations of previous reports had been implemented partially or fully (such as increasing funding for sabbaticals, the number of sabbaticals, funding for the teaching and learning center, the Digital Media Center, opportunities for a longer probationary period). The FDWG was encouraged that perhaps it could accomplish something.

The directive to the FDWG was to find ways to increase faculty productivity. The group spent several months trying to identify the measures it would use. In retrospect, one can wonder why they spent the time they did because there IS no good measure, Professor Bland said. They cannot use research funding because that does not apply to everyone, articles and books are not the right measures, even ranking are not the right measures because the National Research Council does not rank all fields. They gave up on that goal.

They also looked at current faculty development programs. These reviews determined that past recommendations had largely been implemented, but they found that there had been very few recommendations specifically to facilitate research. Sabbaticals would be in that category but most of the recommendations concerned teaching and faculty work life conditions.

The FDWG went back to those who appointed it; based on the initial work and discussions with Professor Goldstein and Vice President Jones, the charge was narrowed to identifying strategies to increase research and scholarly productivity. By research/scholarly productivity we meant all scholarly or creative work that contributes new information or products. Today, over two years later, with increased demands on the University, and fewer resources, there is an even greater need for information on tangible ways in which departments and colleges can increase and maintain their faculty's long-term scholarly productivity. Often this task of facilitating productivity rests most heavily on the shoulders of individual department leaders (heads or chairs).

Professor Bland said she would focus her comments today on the resource book, which was designed to provide department leaders with two intimately intertwined tool sets for facilitating research. There are a lot of ways to facilitate research (more funds from the legislature, more collaborative grant opportunities from the administration) but they decided to go to the departments for information. (The exit surveys of faculty suggested they were moderately satisfied with the University, but the things they are dissatisfied about are almost all at the department level--management, culture and climate, etc.).

The two tools that they wanted to give to department leaders were (1) what is already known from the research-productivity literature, provided in a user-friendly format that they can use to guide decisions, and (2) a set of diverse, concrete strategies or best practices from highly-productive departments for facilitating research excellence in their own departments.

Given their limited (and shrinking) resources, department leaders simply cannot afford to make uninformed decisions about which research-facilitating strategies they should pursue. Fortunately, there is over 40 years of literature defining the many correlates/predictors of research productivity. Numerous studies outline a combination of characteristics of productive research organizations. Some of the characteristics are attributable to individual researchers, some are organizational, and some are leadership.

These characteristics emerge study after study.

Individual characteristics include such factors as motivation, socialization, competence in their content area, well-developed research skills, committed involvement in both institutional and discipline-specific activities (orientation), scholarly work habits, and a balance between institutional commitment and individualism (autonomy).

But while these individual characteristics are essential, they are not sufficient in and of themselves. Of all the factors that affect an academic's productivity, none are as powerful as the environmental features of the work place. Studies reveal that productive academic organizations have a consistent set of features. These include targeted recruitment and selection of driven faculty researchers, clear goals that serve a coordinating function, a research emphasis, a strong academic culture and a positive group climate, mentoring for junior faculty, frequent communication between faculty and their professional networks, the presence (and perception) of sufficient and accessible resources, substantial, uninterrupted time for research, a critical mass of faculty who have been together for a while and who bring different perspectives to the mix (diversity), adequate and fair salaries and other rewards, proactive brokering of opportunities for all faculty, and a decentralized organization led by seasoned, participative academic leadership. There have been studies that followed researchers who moved from institution to institution--people who had all the necessary training and skills--and in about two years their research productivity begins to mirror the productivity of those around them. The power of the environment is amazing, Professor Bland said.

Is there a sense of determinants of research productivity from the University level, the college level, and the department level? Place can be both a department and a university. The effect is cumulative, Professor Bland said. If a highly research-productive environment is in the department, the college, and the university, it has a cumulative impact. It is possible for a research-oriented department to be in a college that does not promote research productivity but it is more difficult, because it is likely, for example, that the tenure and salary system will not be oriented to recognizing research.

Effective leadership is a particularly important characteristic of research productive organizations. It is the leader who influences the presence or absence of all other institutional characteristics. The overarching profile of the effective leader is one who facilitates group productivity through the pairing of common goals and some structure with highly participative governance.

While this body of literature is not new to scholars of research productivity, it is typically not familiar to the busy department head. The first chapter in the resource book introduces readers to a comprehensive, literature-based model of "the research productive organization." The subsequent 13 chapters are organized such that each addresses a single feature on the model of the research productive organization. This allows readers to dig deeper into one characteristic, be it faculty recruitment, mentoring, reward systems, or issues of group culture and climate.

Naming a characteristic is one thing; putting it into practice is quite another. For example, the research literature demonstrates that having clear organizational goals which guide members' work is an important environmental characteristic for facilitating research. But how, in practical terms, are an academic department's goals and research priorities established? How are they communicated and reinforced? Similarly, it is known that researchers need sufficient work time. But what specific strategies do highly research productive departments actually apply to maximize the time their faculty are engaged in research-related activities?

The FDWG sought answers to these pragmatic questions by interviewing the leaders (heads, chairs, deans) of 37 highly productive research departments or colleges at the University of Minnesota. These leaders were identified by asking each college dean to identify up to three highly research productive departments in his or her college--departments having an impact on the discipline, high quality of the scholarship, if money is an indicator, does it bring in a lot? The FDWG then invited the chairs/heads of these identified departments to participate in our interview study. The final cohort consisted of 37 departments (of 43 originally identified), with at least one department from each of our 23 colleges (all except Crookston). Professor Bland provided the Committee with a list of the departments that were included in the study; the average size was 28 full-time faculty.

With respect to how they spend their time, on average in these departments, faculty spend about 46% of their time on research, with some up to 85%. The revenue streams varied considerably. The departments range from having 100% of their funding from tuition and state funds to having only 8% of their money from those sources. What they were the same on, however, was that they all ranked very high in research productivity in national rankings. Whatever ranking measure they used, they were all very high.

What do these departments do? The FDWG obtained information by interviewing each department head using a standard protocol based on the literature review; FDWG members conducted the interviews. (It may be that they would have received different information if they had interviewed the faculty in the units rather than department heads, Professor Bland observed.) They asked for a hour; some rang longer because the department heads were passionate about the topic. The interview began with the open ended question "In your assessment of your department, what are the key factors that contribute to the research productivity of your faculty?" The inclusion and ordering of the remaining protocol questions was determined by (1) the answer to this question and (2) the individual's responses to the survey, indicating on which characteristics they had strategies to share. Department heads were given the opportunity to review and correct the transcripts.

The interview data resulted in over 1,000 pages of double-spaced text; within each transcript, responses were coded and assigned to a theme. Software was used to sort the coded information across transcripts into the study themes. This qualitative data set of practical "lessons learned" constitutes the bulk of the book's narrative. Not surprisingly, since the interview was organized around the characteristics previously identified as being associated with high research productivity, most of the text clustered into these areas. However, a few new characteristics were revealed as well. These were collaboration and teaching. The emergence of these new characteristics was interesting because they have not previously been described as associated with research productivity in the literature.

Again and again, the department heads talked about how much collaboration was a characteristic

of their department and the activities they supported to facilitate it. They also emphasized the importance of high-quality teaching. Perhaps it was lip service, but from recruiting to evaluation, they said it was not enough to be a good researcher but one had to be a good teacher as well.

Professor Bland noted that they asked participants to share their best practices related to all the individual, institutional, and leadership features predictive of research productivity.   The resource book, however, focuses most heavily on the environmental features. This is because, first, as demonstrated by the literature review, institutional characteristics are the ones that most powerfully affect research productivity--but they are also the ones an institution can most readily influence. Second, in the faculty exit survey study conducted by the FDWG, departmental features were found to be the greatest source of dissatisfaction for faculty who left the University. Finally, since most of the current faculty at the University of Minnesota are tenured, they likely already have the individual characteristics of a productive researcher

Although the resource book focuses primarily on the environmental characteristics of research productive departments, it does not neglect the leadership and individual characteristics that also contribute to an organization's success. A consistent theme throughout the resource book is the essential role department leaders play in building and sustaining a research productive environment (e.g., its goals which emphasize research, reward systems, opportunities for faculty career growth). The departments talked about recruitment and recruiting people with the appropriate characteristics; the book offers lessons on recruiting people who have the characteristics of successful researchers. Leadership and governance are also addressed.

The book is primarily for deans, department heads or chairs, and others responsible for maintaining or increasing faculty research productivity in academic departments on a daily basis. We expect, however, that the information will be of use to other audiences as well. These might include current faculty looking for ways to increase their own research productivity, future faculty searching for the academic home that will, by virtue of having certain desirable environmental features, best facilitate their research careers, scholars investigating ways to develop and sustain research-conducive work environments, and institutional leaders--whether administrators or faculty--wishing to improve their organization's *overall* vitality (not just research vitality).

When she presented a preliminary report earlier to this Committee, it recommended that the university make this book available to all new department heads or heads and include in with the materials given to participants in the orientation for new department heads, chairs, and directors. They are currently looking into whether it would be best to seek a commercial publisher that would give the University of Minnesota a reduced rate or publish and distribute it in-house. Professor Bland said she hoped that the book would be within people's hands in the near future.

In terms of the practices recommended in the book, Professor Bland said, she reviewed what department heads said in response to the open-ended question "What do you think are the key factors which facilitate research productivity in your department?" The five most frequently listed factors were recruitment (24), clear goals (16), culture (10), collaboration (4) and mentoring (4). She provided quotations from the department chairs that spoke to these factors.

What exactly does recruitment mean, one Committee member asked? Recruiting research-productive people? Professor Bland affirmed that it did. Recruiting faculty who are likely to be productive researchers? That is the goal, Professor Bland said.

The comments on recruitment fell into five areas. First, how does a department decide it needs to recruit a faculty member in an area? Second, what criteria do departments look for in recruits? Third, what strategies are used to IDENTIFY the best faculty candidates? Fourth, what strategies are used to ATTRACT the best candidates? Finally, what barriers to recruitment do University departments face?

In terms of how they decide whether to recruit a faculty member, there are two departments that said they are always looking for faculty members and will take them in whatever shape or form they come in, they just have to be the best in the world. Nobody else said that; the other departments said they decided as a part of strategic planning. Most commonly, departments decide when they need to recruit faculty and in what areas. In one case, a department head said it is one thing to make plans at a retreat and another when it gets right down to hiring who in what faculty slot; strategic planning is helpful to the department in being thoughtful about who it will go after. The other advantage is that if a department knows it wants faculty in certain areas in the next five years, and a candidate shows up in year one, that is not a problem because the hire is part of the department's plan.

Quite a few departments said it depends on the curriculum; this was most common in the professional schools. Professional schools have accreditation requirements that often include having people with the right credentials teaching certain course so they were sometimes driven by curriculum in hiring.

Funding often drove in what area a department would recruit. In one case, a department head said they look at what the state needs and what the gaps in knowledge are as the unit develops its strategic plan. Then they will check to see if there are places where a faculty member could obtain funding to do research in those areas.

The two departments that always look for the top people in the country are Chemical Engineering and the Law School. In the case of the Law School, they also have a curriculum they must teach, but on the whole they are simply looking for the best and the brightest. The rest of the units are somewhat more systematic.

What criteria do departments look for in faculty? She listed six: strong motivation to conduct research, demonstrated research experience, good "fit" with the department, ability to collaborate, high standard of excellence, and strong teaching skills.

A strong motivation to conduct research is elementary, Professor Bland, but in the best departments the requirement was "over the top." This was echoed in a recent study in the Medical School, Professor Bland said; the first correlate of a research-successful department was faculty who are driven to do research. The second correlate was mentoring. In terms of being driven, on a 5-point scale (5 being most passionate, most driven). The majority of faculty in the Medical School were a 4 but the most highly-productive faculty were all 5s; one needs to be REALLY passionate about research.

Most of the highly-productive departments did not hire new Ph.D.s; they were cautious about hiring anyone who did not already have a research record somewhere else. They all had stories about not

being able to predict who, without having gotten his or her feet wet, will be top-flight. The exception was students out of their own department whom they had watched.

Good fit with the department was also important. But this went beyond the department--they wanted the faculty to fit in the college and the community because they expected them to work with other departments and colleges. They also made comments, however, about not ruling out people who were unique or unusual. They talked about strategies they used to ensure there would be fit: they had the candidates make presentations and observed them at professional meetings; they had social events to observe how they interacted socially. All departments do this but these departments were very systematic in observing how the potential recruit behaved to determine if he or she would be a stimulus to the department.

The ability to collaborate was another characteristic they looked for in recruiting. This varies by field; in some, there is little team research. In others, where there might be a need for statistical methods and clinical approaches and other factors, there is a need for a team.

How did they determine that a potential hire has the ability to collaborate, Professor Hendel asked? They are not hiring anyone new, Professor Bland said, so they look at their past, whom they have worked with, who they have published with, if in groups, what other team members have to say about them. In some units they RECRUIT on the basis of a faculty member's ability to collaborate. In one case, the unit rewards faculty differently (better) if they publish in collaboration with individuals from other fields or units; that is considered higher-value work. There are a number of practices that push collaboration from the beginning.

Excellence is another one of the "over the top" factors that typified these departments, Professor Bland said. These departments have an attitude that "we are the best and we are going to get the best."

Again and again they said they tell faculty candidates that they cannot succeed here if they do not teach. Some of that is a function of the University's tenure code; some who were interviewed said they could get a really good researcher but would not be able to get them tenure if they could not teach--so would not hire them.

How do they identify these people? What was striking was that they spent an enormous of time recruiting people, Professor Bland said. They use their networks extensively; they maintain contact with people (in one case, an undergraduate later became a faculty member). Some have wonderful national recruiting mechanisms. In one department, the department head said that in the last three years he had conducted 500 interviews with people they wanted to recruit. The way they use networks is interesting; in one case a department head sent out 375 personal emails looking for someone to hire. In another case, any one who wants to be a faculty member in the field fills out an application that is then provided to every school in the country--and they have a national meeting at which all of these people can be interviewed. Some professional societies offer something like this but it is a service that could be a lot more systematic.

"Hiring in bunches" has been used by several departments, who say they are more successful in getting the people they want if they hire them together. Those people are then attracted by the others who are coming. It is also attractive to them because they are part of a cohort coming into a department.

What do departments use to attract the people? They try to build their own reputation and make themselves look like an attractive place; they talk about the community. They tell them everything they will get and put it in a letter. In one case, the department head observed that since the department had built up this image of itself as one of the best departments, they had to maintain the perception of themselves at the same level. Every department has unique qualities--students, collegial atmosphere, etc.--and these departments use them in their advertising. They might play up the fact that they are part of a larger university and can collaborate with individuals in a lot of other fields.

The detailed letter of offer was important. It was sent out to the individual but also to the search committee and to other faculty, so everybody knew what the person would get. Everyone could then tell the person what they had, what they could tell them. The letter was both a recruitment device as well as a way to let everyone know what was going on. The expectations in the letter were also quite clear, in terms of grants expected and publications that should appear, but it also identified what the faculty member would receive in turn. A number of the letters speak to the kind of culture the unit has: the individual will be expected to contribute to others' research, to mentor other people, and so on.

There are barriers and none are a surprise; these highly-productive departments have the same barriers as everyone else. The salaries are low. There is not enough space. The teaching load is thought to be too heavy. It is not advantageous to be in a fly-over part of the United States.

The Committee gave Professor Bland a round of applause for her presentation.

Professor Fossum recalled that Professor Bland said the environment had the greatest effect on overall research productivity. That is what the research and the exit surveys said, Professor Bland concurred. In terms of the exit surveys, were there more leavers from the departments that were particularly good or was it more from the other end, Professor Fossum asked? Vice President Carrier said they did not know; the number was small and they did not tie the results to the units. One would think that if productivity and collegiality were important, even if there are salary issues the better departments should have the ability to retain people, Professor Fossum surmised. Professor Bland said that one characteristic of the best departments is longevity--the faculty don't leave.

How does one change the environmental characteristics of a bad department, Professor Fossum asked? They asked the deans to identify for them departments that had improved, Professor Bland said. It is one thing to list the characteristics of a good department; it is quite another to acquire them if the department does not have them, she agreed. They thought they could get closer to helping by providing the practices that the best departments use. It is very difficult to reposition a department, she said; they need to refocus research, change criteria for promotion and tenure, and so on.

What is the tension between clear coordinating goals and a decentralized organization, Professor Fossum inquired next? He said he asked because he comes from a unit with a slightly different organization. Tenure decisions are made on a school-wide basis, not departmental; Management, Law, General College, and the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs are the only units that do that. Many of the elements of the Pew discussions had to do with the role of departments in the University; people felt the departments to be their home. What are the ways the University can deal with the tensions between colleges and departments in creating improved research environments in departments that might not be doing well while still operating on a decentralized basis? How does one get departments that do not have

strong research goals to have them and how does the college also keep its hands off high-performing departments that it might mess up if things get too centralized?

Decentralization is a characteristic of research-productive institutions; the University is very decentralized, which may be one reason it is such a productive institution, Professor Bland said. But it is not a good characteristic unless there are goals that everyone agrees on, she said. Without that, the organization may have no coherence at all. The Medical School recently established a set of ten research priorities, she related; any money for new faculty must be for positions that address one of those priorities. If a department expects to receive any money from the Medical School for faculty, it must align its research goals with those of the Medical School. Anyone brought in to do research will also teach and do service, but if a department expects fund from the Medical School to hire a new faculty member, it must hire someone who will be a researcher in one of those areas. The college has provided incentives for departments to seek research faculty and has influenced the areas in which they will hire. It is decentralized--every department still has control over its activities and goals and who it hires. But the college's common overarching goals provide a cohesive infrastructure and allows a critical mass of colleagues in the priority areas to develop across departments.

There are good examples of coordinating goals without leaving people out, Professor Bland said. If one has tenured faculty, one wants them to be productive. There are three ways to do so. One is the usual approach of getting people together to do strategic planning; quite a few units do that. Another way is the new department head decides what the department will do; some faculty will leave and others will be hired. A third way is to hire consultants to help guide department through the process.

What is the difference between the departments that were progressing in research productivity and the ones that already were productive, Professor Zaheer asked? They are different exactly as one would expect, Professor Bland said: they do not have the clear goals, they do not quite have the research emphasis, they don't quite have the research culture yet. It is all of the categories, just less of them, Professor Zaheer summarized; Professor Bland agreed. In some cases, the department may not possess the characteristic at all. She referred again to the Medical School survey: in places where a department is not at all productive, they may not have a mentoring program and may not have a participative governance system. In most cases, the characteristic may be present--but not at the level that is true in the most highly productive departments.

Vice President Carrier asked about the concept of "fit." Part of that makes her nervous, she said. It made her nervous as well, Professor Bland said; when she first heard it, she thought that departments are not supposed to make decisions on the basis of the way people behave or their personality style. But the departments were clear; she never heard any obviously discriminatory statements. They were clear about the kind of behaviors, the kind of values, the kind of research experience, they wanted people to have. If they wanted people to be able to collaborate, the candidate needed examples of having collaborated. It could get slippery, she said.

Professor Fossum said there could be a lot of differences across departments on what "fit" might mean. For example, his department does a lot of research but not much of it is sponsored. Most of their responsibility is to teach and they teach primarily master's students, with some doctoral students. In hiring a faculty member a few years ago, the candidate asked if he could buy his way out of teaching; we said "no, the reason we are hiring you is because of both your research and your teaching ability, and when a student is considering this University versus one of its competitors, the reason they decide to

come here is because of the quality of the teaching they will get." That was a fit with our culture; it might not necessarily be a fit in another department. And they were absolutely clear about that. If one wants to buy his or her way out of teaching, they should not come here.

If one looked at the departments in management schools that are rated the highest, do they have a lot of funded research, Professor Goldstein asked? Do they put a significant fraction of their effort into research? Not funded research, Professor Fossum said. There are probably not more than three or four faculty in the school who have funded research. That is also true at other top-ranked business schools; the largest responsibility is teaching because that is where most of the revenue comes from. They publish significantly but they don't have large amounts of funded grant research.

Professor Bland next discussed a recommendation from the FDWG that the University us the resources book in development sessions for department heads/chairs and distribute the book to others upon request. Professor Goldstein asked when the report will be published. The department heads are looking at it now, she said; it is one thing to approve a transcript and quite another to have something one said in a larger context. Once they approve, it will be ready to go. Professor Goldstein said it would be very valuable not only for potential department heads but also for present department heads. Professor Bland said she hoped so. She presented the results to deans from Michigan State and from Iowa and at a national meeting; it is not a new information but at every presentation participants reported that they took away some idea they didn't have before or it triggered them to think about applying something in their own departments. It seems that it may be valuable outside the University.

Making it available to doctoral students is also very appropriate, Professor Fossum said, because it talks about a lot of things they might not necessarily consider as they start work.

Professor Fossum asked how much difference a department chair makes. They make an enormous difference, Professor Bland said. One would think a department HEAD would, but so does a CHAIR, she said. In the exit interviews, it was evident that the department chair can make or break how miserable or happy a faculty member is. The recognition by the department head of one's work, the contribution to decision-making, access to resources--all those are often controlled, or perceived to be controlled, by the department chair. Their role in making the department reflect the environmental characteristics of a productive department came up. The other way they are enormously important is that they themselves have been productive researchers. If the chair or head has not been a researcher, they do not have the same value for research, they do not have the network, they cannot help faculty with the agencies, they cannot get help faculty get grants. The department chair/head who serves as mentor is critical.

Professor Fossum said he thought Professor Bland was correct. He surmised that in the departments that are effective, the chairs are themselves effective. How does one educate or develop a department to have a good process for replacing a chair in a department that has been effective or GETTING an effective chair? What's the role of the college or the University in making sure that happens? In her opinion, Professor Bland said, that is one of the most important ways one can have an impact on research productivity in a department: Be sure the department head and other department leaders know how to be effective. How to do it? The seminar series for new department heads helps. She is also beginning to be a believer in coaching, even in coaches from other institutions. And some departments have good succession plans that includes effective use of the former department head or chair. It is tricky, however, especially in big departments.

Dr. Jones agreed with Professor Bland. Based on what they found in this study, the research, and participation in CIC programs, it is clear that department heads and chairs play a critical role in determining how successful a department will be. The downside is that while incoming chairs may have a few basic skills, there are few opportunities for them to be well prepared for the multiple tasks that face them as department chair or head. Each year the University has been sending six people to a CIC workshop for chairs and heads; they are trying to capture the training that occurs in the two-day workshop. They have been working with Vice Presidents Carrier, Cerra, and Hamilton on identifying the most effective series of seminars and development opportunities for department heads and chairs (beyond what the University does now). Right now there is no ongoing program; they are considering starting such a program, one that would focus on the kinds of things highlighted in the FDWG report.

Is the information about the CIC seminar for new chairs widely circulated, Professor Zaheer asked? Dr. Jones said it is; he sends out information every spring. It may be that some have not heard about it because one has to be recommended by a dean or a previous participant to be eligible. The deans are asked to nominate individuals; they usually receive 25 or 30 nominations to fill six slots. They have concluded that the opportunities are too limited so they will develop a parallel program in-house, Dr. Jones told the Committee, to broaden the opportunities. They hope to start by the later part of this semester. Given the fact that these people play a critical role, one would think the University should put more money into their development, he concluded; the University will start to do so.

It is also interesting that almost all of the chairs of effective departments said they pay a lot of attention to recruiting, Professor Fossum observed. Does the University pay the same amount of attention to recruiting department chairs? Do the effective departments do a good job of planning the succession or of being sure they will get good candidates? Dr. Jones said he did not believe that much succession planning takes place at the University. Every time one looks around to fill a central position, one almost bangs one's head against the wall because no one is working with department chairs and heads to prepare them to move into dean positions, etc. The University just does not think in those terms at the level it should.

Professor Hendel noted that the book had 13 chapters, one of which is about teaching. Does it address issues of graduate education? And in particular, the relationship between research and the pool of talented doctoral students at the University who both learn research skills and to address research needs of the department? That was not part of the conversations, Professor Bland said; they did not ask about teaching. Recall, she said, the purpose was to identify practices that facilitated research productivity. The literature does not find that spending time on teaching is conducive to research activity; it finds a small positive correlation between being an effective teacher and a highly-productive researcher. Even though they did not ask about it; it was a factor that just emerged from the interviews, so they thought it important to include this in the results. The chapter likely does not represent all of the things these departments do with respect to teaching, however.

Professor Hendel said he was surprised that the issue did not come up more, even if people were not asked about it. Professor Bland agreed. But, she noted, when asked about important resources for research productivity, department heads/chairs consistently described the importance of quality students to research productivity. The literature finds that the more graduate students one has, the more likely one is to be a productive researcher, compared to only having undergraduate students.

This is her final report, Professor Bland said; the FDWG is now done. Professor Fossum thanked Professor Bland for her report.

2.   Electronic Privacy

Professor Fossum recalled that he had mentioned at the last meeting that electronic privacy is basically fictional. The Committee needs to come up with a position on what level of privacy, if any, the University should take with regard to employees and students.

There may be differences across states but there is a policy from Penn State that could be used as a model for an institutional policy here. He asked Committee members to read it over before the next meeting and be prepared to develop a recommendation for the Faculty Consultative Committee. Professor Wells noted that the most recent issue of ACADEME from the AAUP deals with this issue; it would be an appropriate source of information.

3.   Next Meeting

Professor Fossum asked Dr. Jones to give a briefing on post-tenure review at the next meeting; Dr. Jones said he would be glad to do so. Professor Fossum said he would get a representative from the General Counsel's office to talk more about automobile insurance and homeowner's insurance. Another item the Committee may try to deal with at its next meeting are issues related to workload and workload policy; last year the Committee considered but did not deal with a policy on time allocation for research. There has also been an increased interest and emphasis on civic engagement; there have been questions about what effect that might have on workload. He said he would invite Professor Fogelman to talk about the matter.

The Committee has a number of other issues pending. He asked the Committee members to look over the list; he said he would be calling each Committee member to learn which they thought most important so he has an idea which ones the Committee should focus on. That will allow the Committee to lay out an agenda over the next two or three months.

He also said he received a copy of an article from The Review of Higher Education entitled "Variations on Faculty Work at Research Universities: Implications for State and Institutional Policy." It would be good background reading for thinking about the workload issues.

On post-tenure review, Professor Bland raised the issue of what happens when there is a significant change in the criteria since a faculty member was hired, which new criteria are used in post-tenure review. How does one balance a department's right to evolve against not using revised criteria as a way to get rid of faculty members who were high-performers under different rules? Is post-tenure review being used as a mechanism to get rid of some of those faculty? Dr. Jones said that if that is the mechanism a college wants to use to get rid of unproductive faculty, it is a very long and drawn-out process. It is not the most direct way to do it; post-tenure review as structured here is a human resource tool designed to identify those who are performing at an outstanding level and to assist those who are under-performing. It is not in itself a mechanism for dismissal for cause, although that could be one result--but it adds three or four years to the process.

The issue is not whether someone is performing; it is whether they are performing as they were asked to perform when they were hired and whether that performance has value for the department now. It is not necessarily that post-tenure review would be used to get rid of someone; it would be used to make him or her sufficiently miserable that they would leave. That would be quicker. Can this be part of the post-tenure discussion?

It can be, Professor Fossum said. This gets back to issues of faculty development: How does one maintain an environment within a department so that those sorts of things are less likely to happen? There is no one who could say "my field has not changed in the last 30 years and I should be allowed to do exactly what I was going when I got here." It is more that some departments have moved from being teaching departments to research departments, Professor Bland responded. That is the most common issue, Dr. Jones agreed; departments shift their emphasis and people feel left on the outside with no way of getting back on the cutting edge. Is it the department's responsibility to provide those opportunities or does one negotiate with the faculty member to reassign duties in a way that they can remain productive and make contributions to the unit? That is the way the process is set up--but it may not always be administered that way. That is an issue he raised with the Regents: Does the University have the resources to help department chairs and heads make these critical decisions about post-tenure, especially in providing professional development programs necessary for people to remain productive? A number department heads and chairs may not know how to put together a professional development program for someone found to be performing at a less-than-satisfactory level. But clearly it is the responsibility of heads and chairs to do so; the University is not providing the tools and resources to do so. So what should be done about that?

Professor Fossum adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota