

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, February 28, 2013**  
**1:00 – 2:15**  
**307 Coffman Union**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman

Absent: Linda Bearinger, Ned Patterson, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler

Guests: Provost Karen Hanson

Other: Deb Cran (Office of the Provost); Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) committee business; (3) legislative liaison report]

**1. Discussion with Provost Hanson**

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Provost Hanson. She noted that in a recent discussion with newly-tenured associate professors, the mandated four-year review came up quickly.

Provost Hanson said that the four-year review is not post-tenure review and is meant to be helpful to associate professors. The four-year point was chosen because that is when associate professors are half-way through the (institutional average) eight years it takes for associate professors to be promoted to full professor. The review is intended to nurture and mentor associate professors and, if needed, provide them with a course correction and help with development so that they do not get "stuck" in rank. The four-year review can be part of the regular annual review with additional attention to the question of whether the individual is making progress toward promotion.

Professor Kohlstedt reported that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure had a lengthy discussion with Vice Provost Carney about the review and has decided to re-endorse the process. In the draft minutes, Vice Provost Carney said that units should move deliberately and it appears that they have some flexibility in implementing the process. The point, it appears, is that departments should get into the habit of conducting these reviews.

Provost Hanson concurred. It needs to be part of the culture, she said, and is an unpacking of the expectations departments have when they hire faculty members: The expectation is that people will have

---

\* 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.

fully-developed careers as faculty members and not go off track. There is a form to be filled out for the four-year review that is intended not to be onerous.

Professor Luepker commented that the review brings attention to the heterogeneity in the evaluation process across the institution and could stimulate attention to the differences. Does the form to be filled out identify what the associate professor should work on? The form can be used to include such information, Provost Hanson said, and, very importantly, it institutionalizes some accountability for conducting the four-year review. It provides the central administration a way to see that the four-year review is implemented.

Professor Luepker said there are some examples of people who have been associate professors for 15-20 years and who are comfortable staying at that level. What impact will the reviews have on them? The process can encourage a cultural shift in departments, the provost responded, and should help emphasize that faculty members in a department are linked: The accomplishments of one reflect on all. Successful institutions celebrate the accomplishments of all and help people to remain on track. Professor Kohlstedt said she has seen instances where people have turned their careers around when given attention and provided support for doing so.

Professor May said the four-year review makes perfect sense as it is being discussed at this meeting. She has been in two department meetings, however, when the subject came up, and there was anxiety about it among associate professors who have very good records and who will not be content to remain associate professors for a long period. The anxiety boils down to "then what?" What is the potential negative fallout from these reviews? They are not concerned about having the conversations about their progress; the concern is why these reports go all the way to the provost's office. What consequences do the reviews have for their careers? If the review implies a mentorship obligation on the part of the chair, does it reflect on the chair's performance?

Provost Hanson said that the reason for the form is to make sure the policy is followed; what is on the form will not be judged by anyone in central administration. It is also possible to keep some things out of the report, but there may be no way to get around the anxiety. Professor May said it would help if her office were more explicit about what the college and department plan to do with these reports, that it would help allay concerns if the form simply stated that a conversation took place, and that any content or evaluation remain at the department level. In other words, the purpose of the form is to hold the department chairs accountable, not to track the progress of the faculty member. Provost Hanson said it seemed fine to her that the form and any detailed evaluation not be part of a subsequent promotion file or the decision on promotion. Saying that would help allay concerns, Professor May responded.

Professor Kohlstedt reported that one Committee member had posed a question for discussion. "If the goal is to strengthen graduate education at the University and that requires making serious judgments about current programs, how can we address restructuring so that strong programs attract the right number of top-notch students? Should this be done primarily at the departmental level? Should it be part of the compact process with deans? Are there ways to provide incentives through the administration? Who will be the final authority?" She added that the Committee would like an extended discussion of the subject when there is more time.

There will be such a discussion, the provost promised. It is a subject the deans have been talking about all year and there is a point at which the University must identify more resources for graduate

education. The only way that can be accomplished is by identifying sources of funding and that would involve some restructuring, a process that must involve the faculty and the colleges. She has kept in touch with the deans about how the colleges are doing on recruiting, and the administration has made additional one-time funds available for matching Ph.D. fellowship awards to top applicants. She affirmed that all of the money saved from the Graduate School restructuring has been provided to the colleges, but it seems there still simply isn't enough money.

Putting the money at the college level allows them to better respond to competition and package the funds as they need to, the provost said, but there are resource issues that must be faced. This issue is tied into the development of plans to evaluate the quality of graduate programs, which will involve both the Graduate School and the colleges because there must be agreement on the right measures of quality. This will be an "all hands on deck" effort in order to ensure that the University identifies the best way for the Graduate School and colleges to ensure quality of programs. "Given the importance of our graduate programs to the future of the University, it is imperative that we reflect on what has worked well in the new structure and what can be improved. We need to examine whether the decentralized administrative structure is optimizing resources and ensuring that we successfully attract a sufficient number of high quality students." One question will be about the role the Graduate School should play in program reviews. One approach might be to say that the colleges should examine the programs and the Graduate School should be sure that the colleges are doing what they are supposed to do. The process can move fairly swiftly, without any additional task forces, and should be expanded this spring and with conclusions next fall.

Professor Ben-Ner asked if quality control is the only goal or if there would also be nudging in certain directions. It would be both, Provost Hanson said. The primary aim of the Graduate School is to enhance the quality of graduate programs. The provost's office has a larger role, which could include nudging and restructuring.

Professor Kohlstedt asked if the provost's office is looking at best practices at other institutions that the University can learn from (e.g., in recruiting students, in ensuring program quality, how to restructure). Provost Hanson said that Vice Provost Schroeder is involved in national discussions, as are the provosts through the AAU, and the CIC provosts share a great deal of information in looking for common solutions to common problems. There needs to be a faculty voice at the disciplinary level about how things are going with the decline in public support.

Professor Bitterman asked how many graduate programs there are at the University. (No one at the meeting had an answer ready at hand.) Provost Hanson said that there has been some disagreement about all post-baccalaureate programs being brought under the aegis of the Graduate School; some deans have compelling arguments about the professionally prescribed nature of their post-baccalaureate programs and the effect of market forces, as well as concerns about the cost pool issues. The provost emphasized that the institution must stop making decisions on the basis of cost pools. But, even so, there is no agreement about what should be under the Graduate School, and there is need for faculty advice on the question.

Professor Lanyon said it is a good idea to stop using the cost pools as a basis for decisions—but the budget model encourages doing so. This Committee told the administration early on that the budget model had the wrong incentives. Any budget model will have some unintended consequences, Provost Hanson said, and they can be addressed, but people must stop thinking that the budget model drives

academic decisions. Some decisions are driven by the budget model, but academic decisions must be driven by academic judgments of the deans and the faculty. The institution needs to look carefully to see what effects the current model is having. It may need to change.

Professor Lanyon said he did not disagree and noted that the Committee has been saying the same thing for years. He also agreed that any budget model has unintended consequences—but these consequences were foreseen. The effects on interdisciplinary teaching and research were predictable. It is a problem when faculty members are discouraged from interdisciplinary teaching. Provost Hanson agreed and said the University must find a way to invigorate interdisciplinary teaching and research—and agreed that it's a problem if faculty are being discouraged from working with other units solely because of a concern about the budget model. Professor Kohlstedt echoed Professor Lanyon and said that the budget model drives other decisions as well, such as teaching certain courses to hold student credit hours within a college. Professor May also agreed with Professor Lanyon and said that no one will stop basing decisions on the budget model until the higher-ups do so. The faculty receive their orders about classes and it is all about bean-counting and numbers and it will not stop until the University changes. The results have been devastating. Provost Hanson said that she intends to have further discussions with the colleges, because these outcomes are not the result of budget decisions at the central level. The institution does need to be concerned with student enrollment, but that doesn't mean that tuition revenue and headcount should drive academic decisions. But it does, Professor May said, and it drives quality into the ground.

One advantage of the budget model, Professor Cramer commented, is transparency. That is good, although that does not necessarily mean the current system is good, but he said he would not like to see the process revert to the time when the central administration held all the money and decided who gets what.

Another question from an FCC member related to gender equity: Responding to a recent SCFA meeting with Kathy Brown, he noted that when asked about whether gender-equity is a priority and will there be special instructions to colleges about this, she indicated that the previous salary equity study is now out-of-date and that the provost is conducting another study. So, he asks, "What is your plan and what is the timeline for dealing with the issues of gender equity in salaries?"

Provost Hanson pointed out that this Committee knew last fall that the salary equity study that used 2007 data was being replicated with 2012 data, and following that replication, the Academic Health Center colleges will be added to the study. This work has proceeded. During this time she has had at least three discussions with the deans about the need for clarity and transparency in salary-setting mechanisms that also allow for an appeal. This also goes for the procedures for reviewing faculty merit: The procedures must be transparent. There are some units where no committees make decisions about merit, but there must be agreement about criteria for reviewing performance and how salaries are set. Some colleges are moving with more alacrity on salary equity while others are waiting to see the data to learn if they have problems. The replicated salary equity study data will be available in about a month, she said.

Professor Kohlstedt asked if there are any reports of grievance procedures that people have begun to use. They are not that far along, Provost Hanson said. The Academic Health Center deans discussed these issues and have proposed ways to evaluate salaries.

Professor Bitterman suggested avoiding use of the terms "appeal" and "grievance," which suggest contentiousness. Rather, use terms such as "adjustment" or "review." Provost Hanson agreed and said that there could be salary equity issues and some departments may want individual equity reviews, not a thorough review every year.

Professor Ropers-Huilman recalled that the Women's Faculty Cabinet did much work on this subject; have the deans seen their reports and the models suggested? They have, Provost Hanson said, and some of the models could not be mounted quickly because they require thorough revisions at the local level on how much money will be provided for teaching, research, and outreach. What firm deadline were the deans given, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked? None, the provost said, because they are waiting on the updated salary equity data. Professor Ropers-Huilman said that no college will be without a problem and there is no reason to wait. The provost said she would not be uncomfortable asking for a response by a certain date; Professor Ropers-Huilman said that she knows the issue will be taken up in her college but that the Women's Faculty Cabinet has been told that few deans have. She would like to avoid having to have this same conversation next year.

Professor Lanyon agreed and said asked why the question cannot be part of the process this year. The issues must be dealt with within the college budgets, so colleges could do something this year and could be required to. They may not solve all the problems in one year but there is no reason to delay year after year. Provost Hanson said she knows the deans have talked among themselves but does not know if they have talked to the academic leadership in their colleges.

Provost Hanson made a comment about MOOC construction. There was not a lot of antecedent discussion because the Coursera agreement required that Coursera make the public announcement of our partnership. She said she did not think the procedures for the pilot program were crucial, but for the next stage of any developments in this area, the processes will have to be more regularized.

How much does Coursera charge for a course, Professor Ben-Ner asked? Nothing, the provost said. So there is no new revenue anywhere, Professor Ben-Ner concluded. They charge the University nothing but are very engaged in improving online course quality and in developing learning analytics, the provost said, so one hopes the University can learn from this partnership. They do also have a lot of ideas about generating revenues in the near future. Professor Cramer said there is an opportunity right now to earn revenue if another school chooses a University MOOC as part of a tuition-paying program.

Professor Durfee wondered if the rollout of Coursera was similar to the rollout of the expansion of the Big Ten, with good reasons for the secrecy, and said he was glad there had been consultation with Professors Cramer and Kohlstedt. Provost Hanson contested the analogy and said that the decision to use one platform or another is an administrative decision; the platform does not constrain faculty aspirations or efforts to use digital technology in their courses nor does it constrain faculty development of MOOC's. Advertising of the opportunity to produce a MOOC had been done and she expected further opportunities to catch faculty attention so they can participate fully in this activity, if they are interested in doing so. She said the consequences of choosing Coursera for the University's first partnership in this area had fewer institutional consequences than expansion of the Big Ten Conference.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Provost Hanson for joining the meeting.

## **2. Committee Business**

Professor Kohlstedt began by congratulating Professor Ropers-Huilman on winning a Fulbright to do research in Austria. Committee members gave her a round of applause.

Professor Kohlstedt also congratulated Professor May on winning an NEH fellowship; Committee members gave her a round of applause.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that with the election of Professor Durfee as next year's chair of this Committee, he will not stay on as chair of the Committee on Finance and Planning. This Committee traditionally makes a recommendation to the Committee on Committees for the chairs who serve ex officio on this Committee. Following Professor Luepker's departure from the room, Committee members discussed possible candidates to recommend and voted unanimously to recommend Professor Luepker.

Professor Kohlstedt reported that she has two names to provide to the nominating committee that identifies members of the Benefits Advisory Committee.

The Committee will take up at its next meeting nominations (to the president) of individuals to serve as Senate Clerk and Senate Parliamentarian for 2013-14.

Professor Kohlstedt announced the Professor Sheets has decided to go on phased retirement next year so that a faculty member will need to be identified to replace him as faculty legislative liaison. Committee members agreed to consider possible replacements.

## **3. Legislative Liaison Report**

Professor Buhr reported on what he and Professor Sheets have been doing, which has mostly been attending legislative committee meetings and providing information. The main issues appear to be access, student finances, and workforce; a large part of the University's presentations have been about the budget and administrative costs. One key concern has been how unit budgets go up to central administration for consideration and where budget issues really hit the ground—how they affect undergraduate students, graduate students, and so on. The legislature is also interested in MOOCs and there are a number of other ancillary bills, including one dealing with open-access textbooks (which as drafted appears benign in its advocacy for helping faculty identify such materials).

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Professor Buhr for his report and adjourned the meeting at 2:15.

-- Gary Engstrand