

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 18, 2014

Minutes of the Meeting

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Approval of the Senate Docket, Proposed FY2016 – 2017 Biennial Budget Framework Update, Nominating Subcommittee]

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Dale Carpenter, James Cloyd, Janet Ericksen, Karen Mesce

Regrets: Chris Uggen (vice chair), Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Colin Campbell, Jigna Desai, Jean Wyman

Guests: Jennifer Gunn, director, Institute for Advanced Study; History of Medicine Endowed Professor and Senate Committee on Finance and Planning Member

1. Professor Ropers-Huilman called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. She noted in addition to today's Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) meeting, there would be a Nominating Subcommittee meeting from 2:30 – 3:00 and a Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) meeting from 3:00 – 4:00. Professor Ropers-Huilman in conjunction with Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, then outlined who serves on each of these bodies.

2. Last year, noted Professor Ropers-Huilman, Committee on Committees (ConC) reviewed both the FCC and the Senate Consultative Committee (SCC) and pointed out that there was a fair amount duplication in agenda items at these meetings. A lot of what was covered in the FCC meeting was repeated in the SCC meeting. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she is working with Katherine Cramer, P&A Consultative Committee chair, and Bill O'Neill, Civil Service Consultative Committee chair, to change the format of the SCC meeting to make it different from the FCC meeting. The portion of the FCC and SCC meetings that will continue to be repetitive, to a degree, are the approval of the Faculty and University Senate dockets. The Faculty Senate docket needs to be approved by the FCC and the University Senate docket needs to be approved by the SCC.

Professor Ropers-Huilman walked members through the October 2, 2014 Faculty Senate docket and asked if there were any questions. Professor von Dassow asked whether there would be a strategic planning discussion at the Faculty Senate or just at the University Senate, and, secondly, whether there would be a vote on the Strategic Plan. Professor Ropers-Huilman said it is her understanding that while the administration welcomes comments on the Strategic Plan from the University community, it is the Board of

Regents who approves the plan and not the Senate. While it is true, noted Professor von Dassow, the Strategic Plan has been faculty driven, the Faculty Senate should vote to approve it. If there is no vote on the Strategic Plan, then technically it has not been approved. Members who spoke up agreed that Professor von Dassow had a legitimate point.

A robust discussion ensued about how the Strategic Plan discussion should be handled at the October 2 Senate meeting. Members agreed if the Senate is to have any input into the plan whatsoever, there needs to be a strategic planning discussion on the October 2 Senate docket because the Board of Regents will vote on it at their October meeting. At the conclusion of the discussion, Professor Ropers-Huilman summarized what she heard:

- Expand the time allocated on the University Senate docket for a Strategic Plan discussion from 30 minutes to one hour.
- Invite Provost Hanson to spend about 5 minutes highlighting the substantive changes that were made to the draft Strategic Plan following the public comment period.
- Ask Provost Hanson to moderate the Strategic Plan discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amended October 2 Senate docket. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she would connect with Provost Hanson as soon as possible following this meeting to discuss the upcoming Senate meeting. She also encouraged members to submit their comments concerning the Strategic Plan before the comment period ends on September 25.

Given the longer than expected discussion about the October 2 Senate docket, Professor Ropers-Huilman reported she had hoped to talk about the role of the FCC in terms of being a proactive and responsive body. Anecdotally, she said that she has been hearing from a number of people in a variety of different positions that there is ambiguity around what consultation is and is not, and the shared governance structure in general. Professor Ropers-Huilman turned members' attention to a handout, *FCC's Role in Shared Governance and Consultation*. She proposed the FCC's intellectual futures conversation this year be about the future of shared governance at the University of Minnesota. In light of time, members suggested tabling this discussion for now and putting it on a future agenda.

Professor Gardner said it is important to point out that consultation is not administrators coming to meetings and telling faculty and staff about the decisions they have already made. The closing of the Graduate School is a prime example of a decision being made by the administration without consultation.

3. Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Jennifer Gunn, director, Institute for Advanced Study, and a member of the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) to provide an update on the FY2016 – 2017 biennial budget framework that SCFP heard about at their last meeting.

Professor Gunn thanked the committee for the invitation to share with them the information Vice President Pfutzenreuter provided to SCFP on the FY2016 – 2017 biennial budget request. She began by explaining the process for developing the budget request and noted the University's request needs to be submitted to the legislature by the end of October in order to be put on the docket for the 2015 legislative session. Professor Gunn highlighted salient points from Vice President Pfutzenreuter's PowerPoint presentation to SCFP, and these included:

- The total FY2016 – 2017 biennium request to the legislature is \$1.325 billion, which represents a 10.6% increase over the last biennium request. Of this amount, \$127.2 million is a request for new money (\$41.5 million in FY16 and \$85.7 million for FY17). If the University would get its total request, it would bring its funding up to the level the University was at in 2008, not adjusted for inflation.
- The four budget goals are:
 - Tuition freeze for both undergraduate and graduate students. Without a tuition freeze, the University will have to raise undergraduate tuition by 3% over the next two years and graduate and professional tuition by 3.5% over the next two years. Receiving this money will save 53,000 students and their families \$65 million over two years.
 - Facility condition improvement strategy for which the University is asking for \$5 million for each year of the biennium. Currently, the University is spending \$3.65 per square foot to maintain its facilities, but the estimate is the University should be spending about \$8 per square foot in order to keep pace with needed repairs. Better facilities lead to better learning, recruitment, retention and success.
 - The request for the Healthy Minnesota initiative is \$11.5 million for each year of the biennium. The goal of this initiative is to keep Minnesotans healthy with top-ranked health programs, to train health professionals for an aging and diverse population, to serve Greater Minnesota and underserved communities, and to provide life-saving research and cures, with a focus on the health issues of the state. The key demand areas are dentistry, mental health and care of the elderly, but it also includes paying attention to the importance of having a more diverse health workforce and revamping curriculum and clinical training to incorporate new models of health care.
 - The request for the Vibrant Economy initiative is \$3.5 million for FY16 and \$5.5 million for FY17. This is an initiative around the extractive industries in the state, particularly mining, and incorporates building strong Minnesota communities with economic development opportunities. In terms of the mining industry, the goal is to make extractive industries more sustainable and environmentally friendly (remove the negative impacts of mining). The other aspect of this initiative is to build strong MN communities by identifying and prioritizing critical issues for individual communities or populations in the state, to develop research and evidence-based solutions to support these priorities and critical

problems, and to spread best practices state-wide through Extension Services, the University and its system campuses.

Members' questions/comments included:

- Will a tuition freeze have an impact on the fees students pay? Professor Gunn stated that fees vary college-to-college depending on how they are structured. It is her impression is that a tuition freeze will not have an impact on fees and they could still go up.
- Was SCFP consulted as the biennium budget request was developed? While only having served on SCFP for a relatively short time, her impression, noted Professor Gunn, is that the committee is not consulted during this process. Once, however, the request is developed, it is presented to SCFP and members have an opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns.
- Was the FCC consulted last year on the University's budget request? Professor Durfee said President Kaler talked with the FCC last June and solicited members' input.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Professor Gunn for the update.

4. Professor Ropers-Huilman turned the meeting over to Professor von Dassow, chair of the Nominating Subcommittee. Packets of information to facilitate the identification of a slate of candidates to fill the open seats were distributed to Nominating Subcommittee members.

Professor von Dassow explained the Nominating Subcommittee is responsible for identifying candidates willing to stand for election to fill the seats of members who will be rotating off the committee. The goal is for the FCC to have broad representation and not to be disproportionately represented by only a handful of colleges/schools.

Professor von Dassow asked Ms. Dempsey, Senate staff, the names of the members who will be rotating off the committee. Ms. Dempsey indicated that Professors Cloyd and Ropers-Huilman's seats will need to be filled as will the seat vacated by Professor Kohlstedt. Professor von Dassow asked Professor Ropers-Huilman who will be filling Professor Kohlstedt's seat for the remainder of this year. Professor Ropers-Huilman indicated that conversations are taking place about filling this seat and once she and Professor Uggen identify someone it will be brought to the FCC for approval.

Professor Cloyd added last year the FCC gave the Nominating Subcommittee guidance in terms of demographics that should be taken into consideration e.g., gender, when identifying a slate of candidates. Professor von Dassow and Professor Cloyd explained how the process worked last year and noted that two nominees need to be put forward for each seat being vacated. Ms. Dempsey added the slate of candidates must be finalized by the end of January 2015.

Professor von Dassow said following a call for nominations and self-nominations, four names have been received thus far. She added while she is glad four faculty have been

nominated, unfortunately, they are not from the unrepresented colleges. In response, Ms. Dempsey pointed out that it will be important to keep in mind from which college members who are rotating are from, e.g., all four College of Science and Engineering members currently on the committee will be rotating off.

Hearing no questions, Professor von Dassow adjourned the Nominating Subcommittee meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate