

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)
November 1, 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; FCC Nomination Process; Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA Governance Leadership Conference Update; Discussion with President Kaler; FCC Vice Chair Prediscussion]

PRESENT: Joseph Konstan (chair), Amy Pittenger (vice chair), Robert Blair, Sheri Breen, Phil Buhlmann, Sue Chu, Colleen Flaherty Manchester, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Ned Patterson, Les Drewes, Jessica Larson, Peh Ng, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Wendy St. Peter, Catherine French

REGRETS: Lynn Lukkas, Peggy Nelson, Frank Gigler, Jennifer Goodnough, Philip Zelazo

ABSENT: Michael Oakes

GUESTS: President Kaler

OTHERS ATTENDING: Bri Keeney, deputy chief of staff, President's Office; Austen Macalus, reporter, Minnesota Daily

1. **Announcements:** Professor Konstan convened the meeting and welcomed those present. He then went off the record and made a couple of announcements.

2. **FCC nomination process:** Professor Konstan provided some background information about this agenda item, and began by saying that over the past few years the Nominating Subcommittee has spent a significant amount of time thinking about whether the FCC is adequately represented.

A concern that has arisen from the nomination process is the use of a model that pairs candidates for election. Under this model, some nominees are hesitant or simply unwilling to run against someone who they think would be a good FCC member and who they respect. Professor Konstan said he has talked with people in other organizations to see how they elect their membership and uncovered a number of options:

- Pair candidates.
- Hold an at-large election [$n + 1$ or more nominee(s)].
- Elect some members and appoint other members.

A goal the Nominating Subcommittee strives for every year is getting great FCC members (individually and collectively) on the committee. In general, the Nominating Subcommittee has done a great job making sure that a wide range of views are represented at the table. Another key consideration that the Nominating Subcommittee thinks about as it does its work is the legitimacy of the FCC. While on the one hand, the FCC wants to be representative of the faculty,

its members are also leaders of the faculty, which can at times be incompatible. Having said that, Professor Konstan asked members for their thoughts on the current nomination process.

As vice chair of the University/Faculty Senate and the chair of the Nominating Subcommittee for the past few years, Professor French shared her thoughts/observations about the process, which included:

- Liking the candidate pairing model, but thinks the Nominating Subcommittee needs to keep an open mind about improving the process.
- Regarding the issue of legitimacy, she reminded members that senators are given the opportunity to nominate FCC candidates when the slate of candidates is brought to the floor of the Senate.
- Consideration should be given to electing the members who serve on the Nominating Subcommittee and also expanding the subcommittee's membership (as an example, including the chair of Committee on Committees).
- Finding people who are willing to be nominated can be difficult because serving on the FCC is a large time commitment.

Professor Flaherty Manchester said she likes the idea of an at-large election for a few reasons. First, this model would require fewer people who would be willing to stand for election. Additionally, this model would achieve getting as close as possible to the desired representation. Lastly, there would be fewer nominees with regrets that they stood for election but did not win.

Professor Chu commented about the timing between when a person is asked to stand for election, and finding out the results of the election, which can be several months. Professor French replied, in her opinion, there is no reason the election could not be held earlier in the year.

Professor Buhlmann agreed that legitimacy is critically important, and he believes the Senate could do more to promote FCC membership to the whole university. Additionally, he suggested that for the people who do not get elected that their names be forwarded to Committee on Committees (ConC) to be considered for service on another Senate committee.

Hearing no further comments, Professor Konstan asked members their preference between 1) holding the FCC election earlier in the year and forwarding the names of the non-elected individuals to ConC in the hope there may be another Senate committee that they would be interesting in serving on, or 2) use the at-large model, which requires fewer nominees, but do it in such a way that the process is transparent and provides for FCC legitimacy. Following a bit more discussion, through a show of hands, six people felt it was more important to have more candidates than open seats in order to maintain the legitimacy of the FCC, and five people felt it was preferable to minimize the number of nominees and move closer to a $n + 1$ model. Professor Konstan thanked members and said this gives him a sense of how to move this issue forward.

On a semi-related note, Professor Konstan asked for volunteers to chair of the Nominating Subcommittee, which Professor French has done for the past three years. Professor French said she would be happy to train and work with anyone who is interested. Seeing no volunteers, Professor Konstan said he would be contacting members individually to see if he can find a volunteer.

3. **Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) Governance Leadership Conference update:**

Professor Konstan called on Professor Pittenger to share information about topics that were discussed at the BTAA Governance Leadership Conference that she recently attended. Professor Pittenger highlighted a few of the sessions that she thought were particularly relevant to what the FCC and other Senate committees have been discussing recently, and these included:

- Non-tenure track faculty issues.
- University of Iowa presidential search and subsequent [American Association of University Professors \(AAUP\) sanction](#) for abandoning shared governance during its search process.
- University of Nebraska academic freedom [incident](#) in August 2017.
- [Purdue Global](#).

The committee went off the record to discuss the issues that came out of each of these sessions in greater detail.

4. **Discussion with President Kaler:** Professor Konstan welcomed President Kaler and asked him to share whatever is on his mind. President Kaler began by providing the following brief updates:

- He said that he and Provost Hanson are in the process of reviewing her academic leadership portfolio and planning accordingly for when she steps down at the end of the calendar year. More information will be forthcoming.
- Regarding the [Task Force on Building Names and Institutional History](#), this issue is being taken seriously by the administration in a very thoughtful and deliberate way. After receiving the task force's report, President Kaler said he will make his recommendations to the Board of Regents who will likely also have a diversity of opinions about this matter. A companion part of this effort is to also think carefully about how the University should recognize people who have historically been under-represented in these areas of recognition.
- President Kaler reported that he and Vice President for Clinical Affairs Tolar will be meeting with the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) about the Reproductive Rights Advocacy Fellowship tomorrow. He said he looks forward to having a productive and transparent discussion related to this issue.
- President Kaler noted that he looks forward to the December 6 FCC intellectual futures discussion, *The Future of Education Delivery: Quality, Economy & Access*. He said while he does not believe the University will move away from a bricks and mortar/place-based institution, what the University teaches and how it teaches will likely change, and this is good. The changes will be informed a great deal by neuroscience in terms of having a better understanding of the body and brain.

Following these updates, President Kaler opened the floor to questions/comments, which included:

- Professor Grier-Reed asked President Kaler to talk about the search for the next Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students. President Kaler said that Maggie Towle is the current interim vice provost. This search was put on pause after Provost Hanson announced she was stepping down at the end of the calendar year. Once the

provostal transition has been resolved, there will be discussions about when the Vice Provost for Student Affairs search should be restarted.

- Professor Konstan asked President Kaler to reflect on his decision to create the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations position. In President Kaler's opinion, this was a good decision, recognizing that it comes down to who fills the position because it is a big job. He added that in his continuing efforts to reduce the number of University administrators, it only made sense to combine the chief financial officer and chief operating officer positions.
- In looking to the future, asked Professor Konstan, should there be a separate Vice President for Research or should the research element fall under the Provost while compliance and servicing units fall under operations? Given the shifting of some Academic Health Center (AHC) responsibilities into the Office of the Vice President for Research portfolio makes the structure justifiable. He added that he believes it would send the wrong message to take the vice president for research role out of a vice president/direct presidential report and categorize the position differently. The current Vice President for Research portfolio deserves a vice president level leader. As the medical enterprise evolves, and the University's interactions with Fairview ripen and mature, in the new model with dyad leadership some adjustments in that part of the portfolio may be necessary at some point.
- Because the vice president for research, vice president for clinical affairs and the provost all are responsible for certain aspects of research, said Professor St. Peter, are they talking about where each of their responsibilities lie. President Kaler commented that the old saying "good fences make good neighbors" holds true here too in terms of needing a clear delineation of who is responsible for what. There is always the tension in a large research university between fostering, enabling, supporting and celebrating the creativity of the entrepreneurial individual or small team of investigators, and the need for the institution to marshal its resources across disciplines to work on an urgent problem, e.g., opioid addiction. In President Kaler's opinion, the current structure works pretty well and is a fairly standard model for an institution the size of the University of Minnesota. He added that if situations arise where things are not working, shared governance should step up and let the administration know.
- Professor Flaherty Manchester asked President Kaler about his approach or guiding principles for the interim provost position. President Kaler said he is not in a position answer this question now, but suffice it to say he has been very pleased with what Provost Hanson has accomplished in her time here.
- Professor Spannaus-Martin noted that the Center for Allied Health Programs gave President Kaler a white paper a few weeks ago recommending that the center become a college given it has all the properties and characteristics of a college. President Kaler said he feels this is a decision that should be made by the next administration in light of the resource reallocations such a change would require. He said while he is interested in the idea, he does not feel it would be appropriate for him, as an outgoing president, to make such a significant structural change in the organizational chart.
- With the reorganization of the AHC, said Professor St. Peter, a number of issues have arisen for some of the institutes and centers related to granting degrees and tenure. The issue of operational efficiencies has also come up because some of these institutes and centers have their own operational resources. That said, adding another health sciences

school could resolve some of the Center for Allied Health Programs concerns, but other institutes and centers as well. As a result, she thinks that discussions about a new school should be started sooner rather than later given the AHC is in the midst of an academic restructure to make sure potential opportunities are not overlooked. President Kaler said while he does not necessarily disagree, this is a decision that needs to be left up to the new administration. He added that in his opinion, a college should not be created in response to an organizational challenge, but needs to outline a compelling vision for what such a college should look like. Because he is in the last several months of his presidential term, he would not be able to sustain such an effort, which will take time.

- Professor Konstan commented that there may also be other structural issues that should be cued up such as whether all faculty members should have a dean, for example. He asked President Kaler whether he is collecting issues like this for the next president/administration. Yes, said President Kaler, he has been collecting these issues and cited a few examples, e.g., optimization of interdisciplinarity/cross-disciplinary collaborations, under-utilization of the St. Paul campus, rationalization and movement on the M Health arrangement with Fairview, to name a few.
- In response to a question about salary increases from Professor Konstan, President Kaler commented that given resources are limited, the University needs to identify internal efficiencies and realignments that will serve to generate the resources needed to pay for merit increases.
- Professor Patterson asked President Kaler what he is most looking forward to given he is stepping down at the end of the academic year. President Kaler replied that he really wants to be sure that the things he accomplished while at the University continue to develop and move forward, e.g., M Health/Fairview and the AHC restructuring success, a successful legislative session, and continued success with the Driven campaign.

5. FCC vice chair pre-discussion: Professor Konstan introduced the next agenda item, a pre-discussion about the FCC vice chair position, and said the goal today is to get members to start thinking about whether they may be interested in running for FCC vice chair. Under the revised bylaws and rules, said Professor Konstan, the pool of candidates to fill this vacancy has been expanded. That said, he turned to Professor Pittenger and asked her to talk about what the vice chair role involves. Both Professors Pittenger and Konstan shared their thoughts on the role. Professor Pittenger encouraged members to think about the vice chair role in terms of support for the chair and training for becoming the FCC chair.

In response to a question from Professor Drewes about issues that will likely need attention next year, Professor Konstan said the two big issues will be building a solid relationship with the new president and his/her administration as well as developing relationships with new members of the Board of Regents and sustaining and developing relationships with the continuing members. While other issues will be impossible to anticipate, said Professor Konstan, the one issue that keeps coming back is the need for the University to do a better job with its outreach efforts as well as enhancing its image with the citizens of the State of Minnesota. Additionally, another likely issue will be distance education. Professor Pittenger concurred and said that developing a good relationship with the new president will be paramount. She noted that she really wants this person to see the value in partnering/working with the faculty.

Another significant aspect of the FCC leadership positions is dealing with the media, said Professor Konstan. He added that for those who feel uncomfortable with this responsibility that University Relations provides training in this area.

In light of time, Professor Konstan asked members to think about whether they have an interest in standing for election to be the next vice chair of the FCC. The goal is to have a succession plan that will give the new vice chair a year and a semester before becoming chair July 1, 2020 to learn the ropes.

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

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office