

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, April 26, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler

Absent: Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Walt Jacobs, Russell Luepker

Guests: Dave Dorman, Mel Mitchell (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources), Ole Gram (Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs); Diana Harvey (University Relations); Michael Hancher (incoming 2012-13 Committee member)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) leadership effectiveness and development strategies for chairs and heads; (2) faculty productivity statement; (3) committee on college constitutions; (4) faculty legislative liaison; (5) senate centennial; (6) entrepreneurial leave proposal]

1. Leadership Effectiveness and Development Strategies for Chairs and Heads

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Messrs. Dorman and Mitchell to present the leadership development model for heads and chairs. (Mr. Mitchell is Director of Organizational Effectiveness in Human Resources; Mr. Dorman is Coordinator of Leadership Development in Human Resources.) Committee members received handouts.

Mr. Mitchell began by noting that the leadership development model for heads and chairs (and directors with faculty rank) is part of UM LEADS (University of Minnesota Leadership Effectiveness and Development Strategies), a system to develop leadership at the University. They have divided leadership into four meta-categories (and have definitions and behavioral descriptors for each category). [The definitions, competencies, and behavioral descriptors are appended to these minutes.]

They developed the model for chairs and heads by interviewing chairs and heads, Mr. Mitchell related, and also determined that while the chair and head jobs differ, the competencies required for them do not, although they may be deployed differently. They have used the model development process several times, including for deans (for whom the model is not used as originally developed but was instead incorporated in the three-year review process), for the vice presidents (a 360-degree feedback assessment based on the model was developed), and for assistants and associates in vice presidential and decanal offices (also 360-degree feedback tool was developed). They also developed a 180-degree tool that allows an individual to discuss competencies with his or her boss. They received recommendations

* 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 represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

from many quarters that the University needed a model for heads and chairs, so they developed the one being presented today.

Mr. Mitchell reviewed the elements of the approach they use. He recalled that he was hired about six years ago to work on leadership development. The approach they have used is to "develop and enrich leadership through a comprehensive talent management system, agree on definitions of leadership for various roles at the University of Minnesota, develop fully customized, U of M-specific competency models, [and] consider incumbents in each role as subject matter experts, but not the only experts." (There are off-the-shelf products that can be purchased but they did not believe them as helpful as a model for the University.) The benefits are that the approach "acknowledges academic culture, doesn't try to force fit an existing model, garners buy-in through involvement, [and is] grounded in leaders' description of leadership in their roles." There are many leadership-development models that are not developed for academic institutions, he noted; this one is.

The result of their work is that they have "a fully customized talent management system that enables us to select, develop, support performance, and manage the succession of leaders at the U of M [and] ultimately, to develop leadership that is ready to meet future challenges." Mr. Mitchell described the process and steps they used to develop the model (conduct many interviews, distill information, identify themes and behaviors, and so on). He also provided a list of development resources and an interviewing guide they developed based on the behavioral competencies (he emphasized that this guide is only for leadership assessment; there are other criteria by which administrators are measured).

The outcome of the 360-degree review is an action plan.

Mr. Mitchell said they would like to know the Committee's view of the model because they would like to make it final and develop a tool for 360-degree feedback. He stressed that the model is developmental, not evaluative, and is intended that an individual use it to improve.

If the intent is developmental, where does the information reside, Professor Kohlstedt asked? Who holds it? It is an assessment, not an evaluation, Mr. Mitchell said, and their philosophy is that the individual assessed holds the data. The boss can see it if one wants him or her to see it, but the individual does owe the boss a developmental plan, which may include working with a coach.

Who does the coaching, how many are there, and where are they located, Professor May asked? Mr. Mitchell said there are people on his staff available to serve as coaches; there are also external coaches that can be hired if funding is available. Professor May asked what 360-degree feedback is. It comes from all around, Mr. Mitchell said—from the boss, from oneself, from peers, from those who report to the individual, and others inside and outside the University, as appropriate—to learn where one's strengths are and where there is need for development.

If the supervisor commissions the assessment, and participates in it, Professor May said, there is a fuzzy line between feedback and evaluation. If the boss finds out all these things about the individual, isn't it possible that he or she would use it as part of an evaluation? Is there any way to prevent this from turning into a form of evaluation? But the process is important and healthy, she said. Mr. Mitchell said a participant in this process could elect to share the data with the boss with the understanding that development still would be the nature of the conversation. Professor May said she was thinking about the

human questions. Mr. Mitchell agreed and said the coach will point out areas that need improvement, but they feel strongly that the information is owned by the individual.

Professor Brothen asked about evaluation of the process. How will that work if the individuals own the data? Mr. Mitchell said they will have aggregated data and they will evaluate the process. They do see the data, he said.

Do they anticipate that in most cases the boss will have requested the assessment, Professor Sheets asked? They do not, Mr. Mitchell said; it is often the individuals themselves who request it, although clearly one would want the boss to know that it was happening. Is it a service one must pay for, Professor Sheets inquired? It is very inexpensive, only the cost of the instrument, Mr. Mitchell said.

What is the frequency of assessment they believe useful, Professor Cramer asked? No more than every 18 months to two years, Mr. Mitchell said. It takes that long to develop competencies needed in an assessment.

How does this model interact with other leadership and executive training on the campus, Professor Pacala asked? Mr. Mitchell said he is not sure that it does. There are a number of pockets of leadership efforts around the institution but they are not coordinated. They are also working with MnSCU on a program (Minnesota Partnership for Executive Leader Development).

Professor Chomsky asked how the model is focused on an academic context, reporting that she had found a reference on a listserv to a leadership-development program for department chairs. Most of the models being discussed today with the Committee seem to identify good, basic leadership skills; how is this targeted on academic leadership? Mr. Mitchell said that academic departments and leadership was the context in which they talked with everyone in developing the model, although one might draw the conclusion that leadership is leadership. Mr. Dorman pointed out, however, that the model includes specifics focused on the academic context, for example, "demonstrates academic leadership" and, under "operates strategically," the behavioral descriptor "identifies, attracts, and retains faculty/staff who have the critical capabilities needed by the department." They did bring in elements from other leadership models, but some of the elements are specifically about academic leadership. He also noted that this was developed for chairs and heads on the Twin Cities campus; Mr. Mitchell reported, in response to a question from Professor Ericksen, that the Morris chancellor had been through the process, using the model for that level of academic officer.

Dr. Gram commented, apropos of the academic component of the model, that Vice Provost Carney and Mr. Mitchell run the orientation for new department chairs/heads, a year-long program that functions very well. There is coordination between the two offices and they touch on leadership competencies and the transition from faculty member to chair/head. They also provide new chairs and heads with hands-on information. The program has been a great success; where they hope to do more is in programs for current heads and chairs, working with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Dorman.

Professor Cramer said that it appears they cast a broad net and captured all the fish in creating the model. He suggested Committee members let Mr. Mitchell know if they have comments about any of the bullets in the model. He thanked Messrs. Dorman and Mitchell for bringing the model to the Committee for discussion.

2. Faculty Productivity Statement

Professor Cramer turned next to Professor Sheets to comment on the "Thoughts on Research University Faculty: Mission, Productivity, and Assessing Effectiveness" statement that had been prepared by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA). [A copy of the statement is intended for future distribution upon its completion, but the working draft is not included in these minutes.]

Professor Sheets reported that the statement was prepared by a SCFA subcommittee in response to a request from this Committee for a statement that could clarify for those outside the University the work that academics do. The background is the discourse about higher education that sometimes includes claims that the faculty do not work hard enough or are not accountable for the work they do. One way to address such criticisms in the past was to assure critics that faculty members do a lot of work—and provide an exhaustive list of faculty tasks. [One such report, the Faculty Workload Task Force Report from 1992, can be found here: <http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/48661/1/Report%20of%20the%20Faculty%20Workload%20Task%20Force.pdf>.] The report was accurate but may not have served the purpose of being a communications tool.

Instead of trying to argue that the faculty work hard, Professor Sheets said, SCFA decided to develop a statement on the nature of academic work, and in order to understand the work of research faculty it is necessary to understand the mission of the University. That is the chief aim of the document: to explain the mission and objectives and how faculty members pursue them. The only shortfall of the document is that it is too long; it needs to be repackaged without losing its substance, and perhaps it could take multiple forms for different audiences.

Committee members discussed both the length and the potential audience(s) with Ms. Harvey. Professor Sheets observed that the genesis of the statement was a conversation that Professors Cramer and Jacobs had with President Kaler and Ms. Phenix, his chief of staff, about a statement that the administration might use for various audiences to articulate what faculty members do. Some of the audiences will be more skeptical than others; SCFA believes the statement would benefit from the advice of University Relations to help understand who should receive the message and in what form. Committee members agreed that the statement is one of the more important documents that it has dealt with and that it deserved care in review.

Professor Bitterman said that one question he has been asked over the years by enlightened members of the legislature who are discerning about budget matters (and who recognize that there is only so much money available), which is not addressed in the statement, is about critical mass. A research university must have a critical mass; how does one assess the critical mass needed in each discipline and determine if a department (discipline) is too large or too small? There is obviously the minimum number of faculty members required to teach the curriculum. Some do not value higher education, but there should be a document for those who do that answers that question. Professor Sheets said the point is a plausible one and is an omission, but the problem with trying to address it is that it reduces a set of complex issues to a single number. The matter could be embedded in item 6, "Faculty tenure also has a role in promoting faculty efficiency," Professor Bitterman suggested. Professor Cramer said that it might be possible to establish a minimum threshold for each discipline needed to function, but he would not want to see every discipline lopped down to that minimum (if there are departments that exceed the

minimum). Professor Bitterman agreed but said the institution should not ignore the question. Professor Cramer observed that one could survey the top 50 schools in each discipline for information about size.

Professor Boyle commended the statement as a positive step. What she would like to see in a next iteration is more information on how the University is dynamic and forward-thinking. This relates to Professor Bitterman's point about a critical mass, Professor Sheets said, and the critical mass one year may not be the same critical mass needed five years later.

Professor Pacala endorsed the statement but expressed doubt it would change the minds of anyone who has already decided that faculty members don't work hard. He suggested adding factoids to illuminate the points made in order that it is less abstract and more concrete. He also suggested that it may be unwise to dismiss the use of certain measures; some may see utility in them; a discussion of measurement techniques needs to be balanced. Professor Sheets said those are good suggestions; the crucial point about measurement is that the approach taken in some states has significant problems and it does not ask the right questions about quality in which the public should have an interest. The document can highlight the issues of appropriate measurement.

Professor Chomsky said that the suggestions from Committee members are helpful but an edited version of the document itself is also useful, even without additional facts or bullet points. It might not be something one gives to those who argue about the value of higher education or for heated debate; it is more like an introduction for people (e.g., new members of the Board of Regents, new members of the legislature who might be interested), providing a broader sense of the University's intellectual mission and the faculty role in pursuing it. She said she liked it as it is, with a bit more editing to address some of the concerns expressed earlier in the meeting.

Professor Cramer suggested it would be productive to distribute it to the faculty, inform them that governance committees drafted it, and ask for feedback.

Ms. Harvey said the document is a great basis for use with a variety of audiences and can be boiled down as needed. It will help them (University Relations) do its work.

Professor McCulloch said it is also important to have something for the person on the street that is short, can be delivered, and will be seen. This is a great statement for orientation for new faculty and department chairs, but not for people who do not believe the faculty do their jobs.

It would also be possible to break it up into several messages, Professor Sheets commented. Professor Kohlstedt suggested that for online purposes, people could drill down, with bullet points at one level, commentary and data at other levels.

It was agreed that Professor Sheets would make revisions to the statement and that after Committee review, it would be distributed to the faculty for comment and reaction.

3. Committee on College Constitutions

Professor Cramer reminded the Committee that the ad hoc committee on college constitutions would consist of five members (four from this Committee plus Professor Miksch from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure) and would be asked to gather the constitutions, archive them, look at

them to get a feeling for the similarities and differences and for the state of college governance, develop recommendations on adopting and amending them, and identify steps that could be taken to improve college governance processes.

The Committee agreed that Professor Luepker would be an excellent chair of the ad hoc committee.

Professor McCulloch asked if there are colleges without constitutions. That is a good question the Committee has asked before without being able to get a clear answer, Professor Chomsky noted, and in some cases the faculty cannot find the constitution of their college.

4. Faculty Legislative Liaison

The Committee discussed candidates for the position of Faculty Legislative Liaison. Professor Cramer was given the names of several individuals to contact.

5. Senate Centennial

Professor Cramer said there is need for a small ad hoc committee to plan events surrounding the centennial of the Senate (next October) and Committee suggestions for the intellectual content of any centennial events.

It was agreed that the ad hoc committee would consist of Professors Kohlstedt and McCulloch and others from outside this Committee to be asked.

It was also tentatively agreed that the events should include a history of the work of the Senate, a panel on governance (perhaps with all previous FCC chairs who are available), and a "great conversation" with President Kaler and someone well-known and expert on university governance. There should also be a reception after the Senate meeting in October.

6. Entrepreneurial Leave Proposal

Professor Sheets next reported that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) had heard two days earlier a proposal for an entrepreneurial leave, an option to be added to the current sabbaticals and leaves policy. Committee members were provided the handouts that both SCFA and the Senate Research Committee had received. SCFA endorsed the proposal, Professor Sheets said, and there was not a great deal of controversy about it because the benefits were identified. The important points are that faculty members are eligible for the entrepreneurial leave every four years, with the approval of the department chair and dean (and with provostal approval for probationary faculty members). It would be a leave without pay for a full year (100% time or less), with benefits paid in a lump sum (because the University cannot legally provide benefits for someone who is receiving no salary), and it is believed that the revenue generated by granting such leaves will more than offset the costs—and even if not, the costs are slight because they are benefits that would be paid anyway.

Professor May recalled that she had raised with President Kaler, at an earlier meeting of this committee, the hope that liberal-arts faculty members would be able to take advantage of these kinds of leaves, and the President had indicated they would. This proposal, which provides leaves only to work on

University intellectual property (IP) that has already been licensed, would seem to rule out completely faculty members in the liberal arts. What if one wishes to take a year to develop oneself as a public intellectual and learn to do journalism, to learn new ways to link with the world? Or if one were a painter in Art who wanted to try graphic design? She said she thought the idea included the ability to try to develop different competencies, leaves for efforts that do not fit in the existing sabbatical policy. Professor Sheets said this point did not come up in the SCFA discussion because the linkage is with already-licensed University IP.

Professor McCulloch said there could be a faculty member who is wanted in industry to develop childhood education, for example, but this proposal speaks only about patents and links to industry. There are many ways to be entrepreneurial and she expressed the hope that the options would not be limited to what is in this proposal. Professor Sheets said that there was oblique reference to this kind of activity at SCFA: Someone could develop a program that could be donated to non-profit organizations, so the proposal is not necessarily tied to profits.

Professor Sheets agreed, however, that the proposal as defined did not include the dimensions that Professors May and McCulloch identified. That does not mean there could not be an additional program to provide other types of faculty development leaves. This proposal was evidently intended to be as compatible as possible with the existing leave policy.

But was this the extent of the President's idea, Professor May asked? Professor Cramer suggested it would be worthwhile to ask the President.

Professor Chomsky commented that the proposal is not for entrepreneurial leaves, it is for IP development leaves. It should be called what it is. After the conversation about the intellectual future of the University, and the need to tie what the University does to practical things, this proposal could be an opportunity to do so. But this is a narrow proposal, to develop IP, which is a good thing, but it is also a missed opportunity. She said she would like to see a commitment from the administration that there will be more following and that this is just a first step. The next part of the proposal might not be about making money. She said she would like to have the conversation that SCFA did not have and that if the answer is that there will be something else to put in place, the Committee can return to the topic.

Professor Boyle said the language "IP-based product or service" will be unclear to many faculty. Committee members discussed what IP can be licensed and what is required for it to be subject to licensing.

Professor Sheets reiterated that the scope of the proposal in its current form is indeed narrower than what Professor May identified; it is only to exploit University IP that has already been licensed. The proposal assumes that the IP is of a kind that can be licensed and control retained.

Professor May pointed out that a sabbatical comes only every 7 years; one would be eligible for an entrepreneurial leave every 4 years. The idea came from the President's announcement of new initiatives, she recalled, and she heard a broader vision than the one embodied in the proposal here. This proposal is fine, she said, but she did not see how it fits with what the President said earlier. Professor Boyle said she would not want to see the proposal withdrawn but said that there is need for clarification on what IP-based services and products are. Professor Hancher agreed that there should be some communication with President Kaler about how this proposal matches with his vision.

Professor Cramer said he strongly supported the proposal and added that the points raised at this meeting are good discussion points for the Faculty Senate. SCFA has on its agenda next year a more thorough review of leaves and sabbaticals and this discussion will flow into that review. He said that he would, in the meantime, talk with the President. [Subsequent to the meeting, the President asked that the proposal be withdrawn from the May 3 Faculty Senate docket in order to permit additional consultation.]

Professor Cramer adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Chair, Head, Director with Faculty Rank
Leadership Development Model
Overview of Definitions and Behavioral Descriptors

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

Operates Strategically

Approaches departmental activities with a big picture, long-term view; works collaboratively with faculty and stakeholders to set vision and direction.

- v Aligns the strategic priorities of the department with the mission and values of the college/school and the University.
- v Communicates a clear, collaboratively developed vision of the department's future.
- v Scans the environment to identify strategic opportunities and develop solutions for the department.
- v Integrates input from stakeholders to prioritize the allocation of resources.
- v Identifies, attracts, and retains faculty/staff who have the critical capabilities needed by the department.

Demonstrates Academic Leadership

Displays academic credibility and sound intellectual leadership; exhibits understanding of the particular leadership needs of the department; interfaces with internal and external stakeholders to act on issues important to the department.

- v Advances the reputation of the department both inside and outside of the University.
- v Serves as an effective advocate for the department.
- v Helps position the department's students for success.
- v Exhibits concern for student viewpoints and addresses issues.
- v Demonstrates academic excellence through own research/scholarship, teaching, outreach, and/or professional service.

Demonstrates Organizational Savvy

Understands the context of issues and dilemmas; is attuned to external and institutional politics; skillfully navigates University cultures.

- v Navigates the unique dynamics and organizational cultures of colleges, departments, administrative units, and external stakeholders.
- v Champions critical ideas and initiatives.
- v Negotiates effectively to achieve outcomes that consider the interests of all parties.
- v Adapts appropriately to the realities and constraints of the University.
- v Recognizes which battles are worth fighting and when it is time to compromise.
- v Works effectively with the dean and other leaders.

Leverages Diversity and Differences

Ensures that the department supports diversity goals, values, and practices; leads by example.

- v Capitalizes on diversity and differences to achieve strategic goals.
- v Creates an engaging, collaborative work environment to support a diverse faculty, staff, and student community.
- v Seeks and attracts diverse thoughts and perspectives.
- v Recruits underrepresented faculty, staff, and students.

RESULTS LEADERSHIP

Manages Execution

Conveys clear priorities and aligns efforts; addresses barriers; ensures accountability.

- v Focuses departmental time, talent, and effort on critical priorities.
- v Provides others with the resources, information, authority, and support needed to achieve objectives.
- v Holds self and others accountable for results.
- v Balances multiple priorities and initiatives while achieving day-to-day results.

Makes Sound Decisions

Adheres to defined principles when making decisions; considers intended and unintended consequences of decisions; practices good stewardship of University resources.

- v Ensures financial decisions are aligned with University and department policies and strategic priorities.
- v Considers the impact of decisions on faculty, staff, students, and budget.
- v Makes timely decisions after appropriate consultation and analysis.
- v Formulates decisions using relevant data.
- v Solves problems despite ambiguity, lack of structure, or incomplete information.

PEOPLE LEADERSHIP

Influences and Inspires

Promotes ideas and proposals persuasively; creates a climate that encourages personal investment.

- v Fosters commitment to the department's vision, values, purpose, and direction.
- v Creates a climate that encourages innovation and appropriate risk-taking.
- v Positions ideas and proposals to reflect the needs, interests, and concerns of stakeholders.
- v Anticipates and then addresses the impact of large-scale changes on morale and productivity.
- v Articulates the rationale for decisions clearly and persuasively.

Listens and Communicates Effectively

Shares information appropriately; presents ideas effectively; anticipates and meets information needs; actively listens and incorporates input from others.

- v Fosters an environment of open, honest, and respectful discussion.
- v Promotes a free flow of information throughout the department.
- v Listens attentively to understand issues from the perspectives of others.
- v Considers what to say, when to say it, and how much to share.
- v Communicates effectively to internal and external audiences by tailoring style and content.

Cultivates Relationships and Fosters Collaboration

Invests time in relationships; fosters collaboration by being inclusive, supportive, and cooperative; connects people with common goals and interests.

- v Fosters a culture of collegiality and civility.
- v Cultivates networks and partnerships inside and outside of the University.
- v Establishes a norm where conflicts are managed in a constructive manner.
- v Supports interdisciplinary collaboration.
- v Connects personally with others to build rapport and relationships.
- v Maintains positive relationships even under difficult circumstances or when there is disagreement.

Manages and Develops Talent

Leads a team (faculty, administrators, graduate students, and staff) that addresses the short-term and long-term aspirations of the department; assesses performance; supports a development culture.

- v Sets clear expectations.
- v Ensures that consistent and fair processes and procedures (e.g., tenure, promotion, hiring) are in place and implemented.
- v Recognizes strong performance and addresses performance issues.
- v Provides constructive feedback, coaching, and development opportunities.
- v Connects junior faculty members to mentors, networks, and other resources.

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP

Establishes Trust

Models values that result in trusting relationships; honors commitments to others; perceived to be fair; balances transparency and keeping confidences.

- v Operates in a transparent manner.

- v Models and expects professional conduct and ethical behavior in research, teaching, and outreach activities.
- v Demonstrates consistency between words and actions.
- v Respects personal confidences and sensitive information.
- v Credits others for their contributions and accomplishments.

Displays Self-Awareness

Understands impact of own behavior; considers and responds appropriately to others; has a realistic grasp of own strengths and development needs.

- v Exhibits an awareness of one's own capabilities and addresses development needs.
- v Displays courage (e.g., says no when necessary, names problems, stands alone).
- v Recognizes and manages own emotions.
- v Demonstrates flexibility and comfort with ambiguity.
- v Admits mistakes, misjudgment, and uncertainty.
- v Receives feedback constructively and acts on it when appropriate.