

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs  
Tuesday, February 7, 2012  
2:30 – 4:30  
238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: George Sheets (chair), William Beeman, Ben Bornsztejn, Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Randy Croce, Jennifer Fillo, Kathryn Hanna, Joseph Konstan, Frank Kulacki, Theodor Litman, Geoffrey Sirc, James Wojtaszek
- Absent: Kathryn Brown, Haojun Caoxu, Barbara Elliott, Christine Marran, Benjamin Munson, Pamela Stenhjem
- Guests: Mel Mitchell, Terri Devich (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources); Sophia Anema (Compliance Office); John Kellogg (Office of Institutional Research)
- Other: Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) department chair/head competencies; (2) policy on Reporting and Addressing Concerns of Misconduct; (3) who teaches what]

**1. Department Chair/Head Competencies**

Professor Sheets convened the meeting at 2:35 and welcomed Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Devich from Human Resources to discuss department chair/head competencies. [The effort also included the position of directors with faculty rank, but for the sake of using fewer words, that additional position will not be included in each reference in these minutes.]

Mr. Mitchell provided copies of slides and explained their work. This is a project that has been going on for some time, he related, and is entitled UM LEADS (University of Minnesota Leadership Effectiveness and Development Strategies). They are just now returning to the elements of academic leadership with a focus on the department chairs and heads positions. He explained that he has been at the University for six years and was brought in by former Vice President Carol Carrier to help develop leadership at the University, an effort recommended by one of the strategic-positioning task forces. He said the effort could only be successful if the institution understands talent management, so they have worked to develop a comprehensive talent management system.

Their approach is to (1) develop and enrich leadership through a comprehensive talent management system, (2) agree on definitions of leadership for various roles at the University of Minnesota, (3) develop fully customized, U of M-specific development models, and (4) consider incumbents in each role as subject matter experts, but not the only experts. Mr. Mitchell told the Committee that he came from a corporate culture and he became aware of how different the academic culture is, so they have not proposed to take an off-the-shelf model of leadership but instead have developed a model for the University of Minnesota. The benefits of approaching the project this way is

---

\* 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.

that it acknowledges academic culture, doesn't try to force fit an existing model on to the institution, it garners buy-in through involvement, and is grounded in leaders' description of leadership in their roles—what does it take to be successful? The result is a fully-customized talent management system that enables the institution to select, develop, support performance, and manage the succession of leaders at the University. Ultimately, the goal is to develop leadership that is ready to meet future challenges. In the case of succession, that probably is more true on the administrative side than for department chairs and heads.

Mr. Mitchell described the process used to develop the model for chairs and heads, which included interviews and surveys of incumbents in both kinds of positions, analysis of the information, and identification of themes and behaviors that they turned into competencies necessary to fulfill the roles successfully. They thought they might find differences between heads and chairs, and did learn that the jobs and approaches are different but that the competencies required to be successful leaders in both positions are the same. They also developed behavioral anchors and brief definitions and then vetted the results with incumbents, deans, faculty, members of the Faculty Consultative Committee and this Committee, and those who report to the chairs and heads.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the leadership model framework has four "meta-categories": strategic leadership, results leadership, people leadership, and personal leadership. The competencies fall into one of those four categories, and for each competency there are four to seven behavioral descriptors. In the case of the anchors, they have developed descriptions of what it looks like when the competency is being carried out well and when it is not. Professor Kulacki asked if they used Meyers-Briggs categories. They do not, Mr. Mitchell said, because they have no bearing on the competencies for doing the job; one can, for example, be an introvert or an extravert and do the job very well.

The Committee reviewed the definitions and behavioral descriptors for each of the four categories of leadership. "Strategic leadership" includes, for example, the following competencies, definitions, and behavioral descriptors.

**Operates Strategically:** Approaches departmental activities with a big picture, long-term view; works collaboratively with faculty and stakeholders to set vision and direction.

- Aligns the strategic priorities of the department with the mission and values of the college/school and the University.
- Communicates a clear, collaboratively developed vision of the department's future.
- Scans the environment to identify strategic opportunities and develop solutions for the department.
- Integrates input from stakeholders to prioritize the allocation of resources.
- Identifies, attracts, and retains faculty/staff that have the critical capabilities needed by the department.

**Demonstrates Academic Leadership:** Displays academic credibility and sound intellectual leadership; exhibits understanding of the particular leadership needs of the department; interfaces with internal and external stakeholders to act on issues important to the department.

- Advances the reputation of the department both inside and outside of the University.

- Serves as an effective advocate for the department.
- Helps position the department's students for success.
- Exhibits concern for student viewpoints and addresses issues.
- Demonstrates academic excellence through own research/scholarship, teaching, outreach, and/or professional service.

Demonstrates Organizational Savvy: Understands the context of issues and dilemmas; is attuned to external and institutional politics; skillfully navigates University cultures.

- Navigates the unique dynamics and organizational cultures of colleges, departments, administrative units, and external stakeholders.
- Champions critical ideas and initiatives.
- Negotiates effectively to achieve outcomes that consider the interests of all parties.
- Adapts appropriately to the realities and constraints of the University.
- Recognizes which battles are worth fighting and when it is time to compromise.
- Works effectively with the dean and other leaders.

Leverages Diversity and Differences: Ensures that the department supports diversity goals, values, and practices; leads by example.

- Capitalizes on diversity and differences to achieve strategic goals.
- Creates an engaging, collaborative work environment to support a diverse faculty, staff, and student community.
- Seeks and attracts diverse thoughts and perspectives.
- Recruits underrepresented faculty, staff, and students.

There were corresponding definitions and descriptors for each of the other three categories of leadership as well.

Professor Konstan asked if they had used the model yet to evaluate a sample of heads and chairs to get a sense of how it worked; they have not. He observed that when operationalized, the model can only be used retrospectively; is it possible to create a version for the selection process that can be used to evaluate candidates? Mr. Mitchell said that it can and that there is an interviewing guide based on the factors in the model. The anchors are used to focus on the kinds of answers that are desired. He added a cautionary note: These tools are meant to be developmental, not to reach summative conclusions about someone; they are intended to help individuals build competencies.

This is described as a management system, Professor Bornshtein observed. Some faculty members who are interested in leadership positions would be interested in these competencies. Can they create courses that faculty members could take? They have one course, Mr. Mitchell reported, jointly with MnSCU, with modules drawn from the competencies. How is one chosen for the course, Professor Hanna inquired? They were selected by the University, Mr. Mitchell said. If the course continues, may one self-nominate, Professor Hanna asked? Mr. Mitchell said he believes that if the University continues the course, it will be alone (not with MnSCU) and that there would be a nomination process. Vice Provost Carney noted that there is also the Academic Leadership Program sponsored by the CIC; five people from the University participate every year. It would be possible to transform Mr. Mitchell's program into something more targeted to faculty members who are thinking about becoming a dean.

Professor Sirc pointed out that so many of elements of being a successful department chair or head depend on the dean. Mr. Mitchell agreed and said that the dean and chair could talk about the elements of leadership and how to measure them. The emphases could vary by college, but the categories of leadership and the definitions and descriptors could provide a good basis for a discussion about expectations.

Professor Hanna asked how similar the elements of this list are to the elements in the evaluation of deans and other leaders. Mr. Mitchell said that the deans' competency model is not being used in precisely the same form as they established it, but that the behaviors and competencies that they defined have been incorporated in the deans' comprehensive review procedure. As an example, "Demonstrates Academic Leadership" does not appear in the model for the vice presidents. It appears in the deans' model as "Demonstrates Decanal Leadership." Some core competencies, of course, operate across all the models, no matter the title of the position, but even where the competencies cross models, the behavioral descriptors vary.

Professor Bornshtein asked if there is any question about dealing with conflicts of interest. Mr. Mitchell said that there are questions about behaviors related to ethics.

Professor Beeman asked what the perceived need for the program is. Mr. Mitchell said that human resources directors in colleges and administrative units need measures that they can use to work with chairs and heads to help them develop. They gathered a group of chairs and heads and asked them if the model would be useful; they said it would. Professor Beeman observed that in CLA they do evaluate chairs with a protocol that looks much like this one so he has a certain sense of déjà vu in reading this material. They also have a process for reviewing chairs every three years with a well-established protocol. Mr. Mitchell agreed that CLA has established a review process similar to what he's brought to the Committee today but pointed out that most colleges have not done so.

Mr. Mitchell next noted the suite of UM LEADS models that have been developed: for deans, for senior leaders I (the president's executive team), senior leaders 2 (assistant and associate vice presidents and assistant and associate deans), directors (without faculty rank, which has been in wide use), and now chairs/heads/directors with faculty rank. They've also developed 180° self and manager assessments and 360° assessments to help develop leaders; the former can be used for discussions between two people while the latter is a comprehensive report that one goes over with a coach.

Professor Sheets commented that this process seems very thoughtful; where do they see it going? Mr. Mitchell said it makes sense to build a 360° model, not for evaluation but for development. The individual goes over the results with a coach to identify strengths and areas that need development and then creates an action plan.

Is there any function for educating faculty who are not in these roles, Professor Sheets asked? He was a department chair for 13 years and occasionally encountered disagreement among faculty members about what makes a good chair. Is there a way that the model or the concepts could be used to educate faculty members who do NOT intend to assume these roles? Mr. Mitchell said that the interviewing guide could be the basis for a good discussion.

Mr. Mitchell said the model will be finalized in the next few weeks and that he would appreciate any feedback. He also asked the Committee's view on the best way to introduce the model to the academic community.

Professor Konstan suggested providing a condensed version to department chair search committees. It would help people think through what the department needs at the time of the search. It need not be a heavy-handed approach but it could fuel useful discussions in departments. Talking about what will be going on in the next few years is important to a search because a department will want someone who can make decisions given what the department faces.

Professor Sheets pointed out that in CLA, often chairs are not appointed through a search process but through processes defined by a department constitution generating a recommendation to the Dean. The dean could distribute the guide to the departments.

Professor Beeman said that much of the model presumes developing leadership strength from within. But there are situations when a unit does not have an internal candidate, so there should be a part of the model that helps a unit define when it needs a leader from outside. That is especially true in small departments where people may have served as chair two-three times and do not want to do it again. There should be a way to reach a decision about the need to look outside. Mr. Mitchell said the model helps make that decision; if important behaviors are needed and are not available inside, that helps lead to a decision to look externally. There are other aspects of being chair or head that this model does not address, he pointed out, such as scholarship.

There are tensions in a search, Professor Kulacki said, because it mirrors both the collective faculty view as well as the view of the dean.

Vice Provost Carney noted that there is a program for new chairs that her office sponsors; it starts with a one-day retreat. It is not required but 85% or more of the new chairs do attend. It is up to the dean to decide whether to insist on attendance; the chairs do receive a letter saying the program is one of the more important things they can do. In corporate America time is blocked out for leadership development, Professor Kulacki said, and that could be done at the University as well. It is a process of continuous improvement, something one cannot do with a search. Mr. Mitchell said he would welcome opportunities to offer programs on a continuing basis.

Professor Sheets thanked Mr. Mitchell for the presentation and suggested that it might be useful for him to have a conversation with the Faculty Consultative Committee inasmuch as it has been having lunches with chairs and heads and talking about, among other things, the job of chairs and heads.

## **2. Policy: Reporting and Addressing Concerns of Misconduct**

Professor Sheets welcomed Ms. Anema to the meeting to review proposed changes in the administrative policy on Reporting and Addressing Concerns of Misconduct. [The current policy may be found here: <http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/Operations/Compliance/MISCONDUCTREPORTING.html>]

Ms. Anema began by explaining that before 2005, the University had a policy on reporting financial misconduct. In 2005 the current policy was adopted, as was the establishment of the hotline Ureport. While there are many changes in the policy, there are few of substance. There is now reference

to the academic misconduct policy (to distinguish this policy from the actions covered by the other policy); it now includes reference to mandatory reporting for the protection of minors (in light of the events at Penn State); there is expanded language about retaliation that reflects current case law; there are other minor changes and the addition of an FAQ.

The proposed retaliation language reads as follows:

**Protection from Retaliation.** No University employee may retaliate against another employee for having made a good faith report under this policy. Any individual who engages in retaliation will be subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment. Reporters raising matters not made in good faith will not be protected under this policy and may be subject to disciplinary action.

The language in the existing policy reads as follows:

**Protection from Retaliation.** Retaliation against employees for making good faith reports is prohibited. Employees making good faith reports of suspected misconduct should feel safe and protected from retaliation. The University will provide appropriate support to reporting employees to protect against retaliation and respond to concerns of retaliation or unfair treatment linked to the employee's reporting.

Professor Konstan said he thought the proposed language on retaliation weakened the provision. The language only provides for employee-to-employee retaliation. If a member of the Board of Regents retaliated, or if retaliation were against a contractor, it is not covered. The scope of the retaliation clause should match the scope of who is covered by the policy.

There is also nothing about size and scope of the misconduct, Professor Konstan continued. What if one is riding to work with someone who is speeding? Under this policy, one is obligated to report it. Graduate student employees are obligated to report academic misconduct; what if a faculty member left out a required element of a syllabus? There's no notion of a threshold of importance or a balancing of the trade-off between enforcing policy and maintaining collegiality. There is nothing about the conduct being mission-relevant and this creates a Big Brother state. The language might include a modifier such as "serious" or otherwise the policy encourages a lot of tattling. The problem with a qualifier is that one can argue about what it means, Professor Sheets observed. Ms. Anema said the point is a good one and that she would bring it back to the people who drafted the language. She agreed that there could be disputes about defining "serious" but that the point is well taken.

Professor Sheets suggested that it would be possible to introduce subjectivity into the policy by adding language such as ". . . a good faith report of misconduct the employee considers serious." Professor Konstan concurred; if in good faith one believes it important, he or she should report it, and is not required to do so if it not seen as important.

New language dealing with the protection of minors reads as follows:

**Mandatory Reporting for the Protection of Minors.** Professionals and their delegates in health care, social services, psychological or psychiatric treatment, child care, law enforcement, and education are required by Minnesota law to report when they know or have reason to believe a

child (person under age 18) is being physically or sexually abused or neglected, or has been within the past three years. These employees must report to the local police department (including University Police Departments), the county sheriff, or the local county social services agency. Informing a supervisor does not fulfill the reporting obligation. With regard to employees within "education," the University understands the obligation to extend to at least faculty and instructors, researchers, coaches, deans and other academic administrators. Reports must be made immediately, and within 24 hours at the latest. Failure to report when required is a crime and grounds for employment discipline. The University expects all of its employees, not just those covered by the mandatory reporting law, to report when they know or suspect child abuse or neglect.

This language is broad, Professor Kulacki said. What about graduate students and academic bullying? Is that in another policy? Not to her knowledge, Ms. Anema said. Professor Kulacki said he has seen instances where graduate students have been treated badly. They should take that up. In terms of reporting, the policy should ALSO require reporting up the chain of command, Professor Kulacki suggested; department chairs and deans or unit heads should also be made aware of a problem or incident, in addition to the policy or other authorities. Supervisors too are obligated to report to external authorities under the policy, Professor Sheets observed.

Professor Hanna observed that there are many underage students on campus (e.g., PSEO students). What is to happen when she hears a 16-year-old student talking about an affair with an 18-year-old? Is she required to report that, given that the 16-year-old is a minor? Ms. Anema said that students are not covered by the policy. But if she knows about a sexual relationship between a minor and an 18-year-old, must she report, Professor Hanna asked? She would be, Ms. Anema said. Professor Sheets said the language of the policy can be read to exclude the relationship between a 16-year-old and an 18-year-old—the fact that they have a relationship does not make it a "University activity."

Professor Beeman asked about the relationship between the University Police and the police departments of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Ms. Anema explained that the University Police is a separate organization that works closely with the local police departments but that has all the same responsibilities and authority of a police department in the state. Reporting to the University Police department fulfills the responsibility under the policy to report to the local police department.

Professor Beeman said that what he sometimes finds confusing is the different lines of authority for different categories of employees. Faculty members are responsible to a chair and the dean. But civil service, bargaining-unit, and P&A employees each have a different line in the event of an infraction. It is difficult to sort out the process of reporting a complaint, especially if employees from two different categories are involved. Professor Sheets noted that this policy need not cover HOW to report and as a practical matter probably could not include all the possible ways of doing so. Mr. Chapman agreed that such situations can be complicated and there is no place to go to make it simple except to the college human-resources staff. They are the ones trained to sort things out.

Mr. Croce asked how the policy intersects with the Office for Conflict Resolution. One might not want to go to anyone else and may just want to talk to the person suspected of misconduct. Is there any language that indicates that as a possibility? This wouldn't apply in cases of personal violence, embezzlement, and so on, but there could be instances where it would. Ms. Anema said the point is a

good one and there have been instances on Ureport where there was a misunderstanding of behavior or institutional policy.

What is the next step, Professor Hanna asked? They will bring it to the P&A and Civil Service Consultative Committees, Ms. Anema said, but not back here. Professor Hanna suggested it should also go to the Faculty Consultative Committee. And to the group representing graduate students, Professor Konstan added. The Committee, however, does not disagree with the intent of the changes, Professor Sheets summarized, and he thanked Ms. Anema for joining the meeting.

### **3. Who Teaches What**

Professor Sheets now welcomed Mr. Kellogg from the Office of Institutional Research to join Vice Provost Carney in presenting the data on who teaches what courses. Committee members were provided with several pages of data.

Vice Provost Carney explained that they were providing the data for fall semester, 2010, and have previously provided the data for fall, 2008 (also provided today, in abbreviated form). She observed that the data are only as good as what is entered in PeopleSoft; she noted that the data are for courses labeled "Discussion," "Lecture," or "Seminar." "Discussion" includes a wide range of activities, such as sections of Psychology 1001 with 10-15 students each but also some first- and second-year language courses. Some language courses, however, are coded as "Lecture," depending on the department, and the "Lecture" category does include a large number of language-instruction courses. Laboratories are not in the data. Committee members discussed with Dr. Carney and Mr. Kellogg several technical points about the data.

As Vice Provost Carney said at the last meeting, the point of providing the data to the Committee, Professor Sheets reminded everyone, is to help the Committee answer the question about whether there has been a shift in instructional responsibilities and an increasing number of courses taught by non-regular (NTTT) faculty rather than tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty. What do these data say, he asked?

The data for 2008 and 2010 are similar, Dr. Carney said. She pointed out the data for the 1XXX-level lecture courses to illustrate what the data reveal. About 32% of the courses are taught by TTT faculty. About 45% are taught by academic professionals (i.e., Teaching Specialists and Lecturers) and about 17% are taught by graduate students. She observed that this category of classes—1XXX lectures—includes a large number of language classes and freshman writing classes, which are not typically taught by TTT faculty members.

Professor Sheets pointed out that there are more TTT faculty teaching 1XXX courses in 2010 than there were in 2008 by a couple of percentage points. Dr. Carney surmised that those may be fluctuations that are not statistically significant. Some of the P&A staff recorded as teaching are faculty members who also happen to have a P&A appointment (Dr. Carney noted that she would fall in that category).

Professor Konstan said he found only three results in the data that stood out. One, there are fewer graduate students teaching lecture courses and more academic professionals. (Dr. Carney reported that CLA made the decision to reduce the size of graduate programs, so if a course must be offered to meet

demand, such as language courses, it will be taught by an academic professional instead.) Two, TTT faculty declined a small amount in "Discussion" sections, which is not bothersome because enrollment is up but the number of faculty members is not. Third, and what shocked him, he said, was the significant increase in the number of "Seminars" taught by academic professionals, at the expense of TTT faculty. Dr. Carney said that "Seminar" coding is strange and cannot be predicted. At the same time as that change, the University also saw a significant increase in sponsored funding, which is obtained primarily by faculty members. If the faculty had increased responsibilities in sponsored funding, departments would find academic professionals to teach for the faculty. And one has to look at each course to see what a "seminar" is. What is also difficult to account for is the instance of an aging faculty member who is replaced at the start of a semester. Professor Konstan suggested that three-year averages might then be more useful.

Professor Kulacki asked if it is possible to correlate over time the age of the faculty and unforeseen absences with changes in who teaches what courses; he suggested including data from 2006 so there are three data points that would permit a regression analysis. Dr. Carney said that should be possible but added that she is not attributing causality. She also emphasized that in comparing 2008 and 2010, there is no change in the fact that as the course level increases, the percentage taught by TTT faculty increases. She said that data from 2004 could also be included, but Mr. Kellogg said that data from before that time would be more difficult because there were changes in definitions so that the numbers would not be parallel. Dr. Carney also suggested that it is important to look at collegiate data; some might be very stable while others might be up and down. 2008 also saw the introduction of a hiring pause, which might be the cause of some of the changes (because departments had to make temporary hires when they could not hire TTT faculty).

Ms. Fillo reported that one change graduate students have seen is a significant decline in the number of courses they can teach. For example, instead of two sections, one taught by a graduate student and one by a faculty member, now the faculty member will teach one larger class. This reduces the opportunity for graduate students to obtain teaching experience in discussion sections.

Professor Kulacki wondered about the perception that, for example, at the 4XXX level, 25% of students are not seeing a TTT faculty member. Dr. Carney said that one response is that the results of the course evaluations demonstrate that students have an extraordinarily high opinion of the instruction they receive, irrespective of the employee category of the instructor. The University's instruction is handled very well.

Another difficulty with the data is that they do not take into account the number of students in the various classes, Professor Konstan observed; the unit of measure is the course, not the student. He said that the real question is the availability of faculty members to students, not whether they choose to take advantage of the availability. He guessed that if one looked at the sections available for a course, there would be some taught by faculty and some by P&A staff and graduate students, and that students chose the sections with P&A staff and graduate students because they better met their needs. Dr. Carney agreed with Professor Konstan's point: The data presented today are not configured in a way that shows that the TTT faculty teach a much larger PROPORTION of students than any other category of instructor. The language and writing classes, while there are many of them, are quite small and do not account for a lot of students.

Professor Beeman observed that there is a public perception that graduate students are doing much of the teaching at research universities. At Minnesota, the TTT faculty or academic professionals—most of whom have Ph.D.s and are high-level instructors—are doing most of the teaching. They are regular University employees, not contingent faculty, Dr. Carney added. There is only a small percentage of courses taught by graduate students at Minnesota, Professor Beeman observed.

Professor Sheets thanked Dr. Carney and Mr. Kellogg for providing the data and adjourned the meeting at 4:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota