FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
April 30, 2015
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**: Discussion with Regents Beeson and Johnson, Engagement Initiatives, Governance Communication]

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, James Cloyd, Jigna Desai, Allan Erbsen, Janet Ericksen, Jean Wyman

Regrets: Chris Uggen, Linda Bearinger, Karen Mesce

Guests: Regent Richard Beeson, chair of the Board; Regent Dean Johnson, vice chair of the Board; Regent Michael Hsu; Andy Furco, associate vice president for public engagement, Office for Public Engagement

Others attending: Emily Lawrence, associate to the deputy chief of staff, Office of the President; Amy Phenix, chief of staff, Office of the President, Brian Steeves, executive director and corporate secretary, Board of Regents

1. **Discussion with Regents Beeson and Johnson**: Professor Ropers-Huilman convened the meeting and welcomed Regents Beeson and Johnson. Before beginning, she called for a round of introductions.

Regents Beeson and Johnson each began with a few introductory remarks. Following their remarks, members had a candid conversation with them. Topics discussed included:

- Human subjects research.
- Biennial and capital budget requests.
- Perception of the University by legislators and the importance of educating legislators about the University and the work that is done here related to advancing knowledge. There needs to be a focus on improving the University's image and reminding legislators and the public that the University serves the entire state. Mechanisms should be developed that facilitate faculty participation in helping to educate legislators and the public about their work.
- Management of the University's message, brand and communications.
- Equity and diversity, and student demographics.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Regents Beeson and Johnson for a good conversation.

2. **Engagement initiatives**: Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Andy Furco, associate vice president for public engagement, Office for Public Engagement, who was invited to provide information on the University's engagement initiatives. Before beginning, Professor Ropers-Huilman called for another round of introductions.

Associate Vice President Furco started with a brief update on some of the faculty-focused work that is being done around public engagement, and requested members provide him with feedback on initiatives that will be launched in the coming year. He turned members' attention to a packet of information that had been distributed along with agenda. The Office for Public Engagement, noted Dr. Furco, was established in 2006, and its purpose is to facilitate opportunities for faculty and students to advance community engagement tied to the University's research, teaching or outreach missions. The University of Minnesota Council on Public Engagement adopted the Committee on Institutional Cooperation's (CIC) definition of public engagement, which states:

> "Engagement is the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good."

In addition to the campus-wide Strategic Plan, there is a University-wide public engagement plan, which is a plan for institutionalizing the notion of public engagement across the University's five campuses. An aspect of the public engagement plan highlighted by Dr. Furco was the scholarly value of engagement and the extent to which public engagement is advancing the scholarship and scholarly work that is done at the University. He noted that over the last couple years, several efforts to support faculty who want to do this work have been initiated and cited the example of the revision of the Promotion and Tenure guidelines in 2007 to include public engagement. However, there remains more work to understand and clarify how public engagement gets interpreted across disciplines, and at the campus-wide and University-wide levels.

Dr. Furco turned members' attention to the notes of a meeting with engaged faculty and Provost Hanson that contain a number of recommendations for promoting community engaged scholarship. These recommendations are being used to determine where resources will be allocated to support faculty. The number one issue that came up was Promotion and Tenure (P&T). In many cases, faculty who do this kind work feel their P&T committees do not understand their portfolio. Additionally, faculty frequently do not know how to present their work so it meets the 7.11 and 7.12 statement standards. A recommendation was made to work with P&T committees to explore what community-engaged scholarship mans, what standards need to be met, and the various forms community-engaged scholarship comes in. Community-engaged scholarship is not always applied research. For example, the Clinical Translational Science Institute (CTSI) does basic research through a community-based lens.

In addition to the P&T issue, reported Dr. Furco, other issues coming out of this meeting included:

- Support for staff enhancing engaged research and teaching opportunities – Community-engaged scholarship requires additional time and resources for relationship development and project management. Staff who support this work have well developed networks of community relationships and institutional memory, which are critical. Often, however, their positions lack stability (e.g., year to year appointments and grant to grant).
- Hiring – Increasingly, junior faculty are interested in doing community-engaged work, and will ask when they are being interviewed whether they will have the opportunity to do this kind of work, and, if so, if they be supported. What can be done to ensure the University has a culture that embraces community-engaged work?
- Faculty development – There is a need for opportunities for faculty to develop their skills for engaged research, and, as a result, a recommendation has been made to leverage courses and training programs faculty have developed by expanding them to different audiences and formats.
- Graduate student development – At a recent graduate student forum, it was clear that graduate students want their work to make a difference. They want to have community-engaged opportunities available to them and advisors who are supportive of them doing this kind of work. The Office for Public Engagement and the Graduate School are working on an initiative to build on the graduate student fellows program as it relates to community engaged work.
- Financial barriers – A financial barrier for doing community engaged work outside the institution has to do with the issue of indirect cost (ICR) rates. Community engaged work has a lower ICR. With tight budgets in recent years, a number of faculty are being asked not to do this work because their departments want larger ICR grants. This has become an academic freedom issue, and has been discussed by the University of Minnesota Council on Public Engagement and the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T). Discussions are taking place about providing resources to departments to supplement the lower ICR for community-engaged work.
- Communication – Faculty report a lack of responsive, timely communications for community-engaged work. And, a larger issue of concern is that public engagement is being pigeon holed at the University. What can be done to better communicate the great community-engaged work that is being done? Communications departments across the institution, including University Relations, need to have a clear understanding of public engagement.

An outcome of the community engaged scholarship recommendations has been a series of workshops, roundtables and socials for University faculty who are involved in publicly engaged teaching and research (http://www.engagement.umn.edu/faculty/events-and-workshops, http://www.engagement.umn.edu/how-connect/campus-networks, http://www.engagement.umn.edu/faculty/events-and-workshops#socials).
Unfortunately, noted Dr. Furco, these events have not been well attended.

Dr. Furco reported that a Community Engagement Scholarship P&T Toolkit Development work group is being formed, which will have four primary responsibilities:

1. Review and summarize the standards and criteria that other institutions are applying to community-engaged work.
2. Analyze the University's current 7.12 statements and how public and community engagement are being interpreted in research, teaching and outreach across the institution.
3. Development of universal public engagement standards.
4. Produce recommendations to put forward on how the standards should be institutionalized.

The aforementioned work group will be comprised of engaged scholars, P&T committee members, chairs and deans and others knowledgeable about community-engaged scholarship in higher education. Dr. Furco added that he and Vice Provost Al Levine would co-chair the work group. In terms of a timeline, Dr. Furco said the goal is present a set of recommendations to the University of Minnesota Council on Public Engagement for an initial review in December and then to solicit feedback/input from various governing boards/committees. Dr. Furco asked members for their thoughts on whether this approach seems reasonable, and for any other comments they have on public engagement.

In Professor Wick's opinion, in terms of metrics for measuring the scholarship of community-engaged work, it would seem reasonable to use publications as a metric. Dr. Furco agreed and said that in addition to community-engaged work and its impact, there needs to be evidence of demonstrated scholarship. For some this will mean peer-reviewed journal articles and for others it may mean books and so on.

Professor Gardner said the two key issues in his mind are P&T and ICR. Regarding ICR, the Senate Research Committee wrote a statement on the value of research, *The Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota Whether or Not Externally Funded* (http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/committees/productivity.pdf), which he suggested Dr. Furco read. Using NIH ICR rates, for example, to measure scholarship would be disastrous for the institution. Regarding the P&T issue, Professor Gardner suggested Dr. Furco read Conrad "Bud" Weiser's scholarly articles on how to measure scholarship for Extension faculty. In addition, colleges' 7.12 statements should all contain specific language about what community-engaged contributions count toward P&T, and suggested particularly looking at departments that have a lot of split appointments, e.g., Department of Horticultural Science. Dr. Furco thanked Professor Gardner for these suggestions.

Professor von Dassow said the problem seems to be that there is a conflict between focusing on doing community-engaged work and focusing on documenting that one has done it. Producing publications aligns with the focus on documentation.

Professor Konstan noted there are a diverse set of mechanisms through which people do research. Mechanisms should be put in place to measure people's work individually based on making a reasonable case for impact, and this might not always be a publication.

Picking up on Professor Konstan's point, said Professor Cohen, there should be a way to evaluate whatever work outcome is the final product, e.g., exhibition, film, and not only a journal article. Thought needs to be given as to how to appreciate what was really hard to do and what is original. He welcomed the development of a tool to measure the variety of different kinds of community-engaged work.

Professor Desai said she has heard from a number of graduate students that they would like dissertation guidelines that allow for community-engaged scholarship. She added that the important thing to think about when measuring community-engaged work is impact. Research should not be measured by dollars, but a variety of other mechanisms, and impact should be one of the most important. She suggested Dr. Furco meet with the Board of Regents to provide them with information about the community-engaged work that is being done at the University so they, in turn, can share these stories with legislators and their constituents. Dr. Furco said his office is working hard to tell these stories, and he would appreciate the FCC's support in making this case to the senior leadership.

Professor Gardner further suggested Dr. Furco meet with Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Government and Community Relations, to provide her with information on the community-engaged work that is being done at the University so she can communicate it to legislators as well.

Before leaving, Dr. Furco volunteered to report back to the FCC in December the recommendations coming out of the Community Engagement Scholarship P&T Toolkit Development work group. Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Dr. Furco for the information and a good discussion.

3. **Election of FCC vice chair**: The next agenda item, said Professor Ropers-Huilman, is the election of the FCC vice chair for the 2015 – 2016 academic year. After the ballots that had been distributed to voting members were collected and counted, Professor Ropers-Huilman announced that Professor Desai would be the FCC vice chair for the 2015 – 2016 academic year.

4. **Communication**: Professor Ropers-Huilman introduced the last agenda item, communication. She said when she asked members to prioritize agenda items for the remainder of the year, a number of members were interested in talking about communication between faculty governance groups and the broader faculty cohort as well as collegiate governance structures. Professors Ropers-Huilman said while the Faculty Senate is supposed to be this communication mechanism, she does not know to what extent faculty senators report back to their colleagues or collegiate governance groups.

Professor Cloyd shared a recent conversation with another faculty member to illustrate that there is a lack of understanding by faculty in general about the University FCC and its existence. There needs to be a link/bridge between the FCC and faculty at large.

The last time that faculty in the Medical School were really engaged in faculty governance, said Professor Campbell, was when former AHC Provost Bill Brody tried to get rid of tenure. In his opinion, the challenge has to do with the relevancy of the topics/issues being discussed. Additionally, there is the perception that nothing gets accomplished through the governance system, and, as a result, people do not want to participate. A number of faculty view governance work with apathy.

In Professor Krichbaum's opinion, part of the communication problem rests with the minutes, which are often too long. While the School of Nursing has minutes from its committee meetings, a summary of what was accomplished at their meetings is also drafted. She suggested having regular committee minutes for all the Senate committees as well as abbreviated, bullet-pointed versions.

Professor Wyman raised a question about the mechanisms various schools use to communicate the issues discussed at Senate meetings and any actions that were taken. In the School of Nursing, faculty senators used to have to provide a report to the School of Nursing FCC, but this is no longer true. She suggested the FCC develop best practices for senators, including a requirement that they report back to their schools. In response to this comment, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members whether the existing process is working effectively in their respective units. Unanimously, members said no.

Regarding the minutes, said Professor Gini, previously the minutes were sent in plain text in an email with a Word version of the minutes attached. She said she prefers the plain text version because it saves time not having to open a pdf document. Additionally, she agreed with Professor Krichbaum that the minutes are too long, and she would prefer an abbreviated version. Most people do not have the time to read the minutes, but just want to know what decisions, if any, were made at the meeting.

Professor Gardner recalled in the past that every semester the FCC would send out a message to faculty highlighting its accomplishments for that semester. He suggested reviving this practice and having the FCC send out three messages a year. The first message would be sent out after the retreat outlining the issues the FCC identified for the year, and also asking faculty if they have other ideas. The other two messages would be sent out at the end of each semester outlining accomplishments. Professor Ropers-Huilman said some of this is already being done. In the fall, a message is sent to all faculty asking for their ideas on agenda items/issues the FCC should address. Secondly, the Senate newsletter, *University Senate Semester Update*, is sent out at the end of the fall and spring semesters. Having said that, more can be done to highlight accomplishments and results.

Professor Konstan agreed that faculty want meeting highlights that are no longer than a half a page. He said for him the most important part of the minutes is the 'In these minutes' section. Most committees do not necessarily accomplish anything, but rather illuminate. Additionally, in his opinion, the minutes come out too late. He feels it would be better to sacrifice the level of detail in the minutes and have them out within a week than to have the current level of detail and having the minutes come out in a month. Lastly, he added that he believes the agendas are more important than the minutes, particularly if committees want input from faculty on an issue before a meeting. He suggested broadly sending out the agendas for Senate committee meetings a week ahead of time.

Regarding the earlier comment about senator and/or committee member connections with their colleges, said Professor Konstan, thought should be given to making formal connection requirements. For example, Senate committees should have collegiate representatives serving on them who are required to report back to their collegiate governance committee(s). It is likely the governance structure could be smaller if there were effective consultation on the issues at the collegiate level.

Professor Konstan went on to say that the FCC is actually two committees that sit in the same room 1) the executive committee of the Faculty Senate that focuses on setting the Senate's agenda and coordinating the committees; and 2) a broad and general consultative committee that meets regularly with President Kaler and Provost Hanson, as well as with other University leaders. In his opinion, it is not obvious to him that these two bodies need to be the same committee. He proposed considering whether the two bodies could function as separate committees. Professor Campbell disagreed with this proposal and said he believes the small group meetings with FCC senior leadership and President Kaler and Provost Hanson work because the faculty leaders are members of the FCC. It would seem that the FCC would lose some of its influence with the president and provost if these two bodies were separated.

According to Professor von Dassow, improvements could be made in the following areas:
- Timing and modalities of communication, e.g., sending out committee agendas to all faculty. There should be communication between the different governance structures across the University.
- Responsibility and authority – While many faculty may be apathetic about governance, the reality is that senators have no actual responsibility for or way to report back to their faculty colleagues.
- Representation – There is a misalignment between deliberation representation since discussion happens in committees that are mostly unelected while the Senate, which is constituted by election, has little share in that discussion.

To increase Senate governance visibility, Professor Krichbaum suggested Senate committees co-sponsor forums with administration on issues of interest and importance. This would be a way to engage and connect with faculty who are not as involved as committee members and/or senators. Professor Ropers-Huilman recalled that the FCC co-sponsored the fall 2014 forum with the Provost's Office on free speech and academic

civility. She added that she gets the sense that Provost Hanson would be willing to continue doing this, but feels it would happen more frequently if the FCC brought ideas to her.

Professor Desai commented that colleges function as silos. She proposed bringing the FCC "on the road," to meet with the various colleges governance groups to learn how their governance structures operate. Currently, the FCC meets with the deans and department heads/chairs, but may want to think about going to the colleges and actually meeting with the faculty.

A problem mentioned earlier, said Professor Gardner, is that the FCC has no formal connection with the collegiate governance structures. A formal mechanism should be created to make this connection.

Professor Gini said she is concerned about too many meetings being scheduled. Rather than meeting just to meet, she suggested inviting senior administrators to report on what they are doing because they are the people with power who make the decisions. Professor Ropers-Huilman responded that she believes the FCC has a remarkable amount of power. From her experience as FCC chair, she can say without a doubt that senior administrators' decisions have been influenced by discussions with FCC members. Professor Campbell agreed with Professor Ropers-Huilman and said while the FCC does not have power, it does have influence. When influence is not used, it is lost. With that said, the FCC needs to take advantage of every opportunity to use its influence. In response, Professor Konstan commented that faculty governance has squandered its influence by being diffuse. To have serious influence, a small number of issues need to be promoted on message given administrators will be left with no choice but to respond. He also noted that structurally and in practice in virtually every college, senators have no role. For example, the College of Science and Engineering senators have no standing in the college. Every year it is difficult to get enough people willing to put their name on the ballot. This fact could be reflective of who gets elected. People who serve in the Senate or on Senate committees have no place in the colleges' processes, and because of this there will always be separation. The FCC cannot solve this problem. Instead the colleges need to decide it is problem worth fixing and solve it. Professor Konstan suggested if the FCC is serious about this issue then it should see if one or two colleges would be interested in piloting this change to determine if their faculty feel more engaged and have more influence.

As previous FCC chair, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked Professor Durfee for his thoughts on this matter. In Professor Durfee's opinion, the FCC should look for opportunities to work with the administration to move issues forward. A confrontational approach will not work. Professor Ropers-Huilman said she believes the current administration would be interested in working with faculty as Professor Durfee just described.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said she senses this discussion is not finished and will put it on a future agenda.

5. **Adjournment**: Hearing no further business, Professor Ropers-Huilman adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate