AHC Faculty Consultative Committee (AHC FCC)
May 16, 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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes**: IT Governance; Team Science; Senate Committee on Finance & Planning Update; Office for Conflict Resolution Update]

PRESENT: Kathleen Krichbaum (chair), Cathy Carlson, Les Drewes, Paul Jardine, Angela Panoskaltsis-Mortari, Kyriakie Sarafoglou, Wendy St. Peter

REGRETS: John Connett

GUESTS: CJ Loosbrock, IT liaison, OIT; Colby Reese, IT director, AHC Information Systems; Larry Storey, IT liaison, OIT; David Ingbar, associate director, Research Education, Training and Career Development, Clinical Translational Science Institute (CTSI-Ed); Jennifer Cieslak, chief of staff, CTSI; Paul Olin, AHC FCC representative on the Senate Committee on Finance & Planning; Julie Showers, director, Office for Conflict Resolution

1. **IT governance**: Professor Krichbaum convened the meeting and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, she welcomed today's guests who asked to come before the committee to hear from members what the Office of Information Technology (OIT) can do to support faculty in delivering the mission of the University. She then turned the meeting over to Larry Storey, IT liaison, to facilitate the discussion.

Mr. Storey noted that representatives from OIT are meeting with various groups across the University to get input on what OIT can do to better support the mission of the institution. Prior to this meeting, members were asked to think about four questions in order to further today's discussion, and these questions included:

1. Looking forward to the next year or two, what do you foresee affecting your research, teaching, outreach and/or administrative work most significantly?
2. What IT-related resources do you see that your peers from other institutions (and/or the private sector) have access to that you think would make a positive impact here?
3. What do you see peer institutions, or comparable non-higher education organizations investing in (or not investing in) that you think would be important for IT to invest in here?
4. What activity outside of your core mission seems to take up an outsized amount of departmental resources when compared to its impact?

Mr. Storey told members that the input they share today, along with the input from other groups that OIT has met with, will be shared with IT leaders, and will serve to determine the direction OIT takes in the coming year. He added that the IT governance process has been going on for five years now. Members then shared the following comments:

- Professor Krichbaum said the University's video conferencing technology cannot be relied on; it is not consistently reliable.
- Please speak to technology improvements/enhancements for the Duluth campus, asked Professor Drewes? Ms. Loosbrock said that the Duluth campus is playing a significant role in the University's Next Generation Network (NGN) upgrade, for example. This project will upgrade all components of the University's network, wired and Wi-Fi, over the next three years. Additionally, the Duluth campus has participated in discussions regarding the possible move to the Canvas learning management system.
- If the University moves to Canvas, asked Professor Krichbaum, what is the transition plan? Mr. Storey said it is his understanding that no official decision has been made yet about whether the University will move to Canvas. If the decision is made to move to Canvas, it likely will be multi-year undertaking. A lot was learned from the last transition to Moodle, which did not go well, and so hopefully the lessons learned from that transition will be applied to any future transition.
- Interconnectivity between the campuses is an ongoing issue, said Professor Jardine. Professor St. Peter said there is a need for a common platform among all the campuses. Mr. Storey said conversations are taking place around this issue and agreed there are opportunities as it relates to having standards across all the campuses.
- Professor Ingbar noted that there needs to be interaction with the VA Health Care System.
- Professor Jardine stressed the importance of communication as it relates to technology changes that are coming; there needs to be more transparency.
- Professor St. Peter suggested focusing on the Academic Health Center's technology needs first.
- Professor Drewes noted that 2-137 Jackson Hall and 2-101 Hasselmo Hall are classrooms/seminar rooms that the Duluth campus cannot connect to, and this is problematic.
- Playing of video files can be uncertain on some University-owned computers depending on if the necessary software is or can be loaded on them, said Professor Mortari. Professor Jardine agreed and noted that faculty value their independence and desire to have control over their environment, and the University's network protocol can interfere with this.

Professor Krichbaum thanked Mr. Storey, Mr. Reese, and Ms. Loosbrock for attending today's meeting and giving the AHC FCC the opportunity to provide them with feedback. Regarding the concerns that were raised today, Professor St. Peter asked Mr. Storey what he needs from committee members so they can be assured that these concerns will be addressed. Mr. Storey said he will reach out to members individually to let them know what they can do to help OIT help the faculty.

2. **Team science**: Professor Krichbaum welcomed Dr. David Ingbar, associate director, Research Education, Training and Career Development, Clinical Translational Science Institute (CTSI-Ed), and Jennifer Cieslak, chief of staff, CTSI, who asked to meet with the committee to talk about team science. Dr. Ingbar began by saying he and Ms. Cieslak are coming to the committee today to get advice, input, and hopefully consent on a document that conveys what the University is doing about promotion in the area of team science. While he recognizes this

probably varies from school to school, from his experience in the Medical School, the Medical School was lagging behind in this area given its emphasis on traditional metrics such as first and last authorships, etc. Therefore, in preparation for the resubmission of the CTSI grant in January 2017, a document addressing what the University is doing related to team science was drafted, approved by Provost Hanson and Vice President Jackson, and included with the grant submission. He noted that subsequently the document was shared with the AHC Deans' Council where it received uniform support, but no action plan for dissemination was developed. Dr. Ingbar noted that concern have been raised by some faculty members about how promotion and tenure (P&T) committees were to become aware of the document, and how it can be implemented – with or without officially putting it in each school's 7.12 P&T statements. After meeting with the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Ropers-Huilman, it was recommended that a shorter paragraph length summary be drafted for possible incorporation into the formal P&T tenure code.

Dr. Ingbar said the questions are:
- How should the final statement be disseminated?
- Does it need further input and/or revisions?
- How should this document interface with P&T statements within the different schools (including incorporation as appropriate into school and/or department 7.12 statements), and should this be done on a uniform basis across the AHC or customized for the different schools?

The goal, said Dr. Ingbar, is to publicize the document and have it operationalized in some form.

Members' comments/feedback included:
- Professor Krichbaum suggested the document be shared with the University Faculty Consultative Committee to get the committee's input.
- In Professor St. Peter's opinion, this document needs to be put into each school's 7.12 statements.
- To give this initiative some teeth, Professor Jardine recommended that the Provost's Office send a written memorandum to the various AHC/University P&T committees providing guidance for including a team science component in their 7.12 statements.
- Professor Jardine further suggested sending it to each of AHC school's consultative committee and/or faculty assembly for discussion.
- Professor Drewes proposed making the document more generic and simple rather than more detailed because then it leaves room for interpretation, which the tenure code is meant to do, particularly for longevity purposes. Dr. Ingbar explained that the document contains specifics because it otherwise may be unclear how team science is going to be judged. Professors Mortari and St. Peter liked the version of the document that contained specific examples.
- Professor Krichbaum suggested also sharing this with Interim Vice President for Research Allen Levine who may have additional suggestions for moving this effort forward.

Dr. Ingbar then summarized his next steps:
- Talk with Professor Colin Campbell, chair, FCC, about this initiative and whether the FCC should also review the documents.

- Distribute the short one paragraph and longer one page team science documents to each AHC school's consultative committee for discussion and input. He asked each AHC FCC member to help with this effort.
- Talk with Interim Vice President for Research Allen Levine and get his suggestions and buy-in.
- Encourage dissemination of the document to other appropriate individuals.
- Work toward incorporation of the document in the 7.12 statements.

Professor Krichbaum thanked Dr. Ingbar and Ms. Cieslak for a good discussion, and proposed having them come back in the fall to update the committee on the progress that has been made.

3. **Senate Committee on Finance & Planning update**: Professor Krichbaum welcomed Professor Paul Olin, the AHC FCC representative on the Senate Committee on Finance & Planning (SCFP), and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Professor Krichbaum turned the meeting over to Professor Olin and asked him to provide an update on some of the issues/topics that SCFP has been dealing with this year. Professor Olin went on to highlight and provide information on SCFP's issues/topics:
- Heard from students regarding Aramark/M Dining – student shared concerns over poor food quality, the lack of religious food options, lack of food options for those with dietary restrictions, and the high cost of the residence hall meal plans.
- Heard about fencing or netting of the Washington Avenue Bridge in an effort to try and prevent people from jumping off and committing suicide.
- Presentation by Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations Brian Burnett on the long-term financial sustainability of the University of Minnesota.
- Annual review of the cost pools.
- Received an update on the Athletes Village.
- Discussed the financial costs associated with paid leaves.

Professor Drewes wondered whether the SCFP has talked about the cost of stem cell research monitoring and reporting to which Professor Olin responded no, but he said he would suggest this as a topic for a future meeting. Additionally, Professor Panoskaltsis-Mortari asked whether SCFP has gotten information about the Institutional Review Board (IRB) overhaul in terms of the cost, who is paying for it, etc. Again, Professor Olin said no, but he would suggest this as another topic of discussion for a future meeting.

In light of time, Professor Krichbaum thanked Professor Olin for the update, and proposed inviting him back in the fall for another SCFP update.

4. **Office for Conflict Resolution**: Professor Krichbaum welcomed Julie Showers, director, Office for Conflict Resolution (OCR), and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Ms. Showers began by walking members through a few slides to give those present with a sense of what her office does.

OCR, noted Ms. Showers, is a resource established by the University and it serves faculty, staff and student employees who are not union-represented. Union-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. Additionally, it is important to note that OCR is not an ombudsman office. OCR is independent, and not part of the Office of the General Counsel, OHR, etc.; this is a standalone office that reports up through OED. All visits to OCR are confidential. 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 80% of her job, said Ms. Showers, involves informal conflict resolution processes, which begin with a frank and confidential conversation about a person's experience. Many people who come to OCR simply want to be heard. While some people want advice and counsel, others ask for help in preparing for a difficult conversation. It is human nature for people to want to avoid conflict; therefore, talking about how to make these difficult conversations go better can be helpful. The remaining 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 been allegedly violated. The greatest frustration for many people who visit the OCR, said Ms. Showers, is when they find out there is no policy against poor judgment or being an obnoxious person. However, if a person can identify a rule, regulation, policy or procedure that has been violated, they have access to the formal grievance process, which goes through a number of prescribed steps before being heard by a three-person hearing panel. After a hearing, a panel drafts its findings/recommendations, which are then given to the provost for a final decision.

To give members a sense of volume her office does, 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.

Before concluding her prepared remarks and opening the floor for discussion, she reminded members that OCR is a resource for them and their peers whenever/if ever the time is appropriate.

Is it possible to have both parties present at the same time when an issue is being mediated, asked Professor Panoskaltsis-Mortari? Yes, said Ms. Showers. Next, Professor Panoskaltsis-Mortari asked whether the offer letter of employment given to faculty is considered a contract. While this is an excellent question, said Ms. Showers, it is one she cannot answer. She said she is familiar with occasions where the University has taken the position that such a letter is not a contract. Ms. Showers said this particular issue has never been presented to one of the peer panels to date so she is unable to answer what the outcome would be if this were to go through the formal grievance process. With that said, this is the correct question to ask. Ms. Showers

noted that while she is a lawyer, one of the parameters that comes with her job is not giving legal advice.

What would be an example of a situation when confidentiality would need to be breached, asked Professor Krichbaum? Ms. Showers replied that if she feels someone represents a danger to themselves or others she would have to share the information. The only other exception that she is aware of is if she were required to share information by a court of law, which would be extremely rare.

Professor Drewes asked Ms. Showers if she handles cases from the system campuses. Ms. Showers said OCR is a system office. Of the 10 formal petitions in 2016, she believes two were from system campuses. She added that she makes regular visits to Morris where she does individual consults as well as educational programming, and Crookston is working on a similar cadence as Morris. Regarding Duluth, she said she makes more frequent visits to this campus, and most of the visits are triggered by a specific case or request for service rather than a regularly scheduled visit. Ms. Showers said while part of her role is to do educational programming in which case all are welcome; however, jurisdictionally she reiterated that she cannot offer services to faculty and staff who are union represented.

What does educational programming mean, asked Professor Panoskaltsis-Mortari? Ms. Showers said she offers a couple different workshops and is also in the process of creating a few more. According to Ms. Showers, the way she thinks about her service to the University is that her biggest obligation is to provide direct service, but, at the same time, if no one is aware of what she hears in her office except her, then she would not be serving the University's institutional interests very well. As a result, she believes the best way to improve proficiency in dealing with conflict is to talk about it and, therefore, she does educational programming around basic pragmatic conflict resolution skills. She added that she also does educational programming on communication styles. A real issue she sees facing the University is one of culture and climate, and she will be doing programming around this topic as well. Ms. Showers added that beginning this fall she will also be teaching a seminar in the Law School on conflict resolution.

Professor Sarafoglou commented that the University does not have a bullying policy, and wondered what steps should/could be taken so that one is developed. Ms. Showers said bullying conversations are hard to have and it is a difficult topic to reduce to policy because there is no precise or formulaic definition of bullying. The two universities that she is aware of that have policies around bullying are the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and the University of California, Berkeley. Neither of these institutions, however, have a lot of experience dealing with how their policies are working. In Ms. Showers' opinion, in order to have such a policy, it would have to be faculty led.

5. **Thank you to AHC FCC Chair Krichbaum**: On behalf of the AHC FCC, Professor St. Peter thanked Professor Krichbaum for her exceptional service as the chair of the AHC FCC for the past three years in terms of the time she gave to the committee, and her leadership. Members then gave Professor Krichbaum a round of applause, and Professor Krichbaum in turned thanked members for their service.

6. **Adjournment**: Hearing no further business, Professor Krichbaum adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office