

Facmin110502, the Medical School at the University of Minnesota

MINUTES

University of Minnesota Medical School Faculty Advisory Council

November 5, 2002

The meeting of the Medical School Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) was held on Tuesday, November 5 at 4:30 p.m. in Room B620 Mayo Memorial Building. Peter Bitterman, Chair of the FAC, presided.

Members Present: Gregory Beilman, Susan Berry, Peter Bitterman, Mark Bixby, Blanche Chavers, David Cornfield, David Current, Kenneth Hepburn (for Carole Bland), Elizabeth Hirsch, David Ingbar, Richard King, Walter Low, James McCarthy, R. Scott McIvor, Steven McLoon, James Pacala, Deborah Powell, Patrick Schlievert, Elizabeth Seaquist, Virginia Seybold, Anne Taylor, Roby Thompson, James VanVooren, and Gregory Vercellotti; and special guest Marc Jenkins

Announcements and Comments

Council welcomed Dean Powell to her first FAC meeting.

Policy on Academic Unit Governance

Peter Bitterman presented the draft of the Policy on Academic Unit Governance proposed by the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC). This policy would supercede any existing college governance and has enormous implications for the Medical School as well as other schools/colleges at the University. He summarized the Policy as follows:

Problem

There are units (colleges/departments) where there is a substantial percentage or majority of faculty who are not tenure or tenure-track (extended faculty).

Objective

“To affirm the authority of the tenure and tenure-track faculty to carry out the responsibilities which are invested in their appointments.”

- operation of governance
- creation and dissemination of new knowledge

Issues

- college or department
- one faculty vs. several/parsed faculty
- the choice of each individual college to decide the faculty make-up that best fulfills their mission would be taken away
- the enfranchisement or disenfranchisement of faculty fulfilling essential elements of the mission

Marc Jenkins informed Council that by his appointment as Chair of the Academic Health Center (AHC) FCC, he is a non-voting member on the University FCC and has heard the discussion on the proposed Policy. Where professional and administrative (P&A) faculty outnumbered the tenure and tenure-track faculty, there are non-regular faculty and heads playing a dominate role in the academic and administrative activities in schools/colleges. This concerns many at the University because the tenure system and its associated quality control is no longer present in these situations. There is a sense that tenure and tenure track faculty no longer control their fate. This is a dangerous situation for the University so there is a lot of support “across the road” for this Policy.

Peter asked Council if they agreed with the objective of the policy as he stated. Tenure and tenure track faculty should be deciding how the governance is set-up. Under this policy, a tenured head with support of his faculty would not be able to decide who or what faculty get to vote on issues in the department because according to the policy, extended faculty votes may not exceed one-fourth the number of votes in the department as a whole. As is stands, the Medical School Constitution does not conform to this proposed Policy.

The authority given to the tenure and tenure track faculty cannot be delegated according to the Policy. To fulfill the mission of the Medical School and achieve accreditation, certain authority needs to be delegated to extended faculty who are involved in teaching and education to achieve success. Extended faculty members are not tenured and according to the proposed Policy,

would have no say in the decisions that affect them. Central Administration would like this group to be tenured, but this is not possible. Some of the professional colleges face the same issue, but not on the same scale as the Medical School.

Non-tenure faculty can vote on promotion, but not tenure. This Policy would change that privilege. Tenure code provides a nice model for excellence in research, but not for teaching or clinical service. Would tenure and tenure track faculty be able to judge clinical excellence? If the hallmark is excellence, who judges excellence?

Peter will meet with or e-mail the author of this Policy once Council decides on a response to this Policy. In addition, Marc Jenkins will take the Council's comments back to the group. Marc informed Council that this document will be voted on at the February 27 Senate meeting. He and Senior Vice President Frank Cerra will be meeting with the FCC, on December 20 to discuss the Policy. In addition, he informed Council that Denis Clohisy is the clinical science representative to the AHC FCC and he needs to hear the Council's point of view. Peter acknowledged that Council needs to put together a four or five point response that can be passed onto the University Senate. A working group will be started to develop a response to the Policy. Volunteers for the working group are Greg Beilman, Ken Hepburn, Jim McCarthy, Steve McCloon, and Pat Schlievert. In addition, Sue Berry will serve as liaison. If anyone else wishes to serve on the working group, contact Mary Schmitt. A meeting will be set up next week for the working group. Anne Taylor has contacted Denis Clohisy and his participation will be requested.

Academic Tracks-Faculty Roles

Anne L. Taylor, M.D., Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, handed out part one of the synthesized information on faculty roles from the Academic Track retreat participants. Part two will be more vertical and give the movement from rank to rank. This information will be discussed in more detail at the December or January FAC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Schmitt
Staff to the FAC

©2002 Regents of the University of Minnesota. All rights reserved.

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

Last modified on Friday Dec 02, 2005

This page is located at <http://www.med.umn.edu/faculty/governance/facmin/facmin110502/home.html>