

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA)
September 25, 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:** Faculty Development Leave Policy; Updates on Activities and Training Related to the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct; Update on Works; Planning for the October 9 meeting]

PRESENT: Peh Ng (chair), David Anderson, Jay Bell, Kathryn Brown, Adolfo Carrillo Cabello, Katherine Dowd, Marti Hope Gonzales, Jarvis Haupt, Tae Kim, Robert Kudrle, Monica Luciana, Jenifer McGuire, Terry Roe, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Naomi Thyden, Guru Venkatesan, Alex Wideman

REGRETS: Kenneth Horstman

ABSENT: Aks Azheer, Christine Blue, John Connett, Janna Dickenson, Jessica Larson

GUESTS: Patty Franklin, chief of staff, Office of Human Resources; Ole Gram, assistant vice provost for faculty and academic affairs

Professor Ng called the meeting to order and asked members to introduce themselves.

As a first order of business, Ng encouraged members to take the time to provide input to the presidential search.

1. Faculty Development Leave Policy

Next, Ng directed members' attention to the document titled, "Faculty Development Leaves." Ng provided an overview of the background of the policy, explaining that the plan is to move this forward to the Faculty Senate if it receives endorsements. She then turned it over to Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, vice provost, Faculty and Academic Affairs.

Ropers-Huilman began by pointing out that a new section has been added titled "Collegiate Campus Guidelines." This was added because some Faculty expressed they did not want the policy to change based on how their particular college has administered the policy. She then read the following from the proposed policy:

Collegiate/Campus Guidelines

A college or campus must have in place guidelines for awarding sabbaticals. They may, after consultation with their faculty, propose to the Executive Vice President and Provost an alternative approach to granting time and/or support for their faculty in a way that

fulfills the intention of this policy. Such a variance to this policy must be approved no later than one year prior to desired implementation.

Ropers-Huilman explained that this would allow a college to submit an alternative practice for approval within one year from the time the policy is enacted. She added that Joe Konstan, chair, FCC, suggested that faculty be explicitly listed in the consultation requirements for the evaluation of proposals, therefore a phrase was added to the draft policy.

Next, Ropers-Huilman directed members' attention to an addition that states:

Temporary, visiting, and adjunct faculty and faculty covered by a collective bargaining agreement are not eligible for these development leaves.

Before the addition of this language, it was ensured that there is a leave policy in place for P&A. She noted that these were the only two additions since the draft policy was previously reviewed with the committee.

The committee posed questions and Ropers-Huilman responded:

- Modification of teaching duties can be addressed by the unit at the time a faculty member is negotiating their contract. The unit has the responsibility to assign or modify teaching duties, but a shift in teaching responsibilities is not considered a faculty leave in this context.
- Assuming there are a lot of requests and there is a bottleneck, what kind of options are available for the units to defer to ½ year sabbaticals? The language stating that a college would be limited to a 6% cap of faculty taking leave within one academic year has been removed. There will be a merit review process to determine who is granted a leave; development leave is not meant to be a guarantee. There must be an explanation as to why the faculty member is requesting to take a leave.
- Ng stated that the policy may not go into effect until 2020-21. With this in mind, the transition from the current policy to the proposed could result in a faculty member going on a single semester leave in academic year 19-20, and then requesting another leave under the new policy in year 20-21. Ropers-Huilman pointed out that the current policy requires a minimum of 4 years between sabbaticals. If language were added to the proposed policy it would likely state “no fewer than four years” between sabbaticals. There will need to be a transition period to implement a new policy.
- Anderson raised the question about eligibility for medical school faculty, those who are paid by another entity other than the University. Ropers-Huilman will follow up to see if they are eligible for the policy and how they are classified by the University.
- Ng asked who is responsible to follow up on tracking monthly progress? The committee and Ropers-Huilman agreed the word “monthly” should be removed from the following text:

During the course of their entrepreneurial leave, faculty members are expected to initiate ~~monthly~~ activity and progress discussions with their department head/chair.

- Ropers-Huilman said parental leave while on sabbatical would have to be handled on a case by case basis.

Ng called for a motion to approve the proposed policy and the motion passed.

2. Update on Activities and Training Related to the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct

An update on training and activities related to the prevention of sexual misconduct was provided by Kathy Brown, vice president, Human Resources. Ng explained that she sent questions to Brown, including how many people have completed the training, plus several others.

The training is part of the President's Initiative to Prevent Sexual Misconduct, a committee co-chaired by Dean John Finnegan, School of Public Health, and Associate Professor Karen Miksch, College of Education and Human Development.

Brown began by saying that the required training was conducted early March, 2018, for the first time. The mandatory training completion cut-off date was June 30. Brown reported that as of the morning of this meeting, 99.7 % of the initial group of active employees have completed the training. Employees hired after March 2018 will be informed of the required training in the next few weeks, the list is being compiled currently.

Brown explained that there are several eligible groups that will possibly be invited to take the training. Student employees, volunteers, and visiting faculty are just a few of the groups. For example, student employees complete the student training, it has not yet been decided if they should also take the employee training.

Brown said the feedback they have received from those that have completed the training has been positive. What is next, she rhetorically asked. Likely training will be conducted every two years based on initial conversations. There are still questions remaining as to what the training will look like going forward. The President's Initiative has other prongs, which includes but is not limited to training at the department level and striving to create an overall cultural change. OHR is in the channel of mandatory training, but the initiative as a whole will continue to evolve.

Ropers-Huilman explained that from October 5 – 11, five sessions will be offered, targeting unit leaders. Two hundred people were invited and as of today, 190 people have registered. The sessions are two hours long and involve engaging with scenarios in partnership with the Illusion Theatre. She said that data has shown that on-going efforts are necessary to change the culture. Brown concurred and added that different methodologies need to be used and different levels of the organization need to be reached to affect cultural change.

At this time, Ng opened the floor for questions:

- Monica Luciana commented that students at the graduate level should take the same training as employees. The trainings that are required for undergraduate students do not

meet the needs of graduate students. Naomi Thyden, graduate student member, noted confusion while taking the trainings regarding reporting incidents. As a graduate student employee their role can be complicated by being both a student and an employee, and when they have to report. Brown said that undergraduate students are required to take the student only but now the debate is do students would also have to do the employee training. Graduate students have to do the employee training and now the question is whether they should take the student training as well. Anyone who is a graduate assistant is technically an employee of the University and are required to take the employee training. The question is what is reasonable to ask of undergraduate and graduate students and what is most helpful. Sometimes it is not clear what a students responsibility is because of the multiple hats they wear. Ropers-Huilman added that the policy does not clearly address the issue Thyden raised and that she would raise this issue with the President's Initiative on the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct Committee.

- Patty Franklin thanked the committee for its input, especially for the earlier advice to use the Portal to communicate the training. Through this communication channel, they could see statistics on how many people were engaged.
- Brown said that they have not quite figured out how to administer training for volunteers or non employees that have engagements on campus. She commented that this could potentially be recommended by the departments and a registry used to record completion. Katherine Dowd suggested that PeopleSoft be used as a way to identify eligible non-employees for the training. This would enable OHR to consider the duration of the engagement to determine the necessity for the training. Brown agreed that PeopleSoft could be useful and gave the examples of stage hands at Northrop, and concessions employees at sporting events as additional scenarios that need to be considered. Visiting faculty are another group that will need to be addressed. Franklin explained that if they have an active appointment they will receive the training. Dowd explained that there are varying department policies that determine if a person is entered into PeopleSoft. Brown summarized by saying that it will take time to consider all of the different groups, but the goal of OHR and the committee is the same - to reach the entire community through this training and ensure sexual misconduct does not occur.
- David Anderson asked if the employers of student interns would be asked to take the training. Brown responded that the University would not have jurisdiction over the employer. Franklin will research if there is language included in affiliate agreements with those institutions that are employing students.
- Brown explained that new employees will have 30 days to take the training after they are hired. The training will be communicated to new employees on a monthly rolling basis via the Portal and completion tracked. Research has indicated that requiring employees to complete the training every two years seemed to be reasonable.
- The committee agreed that the training will help prepare students for handling these situations in any setting; as student or employee.
- Adolfo Carrillo Cabello commented on the need to ensure compliance with the requirement to take the training. Brown responded that OHR has the ability to generate reports and distribute to the departments. Further, she said this could possibly become part of the compact meetings. She met with the FCC and they discussed repercussions for those that do not complete the training. There were no repercussions assigned at this time

and there has been a 99% completion rate this year. This topic will be revisited in the future as part of the ongoing management of the training.

- Carrillo Cabello expressed the need to reassure those who fear retaliation and clarify the protections they are entitled to at the channels one might use to report an incident. Brown recalled that there is a general policy that prohibits any retaliation for reporting incidents, and the hotline can offer information in this regard.
- Naomi Thyden raised concern about the intention of the training and intended cultural change being miscommunicated. Brown responded that the President's Initiative involves a varied approach that goes beyond the training. Ropers-Huilman noted that the training she mentioned will be focused on power and the interactions that can lead to sexual assault.

More information regarding the President's Initiative to Prevent Sexual Misconduct can be found here:

<https://president.umn.edu/content/presidents-initiative-prevent-sexual-misconduct-theory-practice-innovations-sexual-violence>

3. Update on Works

Next, Ole Gram, assistant vice provost for faculty and academic affairs, provided an update on "Works," an online activity reporting system, mainly to serve faculty. Faculty can enter their annual activities and accomplishments into the system, as opposed to creating a Word document. This system will enable activities to be entered once and then shared in other areas at the discretion of the faculty member. He noted that this system is being implemented as a result of a motion that was approved by the Faculty Senate in 2008. He then shared a [PowerPoint](#) with the committee and detailed the following:

- Existing UMN data, publication information, and the faculty member can enter data into Works. This information is then available for reporting to include, but not limited to: department websites, CVs, International activities, awards, media appearances, P&T dossier material, etc. This will create greater transparency of the effects of the University activities both regionally and internationally. Report access will be limited.
- Currently, new faculty members are being asked to use Works and input information going back to graduate school activities. This will enable the creation of a CV in the P&T format. Fifty percent of departments and faculty are using Works at this time.
- Department faculty web profiles are often not updated with the most current data. These profiles are helpful with recruiting, Works would enable these updates to be made seamlessly.
- Gram showed example profiles of faculty members that approved their information to be shared. Faculty input has been used to design the modules that organize the information that is entered.
- NG asked if the system can obtain teaching and advising records from APLUS. Gram explained that it is a campus decision to enter the information into APLUS, for this reason the information is available for all of the campuses except Morris.

- Entering presentations has been an issue because the information has to be manually entered. Departments have handled this in different ways, some have asked that only certain presentations be entered.
- It has been noted that peer advising or mentoring is not easily recognized, but there is an area for this to be entered in Works.

Gram concluded the presentation and invited members to share thoughts and questions. Robert Kudrle noted the 50% participation rate and asked what the incentive is for faculty or departments to use this system. Gram responded that this is difficult as there are many differences between colleges, schools, and disciplines. However, they are beginning by encouraging faculty to share their awards and accomplishments.

Gram explained that there is a data governance committee that is involved in deciding who can access the data and generate reports. If a faculty member leaves, there are ways that the data can be shared and retained by the exiting faculty member.

In closing, Ng mentioned that the next meeting is October 9. Professors Amy Pittenger and Dan Feeney, co-chairs, Provost's Child Care Advisory Committee, will join the committee to discuss childcare. The Faculty Retirement SCFA Subcommittee will provide their annual report.

Ng adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Vickie Courtney (on behalf of Renee Dempsey)
University Senate