

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)
December 1, 2016
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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** System-Wide Strategic Planning Discussion; Office for Conflict Resolution; Discussion with the Faculty Athletics Representatives]

PRESENT: Colin Campbell (chair), Joseph Konstan (vice chair), Catherine French, Kathleen Krichbaum, Michael Kyba, Monica Luciana, George Trachte, Robert Blair, Shawn Curley, Janet Ericksen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Peggy Nelson, Ruth Okediji, Amy Pittenger, Peter Tiffin

REGRETS: Dan Feeney, Susan Wick

GUESTS: Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Rebecca Ropers-Huilman; Rochester Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle; Meredith Fox, Portage Partners Consulting; Julie Showers, director, Office for Conflict Resolution

OTHERS ATTENDING: Olivia Johnson, Minnesota Daily reporter; Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon

1. **System-wide strategic planning discussion:** Professor Campbell called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present. He then turned the meeting over to Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman and asked her to set the stage for this discussion. Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman began by noting that President Kaler charged her and Rochester Chancellor Lehmkuhle to initiate and co-chair a system-wide strategic planning process. Currently, the committee is in an inquiry phase and is looking for feedback and ideas. Chancellor Lehmkuhle added that besides himself and Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman, the System-Wide Strategic Planning Committee is comprised of several members of the University community, including faculty, administration leaders, and students (<https://president.umn.edu/content/system-wide-strategic-planning-initiative-launched-committee-led-chancellor-lehmkuhle-and>). To date, members of the committee have visited the Crookston, Morris, and Duluth campuses to garner input, and are meeting with the FCC today and will be going to the Rochester campus tomorrow. Additionally, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman and Chancellor Lehmkuhle will meet with the Board of Regents next week to get their feedback on the benefits and challenges of a multi-campus institution. To be clear, said Chancellor Lehmkuhle, a system-wide strategic plan is not intended to “trump” any individual system campus plan, but is intended to better understand the distinctiveness and uniqueness of each campus in order to better serve the State of Minnesota and its citizens.

Next, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman turned to Meredith Fox of Portage Partners Consulting who facilitated this discussion. Ms. Fox asked members to think about the benefits and drawbacks that the Twin Cities campus experiences by being part of a larger University of

Minnesota system, and to think to about what an “ideal” University of Minnesota system would look like for the Twin Cities campus. To begin, she asked members as they think about their role on the Twin Cities campus and what benefits they derive from being part of a larger system, and, also, what interactions they have had with the system campuses. In response, Professor Konstan said he has had minimal interactions with his system campus colleagues. Being from the College of Science and Engineering, there is little to no interactions with the other programs either on a research or teaching basis. Professor Tiffin mirrored Professor Konstan’s remarks with one exception, the Plant and Microbial Biology graduate program has occasional students from the Duluth campus. Currently, the program has a Duluth student, but this student’s interactions with the Twin Cities program are minimal, which is likely due, at least in part, to the distance.

Being from the Academic Health Center (AHC), said Professor Krichbaum, several of the AHC schools have ties with the Duluth and Rochester campuses, e.g., School of Nursing programs in Rochester, and Medical School and College of Pharmacy in Duluth. The AHC FCC travels to Duluth every year to meet with their faculty colleagues. Additionally, the School of Nursing has agreements with Crookston and Morris to serve as feeder programs for the School of Nursing. Ms. Fox asked what conditions are in place to facilitate these successful collaborations. Professor Krichbaum said the School of Nursing has a physical presence in Rochester with an office, and classes are jointly held using interactive television (ITV). For the most part, the ITV connections work well. Some of the barriers in working with the system campuses have had to do with transfer credits, for example, all of which is very time consuming. A benefit to collaborating with the system campuses is that they get great students who may not have otherwise come to the University if they would have had to come to the Twin Cities. Professor Pittenger from the College of Pharmacy (CoP), said CoP has found it difficult working with the other health professional programs (e.g., Social Work, Medicine) on the Duluth campus outside of CoP. For example, CoP has found it easier to collaborate with the College of St. Scholastica in Duluth than the University of Minnesota Duluth. Regarding the Morris campus, said Professor Pittenger, CoP offers a cohort of sampler courses to try to interest students in CoP. While CoP has close connections with advisors at Morris and they talk frequently, one barrier has been the need for a co-instructor on the Morris campus for courses being shared between the campuses, but there are other issues too that have not been able to be resolved. In light of these issues, Professor Pittenger said that CoP has more or less given up on exploring how to cultivate this relationship any further.

