

**Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)**  
**February 2, 2017**  
**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:** Joint Task Force on Student Mental Health Update; Discussion on Immigration Executive Order; Discussion with Provost Hanson; Legislative Liaison Update; Resolution to Add an American Association of University Professors to the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure; Senate Committee on Finance & Planning Update]

**PRESENT:** Colin Campbell (chair), Joseph Konstan (vice chair), Catherine French, Dan Feeney, Kathleen Krichbaum, Monica Luciana, Donna Spannaus-Martin, George Trachte, Susan Wick, Robert Blair, Shawn Curley, Janet Ericksen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Peggy Nelson, Ruth Okediji, Amy Pittenger

**REGRETS:** Michael Kyba, Michael Oakes, Peter Tiffin

**GUESTS:** Executive Vice President and Provost Karen Hanson

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Deb Cran, chief of staff, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost

**1. Joint Task Force on Student Mental Health update:** Professor Campbell called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. He then called on Professor Wick, FCC member, and chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), and co-chair of the Joint Task Force on Student Mental Health (JTFSMH), to provide the committee with an update on the work of the task force. Professor Wick began by providing background about the task force, e.g., its charge, membership, etc.

The task force has been meeting since the end of August, said Professor Wick, and it has come up with three recommendations, which are in the process of being wordsmithed. While the recommendations specifically focus on the Twin Cities campus, they will be applicable to the system campuses as well. The task force hopes to complete its report in about a month after which it will be given to Provost Hanson and Professor Campbell, chair, FCC. Once they have had an opportunity to review it, the goal is to take it to SCEP, and then the Senate.

What is the status of the Red Folder and are there plans to distribute it broadly to the University community, asked Professor Krichbaum? Professor Wick said it is her understanding that Matt Hanson, assistant director of Boynton Mental Health, distributes these folders when he goes out to speak with various groups about student mental health and how to recognize and respond to students in distress. Professor Krichbaum asked if it was ok to share this resource with the AHC Student Consultative Committee. Professor Wick said she thinks it would be fine to do so, but suggested Professor Krichbaum contact Dr. Hanson to confirm.

Professor French commented that she attended one of these trainings awhile ago and noted that those in attendance were primarily professional advisors versus faculty advisors. It seems like there could be a lot of faculty advisors (upper division) who are not getting this training. What is being done to ensure that faculty and faculty advisors are getting this information? Professor Wick said the JTFSMH is working on getting this information out more broadly. A JTFSMH recommendation is that there be better advertising and promotion of the sessions Dr. Hanson conducts. Departments also need to be made aware that these training sessions are available.

Professor French commented that some students will have stressful careers once they graduate, and so faculty have a responsibility to also equip students with tools to manage stress rather than simply protecting them from it. Professor Wick concurred that some careers are inherently more stressful than others, and further agreed that there needs to be a balance with students in terms of being realistic about their future careers and giving them coping skills, etc.

Professor Konstan asked if there are international students on the JTFSMH. No, said Professor Wick, but the task force has talked about international students and other marginalized students who may not feel comfortable talking about mental health issues. Professor Konstan said for international students in particular there is a confounding of academic status, employment status and visa status, which creates unique stressors. He suggested the task force solicit input from international students about their stressors.

Professor Campbell said he wanted it made clear that serious thought was given to involving the system campuses in the JTFSMH effort, but the decision was intentionally made not to do so. The rationale behind this decision was that the Twin Cities needed to get its own house in order before rolling it out to the system campuses. He said he hopes this is articulated in the JTFSMH's final report because he does not want it coming across that the system campuses were once again overlooked.

Before concluding, Professor Wick said she and Gary Christenson, chief medical officer, Boynton Health and JTFSMH co-chair, would be updating the Board of Regents on the JTFSMH next week.

**2. Discussion regarding the executive order on immigration:** Professor Campbell teed up the discussion by saying he has been bombarded with emails from a number of institutions asking if the FCC plans to make a statement about the recent executive order on immigration. With that said, he asked members for their thoughts on whether the FCC should weigh in on this matter, and, if so, how it should go about doing so.

Professor Luciana said it strikes her as being premature to put out a meaningful statement given the fluid nature of this order. Having said that, what might the FCC say that would be substantially different from what President Kaler has already said?

Professor Feeney raised the question about the ramifications of the executive order on the University. Secondly, he suggested Professor Campbell and Konstan, as chair and vice chair of the FCC, talk with President Kaler about this issue particularly in light of the recent Star Tribune article: [\*Trump's orders have U and Macalester presidents with varying views\*](#). Before

making any statement, the FCC and the University need to better understand the ramifications of the executive order on the institution.

Professor Konstan said he too has received a lot of emails about the executive order some of which were critical of President Kaler's statement because, according to some people, it did not sufficiently condemn the executive action taken by President Trump. In Professor Konstan's opinion and based on what he has heard from some of his colleagues, people should compare President Kaler's statement with those of other public university leaders. In comparison, President Kaler's statement was among the strongest; it is the private college leaders who are the ones speaking out. Public institutions need to steer clear of taking sides on political matters. It is clear that President Kaler does not want to position the University as being anti any-political group. Professor Konstan noted that he tends to side with the people who say that the faculty, staff and students should make a statement about the University's values; however, having said that, any statement that is made will likely be out-of-date within 48 hours given the flux around this situation.

Recognizing the fluidity of this situation, Professor Curley suggested the FCC consider voicing its support of President Kaler's position. In response, Professor Campbell commented on the number of deans who have issued statements on behalf of their respective schools. He then read a sentence from Dr. Brooks Jackson's statement that impressed him because it conveyed the sense that the University of Minnesota is an extended family and that it cares about its students and employees. Professor Nelson said she was not interested in condemning or supporting President Kaler's statement, but suggested the FCC put out a general statement of support for its students, faculty and staff who have been impacted by this executive order.

Professor Krichbaum noted that in a recent AHC FCC meeting with Dr. Jackson, he clearly stated that the University is not a sanctuary campus, and she thinks this statement needs further clarification on what it really means, especially in light of the fact that the City of Minneapolis and the City of St. Paul have both declared themselves sanctuary cities. Professor Konstan said there is an [article](#) in today's Minnesota Daily that provides some clarification around this question.

Professor Friedemann-Sanchez suggested separating the instrumental from the moral position on this matter. In essence, President Kaler's statement presented the instrumental position facing the University. She agreed that there is a big difference between what public versus private universities can say about the executive order. With that said, the FCC could make a statement that aligns with the mission of the University, which includes being an inclusive place. In her opinion, such a statement would be beneficial for students who are feeling stressed, isolated, and potentially discriminated against. The statement could say something to the effect that the FCC empathizes with students who are feeling this way in order to validate their experience. Related to this, Professor Nelson suggested that the FCC may want to ask for faculty volunteers who would be willing to talk with students who are feeling stressed and isolated.

In light of time, Professor Campbell commented that the point Professor Friedemann-Sanchez raised was quite similar to what Professor Konstan said. Therefore, he asked Professors

Friedemann-Sanchez and Konstan if they would be willing to collaborate and draft a statement that captures the essence of the points they made. He added that the draft statement will be an item for the February 16 FCC agenda. In the meantime, Professor Campbell said he and Professor Konstan will touch base with President Kaler about how the FCC plans to respond.

**3. Discussion with Provost Hanson:** Professor Campbell welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting and asked her to share what is on her mind with the committee. Provost Hanson said that she just came from a forum, *What Is The Impact Of New Immigration Policies for the U of M?* She noted that the event was sponsored by multiple campus units and academic programs and featured speakers from the University community who were able to speak to various issues related to the executive order and provided resources for faculty, staff and students. Provost Hanson noted that an unaddressed issue that was raised at the forum was the number of University staff who have been impacted by the executive order, and of course the impact was not just felt by faculty and students. In Provost Hanson's opinion, the forum was in many ways encouraging because it illustrated the amount of brainpower and energy from a variety of areas across the institution that was and will be put into staying on top of the immigration executive order.

Professor Campbell said that the FCC was talking about this issue before she came in the room. He said the FCC agreed that the fluidity issue related to this matter is vexing – on the one hand a quick response would be good, but, on the other hand, responding quickly might mean a response that actually does not respond to the current state of affairs. Additionally, the FCC talked about the challenges related to the University being a publically supported institution and how that impacts its response. Then, at the request of Professor Campbell, Professor Friedemann-Sanchez informed Provost Hanson about her suggestion that the FCC write a statement validating the feelings of its students and justifying its position based on the mission of the University. This statement would serve the purpose of reaching out to students and letting them know the University is here for them. Professor Campbell said he likes the idea of a non-political statement in favor of a statement that speaks to the students. Professor Konstan agreed and said he believes it is important for the FCC to reaffirm the University's mission, which talks about how the University treats diverse people.

In response to a question from Professor Curley about what the University is doing in terms of providing resources to faculty, staff and students impacted by the executive order, Provost Hanson said a website with resources is being developed (for now, the Campus Climate website is being used: <https://campus-climate.umn.edu/content/immigration-executive-order-questions-and-resources>), but if faculty, staff, or students have immediate issues they should go to one of the offices on campus that can help them such as University Student Legal Service, and/or Global Programs and Strategy Alliance. Additionally, said Provost Hanson, the University is seeing cooperation across academia about how to respond to the various issues that are arising. The reality is the dimension of this problem is unclear in terms of the number of people in the University community who are impacted; this is a remarkably fluid situation.

Regarding the J1 visa program, Professor Konstan suggested that the Graduate School and its programs should be thinking about what might change going forward. For example, it could be that international students who are coming to the United States to get a graduate degree and

who are thinking it will lead to American residency and citizenship, could likely change. Behind this issue, said Provost Hanson, is the issue of what it means for our institutions to pursue knowledge in circumstances that are hostile to full and free international exchange.

Moving on, Provost Hanson talked about the [Pre-Planning Open Forum on Liberal Education](#) that was held on Monday, January 30, 2017. Provost Hanson said she heard that some people did not like the idea of an open forum and that they felt the discussion should start in the Senate, but, in her opinion, she thinks this is a topic that should be broadly discussed, and not limited to senators. Professor Campbell said because not everyone that cares about liberal education is on the Senate, and not everyone on the Senate cares about liberal education that it would make sense to have Professor Wick brief the Senate at the April meeting on the progress of these discussions. Provost Hanson said there are additional liberal education forums scheduled for this spring, and, once these sessions have taken place, a summary report will be generated. Regarding the January 30 open forum, commented Professor Konstan, the random nature of how people were seated at the forum tables led to good ideas, and, hopefully, this will continue. Other members agreed that they also liked the diverse nature of the table groups, which resulted in thoughtful discussions.

Next, Provost Hanson said in a previous conversation with the FCC she had shared that she was not particularly happy with the instrument used for the decanal reviews. While the reviews are on the whole useful, she believes the timing of the reviews should be shifted and the instrument updated. In her opinion, many of the questions in the instrument are not relevant and the instrument itself is daunting in terms of its length. Professor Campbell added that the instrument enables people to provide insight on matters that they had no knowledge of.

Provost Hanson noted that decanal reviews are not a time when deans get their appointments renewed or not. To be clear, deans serve at-will and can be terminated at any time. The reviews are a touch point for gathering information about how things are going in the schools. With that said, the current review process and instrument do not get at the things that could be useful; for example, whether resources are being appropriately allocated in light of changes that might be occurring in the fields served by the schools, or how the position of the school or college, influenced by internal and external factors, is being monitored and shaped by the dean. In Provost Hanson's opinion, she would like to check in sooner with these sorts of reviews, rather than waiting three years for the first review. This would provide the deans with more timely feedback and give them a better sense of how they are settling into their new roles. Provost Hanson said the review instrument is in the process of being revamped - e.g., using shorter, more direct questions - and will be rolled out relatively soon.

Professor French asked if there are any peer institutions that have good processes and instruments that the University could borrow from. Given her experience at Indiana University, Provost Hanson said their process involved a lot more people from the colleges participating in the campus discussion once the survey results were collected. Provost Hanson said she feels strongly that there needs to be more robust participation from people in the colleges in these discussions, which would enlarge the campus review committees. She added that she has talked with other Big Ten provosts about their review processes and most of the schools work in much of the same way.

Regarding the frequency of reviews, Professor Friedemann-Sanchez asked Provost Hanson her opinion about waiting three-years for the first review. Provost Hanson said that moving forward the idea is to have the first survey go out 12 – 18 months after the dean has started. The people working on changes to the current review process characterize this first review as a “developmental” review. A more detailed review would then be undertaken in three years, and at some point, for long-serving deans, in-depth reviews might move to five-year intervals.

Professor Wick commented that some survey questions are answerable and other questions are asking for impressions, e.g., how does the dean manage money. She said somehow the questions need to discriminate what a person actually knows versus and how someone feels about or perceives something. In response, Provost Hanson said the earlier instrument had a number of these types questions, and so the goal in revamping the instrument is to minimize these kinds of questions. In addition, she noted that the earlier instrument asked a lot of demographic questions, the answers to which could, in some circumstances, uniquely identify the respondent. In Provost Hanson’s opinion, anonymity should be maintained, and, therefore, some of these questions will be omitted. Professor French agreed, and added that regarding the comment about if someone has evidence that allows him/her to answer a question or whether their response is subjective, she thinks even the questions that people might not have direct knowledge about could still be valuable in terms of signaling to a dean that he/she may need to explain their actions more clearly.

In light of time, Professor Campbell thanked Provost Hanson for a good discussion.

**4. Legislative liaison update:** Professor Campbell called on Professor Spannaus-Martin to provide the committee with a legislative liaison update. Professor Spannaus-Martin began by noting said she and Professor Michael Oakes, the other legislative liaison, have been attending both House and Senate committee meetings. She then briefly highlighted some of the topics of interest to legislators such as athletics and student debt to name a few.

Moving on, Professor Spannaus-Martin said that as a new legislative liaison, it would be helpful for her to hear from her faculty colleagues about their University-related legislative priorities so that she can connect legislators to faculty who are intimately familiar with specific projects in the University’s budget request. Professor Spannaus-Martin said she is happy to give legislators her opinion in response to their questions, but would like to know how to go about getting faculty feedback. Professor Konstan suggested to Professor Spannaus-Martin that as questions arise she should feel free to contact him or Professor Campbell as well as the administration because they know what colleges/units are asking for. Professor Campbell agreed and suggested Professor Spannaus-Martin send any questions to Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, and she will triage to the appropriate people.

Lastly, Professor Spannaus-Martin reported that she and Professor Oakes will be meeting with Representative Jennifer Schultz (DFL) District 7A Duluth next week. Representative Schultz is also a faculty member at UMD.

**5. Academic Freedom & Tenure (AF&T) resolution to add an American Association of University Professors (AAUP) representative on AF&T:** Professor Campbell welcomed Professor Phil Buhlmann, co-chair, AF&T. Professor Buhlmann began with an explanation of how the request to add an AAUP ex-officio member to AF&T came about. He noted that about two and a half years ago or so, Professor Paula Rabinowitz suggested that the AAUP should have an ex-officio seat on AF&T. AF&T took the position that because their meetings are open to the public that the AAUP local chapter president should simply attend their meetings. Subsequently, AAUP local chapter president Professor Naomi Scheman attended AF&T meetings regularly as a guest.

Professor Buhlmann said that Professor Eva von Dassow is now the AAUP local chapter president, and since fall 2016 replaced Professor Naomi Scheman who has retired. Like Professor Scheman, Professor von Dassow has been regularly attending meetings this year. Last fall, the issue of having an AAUP non-voting, ex-officio member on AF&T came up once again. While some members were enthusiastic about moving forward with this action, others were less enthusiastic; however, no one on the committee could come up with a reason for why having an AAUP seat on the committee would be a bad idea. In the end, the committee looked back on the time that someone from AAUP had been attending its meetings and concluded it had been useful, which led to the resolution being discussed today. With that said, Professor Buhlmann welcomed questions and comments from the floor.

Professor Curley said for him the burden of proof would be why AF&T should add an AAUP non-voting, ex-officio member on the committee rather than why it should not. If an informal system already exists and it is working, what would be the benefit of adding an AAUP member to AF&T? Professor Buhlmann said AF&T feels that because the AAUP thinks about issues relevant to AF&T at the national level, and gets input from several different universities, this is input that is helpful to the committee. To have someone from AAUP who regularly attends AF&T meetings, and provides information is beneficial to the committee. Giving the AAUP an official non-voting, ex-officio seat on the committee guarantees the committee will have continuous input from the AAUP, particularly as new AAUP presidents are elected.

Despite the fact that a non-voting, ex-officio member would not have a vote, said Professor Wick, they are present and vocal during the discussions that result in a vote, which could ultimately influence/sway how members of the committee vote. Regarding the continuity argument, this is something that actually bothers her because if someone gets on the committee and stays on it for an extended period of time, he/she could have undue influence on the committee. The committee could likely come to rely on this person because of the continuity they bring to the committee, and yet they were never elected to serve on the committee or vetted through the Committee on Committees process. In response, Professor Buhlmann said he does not know if there are term limits for the local AAUP president position.

In an effort to avoid any controversy related to this resolution, Professor Pittenger suggested that the AAUP set the expectation as part of its governing documents that whoever is elected AAUP president that this person must, as part of their job duties, regularly attend AF&T meetings. This would put the onus on the AAUP and accomplish the same thing without having to add a non-voting, ex-officio seat on AF&T.

Do any other Senate committees, asked Professor Blair, have ex-officio members who are outside of the University? Professor Campbell said he is not aware of any other committees that have ex-officio members that are representing an outside organization.

Professor Okediji said she likes Professor Pittenger's solution, and that she personally is not persuaded by the information argument given that the information provided by the AAUP member is information the committee could get anyway. With that said, it strikes her that a move like this should require that there be some specific, distinctive, or unique need for information that would otherwise be difficult for the committee to get. Professor Buhlmann said he believes there are two types of information, the information that is out there and widely available, and information that the committee might not be aware of. Having input from someone from AAUP that has some historical memory that members of the committee might not otherwise have would be beneficial. In response, Professor Okediji asked whether this person brings new knowledge to every meeting that he/she attends. There is form and there is function; therefore, if the strongest argument is that someone be accessible to the committee, then Professor Pittenger's suggestion or a variation on that would be just as effective. She added that in her mind she wonders if there is something distinctive that makes the formalization of this seat necessary. Yes and no, said Professor Buhlmann. Yes, as it relates to the fact that the committee has a continuous need for the information this person provides, but no from the perspective that this information could be obtained by simply having this person regularly sit in on the meetings without being an official member.

Professor Feeney said he has concerns about an outside entity having an official seat on a Senate committee that represents different interests. He does not feel the AAUP local chapter president should be an official duly constituted member of AF&T, regardless if the person has voting rights or not. Professor Nelson agreed with Professor Feeney. She added that the AAUP is nationally involved in unionization efforts, regardless if the local chapter is involved or not.

Given the AF&T meetings are open to the public, said Professor Konstan, the AAUP president or a local AAUP officer could attend the meetings and serve as a liaison to the committee. However, if AF&T ever feels the need to close its meeting, this person would have to leave the room. He reminded members that the AAUP is a membership organization that the vast majority of University faculty members do not belong to, and, as a result, they would not have a say in the selection of its leadership. There are other organizations that attempt to cover the same space as AAUP such as the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), and no one is suggesting there should be a FIRE representative on AF&T. Professor Konstan suggested AF&T ask the Committee on Committees to identify people who have knowledge of the national scene related to academic freedom as part of its criteria for serving on AF&T. Then, as people are identified to serve on AF&T, they would be there representing the faculty and not an outside organization. Members of the committee should not be chosen because of their title and they should not be chosen by AAUP.

Professor Campbell thanked Professor Buhlmann for attending today's meeting. He added that he really likes Professor Pittenger's suggestion because it accomplishes the same thing that the

resolution does, but puts the onus on the AAUP. Professor Buhlmann said he would bring the FCC's concerns back to AF&T for further discussion.

**6. Senate Committee on Finance and Planning (SCFP) update:** Professor Campbell turned to Professor Feeney and asked him provide the committee with an update on what SCFP has been working on this year. Professor Feeney said SCFP has been quite busy this year. To begin, he noted that the committee has had extensive discussions about M Health with Dr. Bobbi Daniels, chief executive officer, University of Minnesota Physicians (UMP), and Dr. Brooks Jackson, vice president for health sciences and dean of the Medical School. SCFP is looking at M Health from the perspective of what is the financial risk to the institution.

Additionally, said Professor Feeney, SCFP has had a couple of discussions about the Athletes Village. While SCFP is not interested in talking about the merits of or the lack thereof of the Athletes Village, it is looking at it from the point of whether the institution can afford it and how the fundraising going.

Another issue that SCFP has talked about this year is the student expense or the cost of attending the University on a number of different fronts such as the cost of housing and food, do the liberal education requirements influence the amount of tuition that has to be expended for a student to get a degree, and is enrollment being properly managed.

Other topics SCFP has taken up this year include, but are not limited to, the status of University facilities, the Aramark resolution from the student and administrative perspectives, status of select collegiate budgets, tuition policies, the six-year capital plan, the Job Family Study, the student academic experience, cost benchmarking, student housing strategy, a discussion with the Vice President for Research on extramural funding, a discussion with Provost Hanson on the sustainability of faculty size for instruction and research.

Following the update, Professor Feeney fielded a couple questions one of which had to do with faculty or retired faculty housing in the area close to University and Washington Avenues. Professor Feeney said he has heard nothing about this, but will look into it. Professor Krichbaum noted that the new building that is being built at Harvard Street and Washington Avenue is supposed to be, at least in part, designed for faculty housing also.

Professor Campbell thanked Professor Feeney for the update.

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

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate Office