

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)
April 5, 2018
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: Announcements; Conversation with Vice President for University Services Mike Berthelsen; 2018 FCC Retreat; Conversation with President Kaler; Consultation re System-Wide Strategic Planning Efforts in the Research & Discovery Focus Area; Miscellaneous Committee Business]

PRESENT: Joseph Konstan (chair), Amy Pittenger (vice chair), Catherine French, Bill Arnold, Dan Feeney, Jennifer Goodnough, Robert Kudrle, Michael Oakes, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Wendy St. Peter, Abimbola Asojo, Sheri Breen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Peggy Nelson, Ned Patterson

REGRETS: Les Drewes, Robert Blair, Peter Tiffin

GUESTS: Vice President for University Services Mike Berthelsen; President Eric Kaler; Vice President for Research Al Levine; Associate Vice President Claudia Neuhauser, Office of the Vice President for Research

OTHERS ATTENDING: Leslie Kreuger; Lyle Peterson; Dan Gilchrist

1. Miscellaneous committee business: Professor Konstan convened the meeting, welcomed those present and began with a few announcements:

- Professor Cathy French is willing to serve as vice chair of the Senate for another year, said Professor Konstan. With that said, he asked for a vote, and members unanimously elected Professor French to serve in this capacity for another year.
- The Office of Conflict Resolution (OCR) is looking for a faculty member to serve on its Conflict Resolution Advisory Committee (CRAC) as well as two faculty panelists. Details about what is involved with these seats will be forthcoming. Professor Konstan asked members to start thinking about who they think would be good candidates to fill these vacancies.
- Traditionally, said Professor Konstan, the FCC does not meet during the summer (mid June – mid August). However, it is possible that the FCC will be asked to convene this summer. If this is the case, members who are able to attend meetings should plan on doing so.
- This morning, a charge letter was sent out to those who volunteered to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee on Stipends. The five members of this committee are Professors Will Durfee who will serve as chair, Janet Schrunk Ericksen, Greta Friedemann-Sanchez, Tabitha Grier-Reed, and Peter Tiffin. The plan is that they will have something to report to the FCC at its June 7 meeting.

2. Conversation with Vice President for University Services Mike Berthelsen: Professor Konstan welcomed Vice President for University Services and called for a round of introductions.

Following introductions, VP Berthelsen distributed two handouts 1) a University Services organizational chart, and 2) an overview of the FY17-18 University Services Strategic Plan. He then walked members through the organizational chart. Regarding the strategic plan, VP Berthelsen said that the job of University Services is to make the University “work” by supporting its teaching, research and outreach missions and making the campus a safe, welcoming and reliable campus for everyone who comes here.

After his brief introductory remarks, VP Berthelsen opened the floor to questions. Professor Konstan asked about how aligning University Services’ mission with the mission of the University will play out as decisions are made. VP Berthelsen said that there are a lot of pieces involved, but it starts with him getting a copy of every college’s compact and budget. University Services looks at what the colleges and departments are doing by routinely meeting with the deans in order to align its mission with that of the institution. Additionally, University Services pays attention to several other things such as the size of the undergraduate population, where students are living, density of students near campus in terms of public safety, where students are coming from, which impacts transportation. For example, 25 years ago, the University was a commuter campus, and parking was hard to come by. Now, however, it is relatively easy to get a contract parking space. In other words, University Services is paying attention to trends on the campus and also soliciting faculty, staff and student feedback about their observations and experiences.

Professor Kudrle commented that it seems the University is closing more now due to weather than it has in the past. He then asked about the criteria used to decide whether to close the campus. VP Berthelsen said classes were cancelled once this year, and, in the past 25 years, campus has only been closed a handful of times. A lot of factors are taken into consideration when deciding to close the campus such as 1) when a storm is projected to hit, 2) the duration and impact of the storm, 3) is public transportation still running, 4) conversations with MnDOT and other public safety officials, etc. The University has a protocol for communicating the situation and predicted conditions to senior leaders and for how and when to communicate any change to the University community.

What is the relationship between your office and the rest of the system campuses, asked Professor Konstan? VP Berthelsen turned members’ attention to the organizational chart he distributed earlier, which shows the University Services’ offices that are system-wide, and the other offices that have no or only partial system-wide responsibility. Specifically, the following components of University Services have system-wide responsibilities: Capital Project Management; Planning, Space, & Real Estate; and University Health and Safety.

The I94 and Huron Boulevard interchange continues to be a problem, said Professor Konstan. Who from the University of Minnesota is responsible for working with the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County and State of Minnesota to resolve this issue? VP Berthelsen said that the primary connection points through University Services with the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin

County and the State of Minnesota are Parking & Transportation, and Planning, Space, & Real Estate. University Relations is also involved in these conversations because there is both a planning component as well as a political component.

The dynamics of the areas close to campus have changed dramatically over the past few years with all the private and multi-unit housing complexes that are being built, noted Professor Feeney. What kind of relationships does University Services have with the developers who are building these complexes? VP Berthelsen said student interests have shifted over time, and currently students find it attractive to live on or near campus. The University had a choice to either build its way out of this situation using its own debt capacity and finances, or let the private sector respond to the increased demand, and the University chose the latter. A lot of other universities have had to either build housing themselves or enter into public-private partnerships, but many of these institutions are not located in major metropolitan areas like the University of Minnesota. Instead of buying or building, the University has entered into master leases with [University Village](#) and [Radius](#). By doing this, the University has more influence over this housing without having all the underlying finances, debt capacity and risk. Going forward, in conjunction with the University of Minnesota Foundation's real estate advisors group, the University is thinking about how to influence the development around its borders.

Are the new building developments near campus impacting campus safety, asked Professor Nelson? VP Berthelsen said it is a bit tricky to answer this question because these developments are not on campus but rather are under the jurisdiction of the City of Minneapolis. In general, the broad data from the campus over the past 10 – 15 years shows that the percentage and number of crimes has declined. The amount of crime on the campus, given the number of people who come to campus every day, is small compared to the crime that occurs in the City of Minneapolis. Compared to the City of Minneapolis, the University is quite safe; however, relative to other institutions that are located in rural areas, the University has more crime. Given that incidents of crime tend to spike in the fall and spring, University Services in conjunction with the Office of Student Affairs and University Relations is working on building a better communication plan to start educating students before they even arrive on campus.

Is surveillance or police presence increased during the times of the year when crime predictably increases, asked Professor St. Peter? The University of Minnesota, said VP Berthelsen, at this time has a sworn officer count of 53. With that said, the University does not have a lot of ability to ramp up its presence, but it works closely with the City of Minneapolis and tries to influence them to pay attention to certain areas at certain times. Leslie Krueger, chief of staff, University Services, added that the University is continuing to push the City of Minneapolis as the density around the campus has grown significantly. Additionally, when the University has seen upticks in crime, while it cannot increase its staffing levels, it has increased the amount of overtime for its officers. When the University thinks about safety, it thinks about whether people are safe and whether people feel safe, both of which are important.

In light of time, Professor Konstan thanked VP Berthelsen for his time and meeting with the committee.

3. FCC retreat: Professor Konstan said it is that time of year when planning for the FCC retreat takes place. What makes this planning a little difficult, is that the campuses are on different schedules with the Twin Cities starting classes on September 4, Duluth starting on August 27 and Morris starting on August 29. Given this, Professor Konstan proposed scheduling the retreat the week of August 20th. Professor Breen said the week of August 20 is when Morris faculty contracts start and they hold their division meetings and have professional development days making it a busy meeting week. Professor Konstan said he will work in conjunction with Renee Dempsey, Senate staff, to identify dates that will work for a majority of members.

As far as topics for discussion, said Professor Konstan, Professor Patterson has suggested inviting a small group of non-tenure track faculty from across the institution to talk about the issues they face. If members have other ideas for topics, Professor Konstan encouraged members to send them to him and Ms. Dempsey.

4. Discussion with President Kaler: Professor Konstan welcomed President Kaler. Before beginning, President Kaler congratulated Professor Pittenger on being elected FCC vice chair for the remainder of the 2017 – 2018 academic year and next year too.

Next, President Kaler turned members' attention to two system-wide strategic planning documents that had been distributed. According to President Kaler, system-wide strategic planning activities have been conducted on all the campuses, and these are extremely important activities to do. As members may recall, the process began with a structuring/framework exercise during the 2016 – 2017 academic year that was led by then Rochester Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle and Vice Provost Rebecca Ropers-Huilman to look at why and what the University does. Now, it is time to talk about what and how the University should move forward.

Moving on, President Kaler directed members' attention to the draft System-Wide Strategic Plan (SWSP) vision statement and priorities. In President Kaler's opinion, the priority areas are broad enough so that all faculty will be able to make a tangential if not a direct connection to them. He then went on to highlight the draft system level priorities by focus area and provide some information about each:

- Outreach & Public Engagement
- Research & Discovery
- Teaching & Learning
- Medicine & Health

In concluding his overview of where things are at with the SWSP efforts, President Kaler reiterated the draft nature of the priorities. The purpose of attending today's FCC meeting is to get members' reactions and comments to the plan. Professor Konstan then opened the floor for questions/comments.

Professor French commented that the SWSP seems very top down. With that said, what is being done at the campus level to make each campus feel/be part of the whole University of Minnesota system. President Kaler said that the structuring/framework exercise that was led by Chancellor Lehmkuhle and Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman was a "bottom up" effort focusing on the Grand Challenges. The Grand Challenges themes will then get folded in to the system-wide plan. The

top down implementation of this plan is intentional because most faculty do not have a system-wide perspective.

In response to a question about the Grand Challenges from Professor French, President Kaler explained that they are designed to be dynamic, and over the course of time there will be an evolution of the topics with participation from the system campuses.

Professor Nelson said she is happy to see outreach and public engagement on the list of priorities but the description is more or less a marketing plan and not a public engagement plan. There needs to be an active listening partnership component to the plan if it is to be successful. President Kaler said this is a fair criticism and acknowledged the document is still being vetted and fleshed out.

Professor Arnold asked about the University's plans for online education. President Kaler said this is yet to be determined. The SWSP will need to detail the University's plan for online education. There is a lot to think about in this space. Both Professors Patterson and Pittenger commented that there are areas within the University that have expertise when it comes to online education. President Kaler agreed and said the goal will be to find, promote and reward the expertise that exists within the University.

For certain undertakings, said Professor Konstan, top down is the right approach, but, on the other hand, if the goal is to change the culture and/or establish values, buy-in needs to gotten earlier rather than later. Part of the challenge in distance education, for example, is that there has been no culture change around it. To make change happen, people need to be re-energized to do the bottom up work once the SWSP is finalized. In response, President Kaler reminded the committee that the SWSP is a strategy and not a list of tactics for how to accomplish it.

Moving on, President Kaler provided members with an update on the Academic Health Center (AHC). He noted that he solicited input from a variety of stakeholders, including the AHC FCC, looking for guidance regarding the structure of the AHC moving forward. Not surprisingly, said President Kaler, there was a wide range of opinion on what the structure should look like, and he is in the process of digesting all the input he received. He said he hopes to be able to make some decisions about the AHC in the next few months or so.

Next, President Kaler said that he expects the President's and Provost's Committee on University History to provide him with a report sometime yet this month. The report will then generate the next set of conversations regarding building names, e.g., Coffman Memorial Union, Nicholson Hall. The goal will be to have productive and respectful discussions around this topic.

Regarding the President's Initiative to Prevent Sexual Misconduct (PIPSM), President Kaler solicited members' feedback about the training and what they have heard from their colleagues. Professor Konstan said that the FCC met with the co-chairs of PIPSM at its last meeting, and, based on that conversation, the overall sense was that people were pleasantly surprised with the online training module. The question that remains, however, is what is next. President Kaler said the next step will be departmental level training and conversations, and he believes this is where significant progress will be made.

Professor St. Peter commented that when she took the training she found it confusing about who to report incidents to, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) or the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA). President Kaler agreed and noted that there is some ambiguity in one of the vignettes that will need to be corrected because the correct place to report is EOAA. He added that at the end of the day, the most important thing to do is report.

Hearing no other comments, Professor Konstan thanked President Kaler for his time.

5. Conversation with Vice President for Research Al Levine on system-wide strategic planning efforts in the Research & Discovery focus area: Professor Konstan welcomed Vice President for Research Al Levine who began by walking members through a PowerPoint. He pointed out that while the analysis conducted by Chancellor Lehmkuhle and Vice Provost Ropers-Huilman was originally intended to be the SWSP, some Regents felt it was not specific enough to be a plan and that it was only a framework for a SWSP; hence, the current phase of this process.

VP Levine said the Research & Discovery focus area concentrates on the State of Minnesota; therefore, it should be viewed as a strategy to work with the state on problems of importance to the state, the University and beyond (global interests). The charge to the Research & Discovery group was to establish priorities and ways to support these priorities, e.g., internal research and entrepreneurial support funding, research talent recruitment and retention practices, technology commercialization and economic development as well as working with the interdisciplinary research centers and institutes on campus. He then went on to share information about who has been consulted with throughout this process.

VP Levine emphasized to be agnostic to research areas and have the focus be on being agile and creative so the University can move forward on all areas brought forward, within reason, of course. The administration got specific direction from the Board of Regents who wanted specificity and priority research areas. VP Levine went on to explain how the priority areas were selected. Some of the criteria used to determine priorities included but were not limited to:

- Depth in the faculty.
- Important to the state economy.
- Global importance.
- Student interest.
- Alignment with the system vision.
- Enhancement of the University's reputation in the state and beyond.

Noting that [MnDRIVE](#) was used as a model for identifying the research focus areas, VP Levine went on to explain the process used for selecting the focus areas. If this were to be a traditional system-wide plan, it would likely look different because in reality the current plan is a strategy for working with the State of Minnesota.

Professor Konstan suggested identifying a “grander challenge” that spans more deeply into the humanities, e.g., coping with increasing labor productivity as a society by bridging technology,

medicine, arts, etc. He said when he thinks of the issue of opioid addiction, for example, he thinks the focus should be broader with a focus on addiction in general because it would get at chemical addictions, behavioral addictions, etc. Several members agreed. Professor Grier-Reed further suggested positioning the institution as an engaged University that wants to solve social issues and problems that are present in the state. Professor Kudrle proposed having broad themes with sub-themes underneath them. VP Levine agreed that how the plan will be marketed is critically important.

Professor French commented that it seems like the University's SWSP is morphing into what the Board of Regents want from the University of Minnesota looking at a very local level. Minnesota has and can continue to benefit by the advances and industries that have developed from the contributions of a cutting-edge university. The plan should focus on our strengths and opportunities focusing on a broader impact. With that said, she suggested looking at the SWSP differently and use pools of funding for seed grants (not directed in Grand Challenges) so different groups of people can work together and come up with different ideas to go after larger proposals. The Grand Challenges are focused on a few specific areas that are not inclusive of all interests. Maybe there needs to be two plans. VP Levine said grant in aid, for example, could be re-purposed to do what Professor French proposes. He then spent a few minutes talk about a University of Michigan program, [MCubed](#), which is designed to stimulate innovative research and scholarship by distributing seed funding to multi-unit, faculty-led teams.

Professor Konstan encouraged VP Levine to think about the value of what the University does and how it is measured.

How will the collegiate, system campus and other strategic plans inform the SWSP, asked Professor Grier-Reed? On the research side of the house, the Office for Research uses the [Five Years Forward](#) plan.

To conclude, VP Levine said getting the concept of serendipity in the plan is proving to be very challenging. Many discoveries that have been made over the years were accidents. On the other hand, however, targeted discoveries are made as well; it is not an either or.

Professor Konstan thanked VP Levine for a good discussion. After VP Levine left, the committee agreed it would be worthwhile to continue this discussion. He said there are at least three messages that are not being conveyed in the SWSP:

- Emphasizing the importance of post-baccalaureate education, particularly graduate education.
- Valuing the breadth of disciplines and fields at the University.
- Allowing faculty to follow their instincts when it comes to their research instead of being told what to research. Of the great discoveries that have occurred, they happened because the person wanted to discover it.

On a semi-related note, Professor Pittenger added that she thinks the FCC should be involved in discussions about online learning because this is a system-wide issue. She said she is shocked by the fact that the University does not tap into the experts they have in this area. Professor Konstan

said the right place for this discussion to start is probably at the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) but should eventually come to the FCC.

6. Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) nomination discussion: Professor Konstan began by sharing information on the work of the BAC. He then solicited names of possible nominees from members about who they think would make a good faculty member on the BAC. FCC members generated a handful of names and Professor Konstan encouraged members to think of others and to send their ideas to him. Then, at the next meeting, Professor Konstan said he will ask members to complete an “approval ballot,” and the two nominees who receive the most votes will be put forward to the BAC Committee of Selection for a vote.

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

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office