Chancellor Lehmkuhle asked about the reasons for it being easier to work with a school not in the University system versus one of the system campus schools. He acknowledged that the University does not make it easy for its system campuses to work together. He said there should be an incentive to push through the issues that make it difficult for the University’s campuses to work together. Professor Pittenger said she is not sure what the obstacles are but speculated maybe CoP has not found the “right” partner in the other programs on the Duluth campus. In terms of St. Scholastica, said Professor Krichbaum, it has a strong presence in Duluth and has close ties with the health systems. Additionally, the AHC FCC has heard from UMD faculty that current facilities need to be upgraded and new space needs to be created. Another issue is technology, said Professor Krichbaum, and provided an example of an email compatibility issue between Duluth and the Twin Cities. Professor Campbell asked Professor

Krichbaum about whether the video technology connections have improved over the years, e.g., connecting Twin Cities and Duluth faculty for a meeting or seminar. Professors Krichbaum and Pittenger agreed these connections are uneven and continue to be a problem. Professor Campbell said this is a huge impediment for faculty on the Duluth campus to be able to participate in seminars on the Twin Cities campus.

In contrast, Professor Blair noted that he has a partial Extension appointment, and he has started a statewide program called Minnesota Master Naturalist. Because of this partial Extension appointment, he has had the opportunity to work with people from the system campuses. This program has been very effective, particularly because the program has people stationed across the state. In Professor Blair's opinion, having either a partial or full Extension appointment has contributed to the success of the Minnesota Master Naturalist program.

What are the drawbacks to collaborating with the system campuses or being a part of a larger system, asked Ms. Fox? Members mentioned the following drawbacks:

- Redundancies with some programs.
- Some degree of "turf" per se among programs on different campuses.
- Technology issues limiting participation by students and faculty in seminars, courses, etc.
- Different levels of Library access from campus to campus.

From Professor Tiffin's perspective, the discussion about how the Twin Cities could benefit from stronger relationships with the system campuses is really a moot discussion. When it comes to collaboration, it is not clear why the system and Twin Cities campuses should stay in the same system given they are so different. Professor Konstan agreed for the most part, but said there is at least one exception, which is probably not visible because people do not notice the things they do not have access to. He then cited the example of health benefits. In attempting to negotiate a statewide contract has probably put the Twin Cities campus at a disadvantage compared to where it would be if the University were to have negotiated a campus only contract. The University community does not know how much more it is paying in order to get service for all the campuses from its vendor. This is likely true for the system campuses too, e.g., they may have been able to get better pricing from a local vendor than trying to have a system-wide provider. Typically, there is the assumption that larger contracts give the University more leverage, but, using the example of the Library, being bigger actually increases costs. Being bigger is not always necessarily an advantage.

Professor Campbell noted that UMD has proximity to a large Native American population, which the Twin Cities faculty would like to be able to work with more effectively. While the system glitches are not responsible for a lack of transition, they do not help. The Medical School has received federal funding for programs that were designed to facilitate Native American undergraduates from northern Minnesota to the Twin Cities, and, while there have been some successes, the programs have encountered difficulties in achieving this objective. There are also a lot of other non-traditional students from across the state that are under-represented at the University. In Professor Campbell's opinion, part of the blame for this could be the perception that the University is unwelcoming and insular, and certainly the poor technology access issues do not help.

If the University of Minnesota were better coordinated across all its campuses, asked Ms. Fox, what would that look like? What kind of changes would need to be made at a system level to make this happen? Professor Friedemann-Sanchez suggested the System-Wide Strategic Planning Committee talk with faculty who have expertise in state issues such as Professors Ryan Allen and Kathy Quick from the Humphrey School of Public Affairs and get their input on barriers and possible solutions for recruiting Native American students, for example. The University needs to think strategically about recruiting Native American students, East African students, Latino students, etc. and to garner the resources that exist on all the campuses to meet these students' needs. In Professor Friedemann-Sanchez' opinion, the admissions offices on all the campuses should work together. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said this is something that is being looked at, and one of the challenges related to coordinated admissions is that the campuses are competing with each other for students. Professor Curley noted as a Twin Cities faculty member he does not know a lot about the distinctions/uniqueness of each campus and more should be done to showcase this and make not only the University community aware, but also citizens across the state. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said the committee has heard this same feedback from others, and acknowledged there is a lack of understanding about the distinctions of each campus.

In response to what she has heard from this discussion, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman asked what would motivate faculty on the Twin Cities campus to care enough about the uniqueness of each campus. Professor Tiffin said it basically comes down to what faculty are rewarded for and that is research, teaching and service. Faculty already have many obligations to the communities here and their professional communities such that they may not have any desire to take on additional community outreach efforts.

Regarding the former General College, Professor French suggested the University do more to partner with community colleges and develop a pipeline for recruiting diverse students rather than having the University try to be everything for everybody.

Professor Nelson said competition for students among the campuses is an issue. She and her colleagues are concerned that if students go to a system campus rather than stay in the Twin Cities that it could potentially take away the strength of the Twin Cities programs.

Professor Tiffin wondered if it might be beneficial for students to be given the opportunity to spend time on the system campuses – similar to studying abroad but not that far away. He asked if the University has infrastructure in place for a student, for example, to spend a semester on another campus. Chancellor Lehmkuhle noted that recently the University launched a Study Away program (<http://onestop.umn.edu/academics/study-away-program>), which gives students the opportunity to do just that. Similarly, said Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman, would faculty be interested in having the same kind of opportunity? Members agreed that it seems like it would be an easy program to develop and it would likely serve to incentivize faculty to seek out collaborations with the system campuses.

As a parent of a college-aged person and a senior in high school, said Professor Pittenger, she finds it interesting that the University's recruiting materials give the impression that people

who attend the University are part of a larger system, but in reality this is not the case. The recruiting materials leave potential incoming students with the sense that if they go to the University they will have the advantage of the entire system. She added that she thinks the Study Away program mentioned by Chancellor Lehmkuhle would be enticing for many students.

In Professor Konstan's opinion, for the average student and faculty member, the University of Minnesota is not a system, and there are advantages to not being a system. The system campuses, despite being excellent in their niches, have more in common with the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) way of operating than they do with how the Twin Cities campus operates. Additionally, regarding the Study Away program, if the goal is to give students an experience somewhere else, the University should be thinking about where that best experience might be. With the exception of the Rochester campus, not a lot of strategic planning has gone into what programs belong where. For example, are there programs that should be on a different campus, or are there programs that are currently centralized that should be divided among the campuses, etc? These efforts should be coordinated in a more meaningful way to make the student experience better. Professor Konstan said the University needs to recognize that being one large system does not necessarily benefit anyone, but being well coordinated could.

Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon commented that there are benefits to being part of a system and there are benefits to being an individual campus. While the system campuses have capitalized on their distinctiveness, the University has not capitalized on being a system. With that said, what can the University do because it is a system? What are these opportunities? These need to be identified.

Professor Kyba asked if there are other institutions that could serve as role models for the University. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said he came from the University of Missouri, and in his opinion, "if you've seen one system, you've seen one system." Regardless if schools in a system have the same or different structures, they will operate differently. This raises the question of how can the University leverage its connections with all its campuses. There are some areas where being connected does not make sense, e.g., if being connected reduces the University's ability to apply for federal funding. In terms of recruitment, he added that the University of California approaches this differently than the University of Minnesota. When students apply to attend the University of California, they apply to the system, and the system decides which campus would be the best fit for that particular student. He said he is not saying that this is right or wrong, but the point is that there are a lot of different models, and the University needs to determine what model works for it. In response, Professor Friedemann-Sanchez said she believes that the University benefits from being spread out across the state.

In closing, Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman noted that if members have additional system-wide strategic planning ideas after this meeting that they should send them to her or Chancellor Lehmkuhle, or submit them on the system-wide strategic planning website at <https://president.umn.edu/strategic-vision/system-wide>. Ms. Fox added that summaries from all of the campus conversations will be put on this website and people will have an opportunity to react to these summaries as well.

2. Office for Conflict Resolution update: Professor Campbell welcomed Julie Showers, director, Office for Conflict Resolution (OCR), who was invited to talk about the work of her office. Ms. Showers began by providing the committee with information about OCR. OCR, noted Ms. Showers, is a resource established by the University and it serves faculty, staff and student employees who are not labor-represented. Represented employees are covered by collective bargaining agreements that have built-in dispute resolution services; therefore, it would not be appropriate or, in some cases, lawful for the University to create a workaround for these provisions. OCR deals with conflicts that arise in the course of a person's employment at the University. While OCR is not an ombuds office, it has some attributes in common with one. OCR is independent, and not part of the Office of the General Counsel, Office of Human Resources (OHR), etc.; this is a standalone office that reports up through the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED). All visits to OCR are confidential unless that person presents a real, and present danger to himself/herself or someone else. Ms. Showers also noted that she works hard to ensure matters are handled impartially, and uses a multi-partial approach by letting each side know the strengths and weaknesses associated with their individual position. Ms. Showers added that she is neither an employee advocate nor a University advocate, but is an advocate for having a process that allows disputes to be heard fairly.

Approximately 20% of what OCR does, said Ms. Showers, is handling what used to be called the grievance process, but are now called petitions. The process begins with the filing of a petition, which must, under jurisdictional guidelines, identify a University rule, regulation, policy or procedure that has allegedly been violated. Each petition goes through a number of prescribed steps before being heard by a three-person hearing panel. After the hearing, the panel drafts its findings/recommendations, which are then given to the provost for a final decision.

The remaining 80% of her job, said Ms. Showers, involves informal conflict resolution, which includes helping people identify resources that they may not otherwise be aware of, talking through a troubling event or possible responses to a troubling event, skills building, and conducting facilitated dialogues where parties are brought together, and, in a structured way, are encouraged to engage in a dialogue, but not a debate. The purpose is to give each party an opportunity to share how they have experienced a particular set of circumstances, and the intent is to actually have the other party understand their perspective, e.g., a shared reality. Finally, a small part of the work OCR does is mediation, said Ms. Showers. The University actually has very few mediation cases that go through the OCR.

Ms. Showers reported that she is in the process of finalizing the OCR annual report, and she would be happy to send it to anyone who is interested in receiving it. To give members a sense of the volume her office handles, she noted that last year there were 186 informal consultations, and, of these, 65 involved faculty, 65 involved P&A staff, 34 involved Civil Service employees, 17 involved graduate or undergraduate student employees, and 5 involved retirees or people in other employment categories. These numbers represent a 20% increase over the 2015 academic year. Ms. Showers noted that of the 186 consultations, only 10 resulted in the filing of a formal petition.

Next, Ms. Showers shared her approach to the work she does, which involves teaching about conflict. She noted that it is human nature to want to avoid conflict because it is uncomfortable, unwelcome, and unpleasant – all of which contribute to the avoidance. Hope, however, is not a good strategy for dealing with conflict. Instead of a conflict situation representing some sort of failure, it should be approached in such a way that potentially could offer some benefit. There are some basic pragmatic, strategic ways of doing this, which can result in a shift in behavior. With that said, she opened the floor to questions and comments from members.

In response to a question Ms. Showers received prior to today's meeting about how her office interacts with other offices on campus that handle complaints, she reiterated that while OCR is independent, it reports up through the Office for Equity and Diversity (OED) as does the Office for Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA). With that said, to the extent that an employee has a concern about harassment or discrimination based on a protected identity, this person can file a complaint with OCR or EOAA, but not both. When people come to OCR or EOAA they are given information about the process of each office so they can make an informed decision about which office they would prefer to work with. OCR and EOAA collaborate to ensure they are not operating on parallel tracks, but other than that OCR and EOAA do not interact with each other unless requested to do so by the person seeking help. Another office that she occasionally interacts with is the Office for Institutional Compliance, but, again, in no case does she share the information she gets with any other administrative office unless she is requested by the person to do so.

Professor Curley asked if OCR interacts with the Senate Judicial Committee. Ms. Showers noted that the Senate Judicial Committee has jurisdiction over issues of academic freedom and/or promotion and tenure.

Professor Konstan asked if OCR handles complaints about employee benefit issues, e.g., medical care, disability leaves, etc. if employees cannot resolve them with OHR. Yes, said Ms. Showers, she takes these complaints, but they are not very common. She asked members to be aware that there are aspects of the benefits structure that employees may dislike, but it is what it is. Sometimes in doing her due diligence in these cases she has to tell people that the answer they had been given by OHR is correct, but not always. Ms. Showers went on to say that the most common reason people come to OCR is due to a behavior that they have found rude, offensive or disrespectful. In other words, the number one issue involves concerns around a personal relationship, and these cases do not result in the filing of a petition because there is no policy prohibiting people from being rude, offensive or disrespectful. She said another issue that comes up fairly frequently has to do with people who have repetitively raised a concern, but were never granted the courtesy of a response. In her opinion, she believes employees who work at the University deserve a response when they raise a concern. Other fairly common issues that she deals with involve inconsistent application of rules, and poor communication.

Does OCR have the power to enforce/require a change in behavior, for example, asked Professor French, particularly if the person being complained about is in a position of power? Ms. Showers said she has no authority to require people to do anything based on her findings; she cannot issue sanctions or binding direction. The petition process, however, has more teeth,

assuming that the behavior that is being complained about is actionable. In informal processes, it takes receptivity on the part of the person whose behavior is an issue to be willing to be self-reflective, and to be willing to do some work on themselves. At the end of the day, there are limits on what OCR can do.

Professor Campbell asked Ms. Showers if she thinks her office is sufficiently resourced and has the appropriate level of commitment by the administration. Ms. Showers said she is very happy in her job. Having said that, she noted that the tension she feels has to do with her ability to be able to deliver direct services to people in distress in a timely way with her desire to serve the University more holistically. Her goal, which she is working on, is to influence those who have power and who can effect or advocate for systematic change. From that perspective, it would be nice to have other colleagues who do the same work as she does, but she said she does not feel overburdened at this point. Ms. Showers said she believes deeply, if given the opportunity to grow, the services OCR offers could evolve with time.

Professor Campbell thanked Ms. Showers for her time and meeting with the committee.

3. Discussion with the Faculty Athletics Representatives: Professor Campbell welcomed Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs) Professors Emily Hoover and Perry Leo. Following a round of introductions, Professor Hoover began by outlining the roles and responsibilities of the FARs on campus. The role of the FARs, explained Professor Hoover, is to have the academic oversight of Athletics; they are the conduit between Athletics, the Athletics administration, and the academy. Next, Professor Leo talked about the FARs responsibilities outside of the University of Minnesota in the Big Ten, WCHA, and NCAA. For more information about the selection of and responsibilities of the FARs visit http://usenate.umn.edu/athletics/fac_rep_selection_responsibilities.pdf.

After receiving this preparatory information, the FCC closed the meeting to have a candid conversation with the FARs about Intercollegiate Athletics in general. At the end of the discussion, Professor Campbell thanked Professors Hoover and Leo for their time and a good conversation.

4. Adjournment: Hearing no further business, Professor Campbell adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate