
The University Senate

FACULTY · STUDENT · P&A · CIVIL SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)

April 25, 2024

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 represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Conversation with Provost Croson; FACHS Charge; Committee Business, Workforce Reinvestment Resolution Response]

PRESENT: Mark Bee (chair), Abraham Ayebo, Rob Blair, David Brown, Liz Davis, Colleen Flaherty Manchester, Jennifer Goodnough (vice chair), Sharon Jansa, Perry Leo, Monica Luciana, Tania Mitchell, Sonali Pahwa, Katherine Scheil, Donna Spannaus-Martin, David Stenhjem, Subree Subramanian, Eric Van Wyk

REGRETS: Carl Flink, Robert Jones, Rachna Shah, Clifford Steer

ABSENT: Ann Parr, Carston Wagner

GUESTS: Executive Vice President and Provost Rachel Croson, Pawel Mroz, co-chair, Faculty Advisory Committee on the Health Sciences (FACHS)

OTHERS: Erin Heath, director, University Senate Office; Jaclyn Adair, senate associate and assistant to the director, University Senate Office; Maggie Flaten, advisor for strategy and initiatives, Office of the President

1. Conversation with Provost Croson

Professor Mark Bee, chair, opened the meeting and introduced Executive Vice President and Provost Rachel Croson, who was present to provide a regular update to the committee. Croson extended her presentation to address recent campus events and nationwide issues.

- Croson affirmed the University of Minnesota's support for peaceful protests that comply with campus policies. She said that recent encampments on campus led to enforcement of policies against unauthorized tents on the morning of April 23, 2024. And after notifying protesters that tents were in violation of policy, some left voluntarily, while 9 chose to stay and were peacefully arrested. Their tents were stored for pickup.
- A larger protest later that evening led to additional enforcement actions, with tents removed after giving a 30-minute notice. Minimal graffiti cleanup was needed. Croson highlighted that interventions are timed to minimize disruption and potential violence.

- Regarding arrests, she clarified the difference between criminal and civil trespass. Arrested individuals received a ban notice, but current students and employees had the ban waived.

Bee invited members of the committee to ask questions about this specific topic before the provost continued with her other updates. Questions and comments were as follows:

- Members asked how officials obtained information about potential protests. Croson said that information on protests comes from the University of Minnesota Police Department (UMPD), including monitoring social media of groups that have a history of organizing protests, and discussions with other campuses. The intelligence was not from the Minneapolis Police Department (MPD).
- There was discussion of the involvement of police in student protests and the impact on free speech and student rights. Members voiced concern about police involvement for a variety of reasons, including MPD's potential involvement and its implications, given past criticisms and the impact on students; the scale of police presence, with some reporting a large number of officers and intimidating tactics (the presence of SWAT vehicles and state troopers was noted); and how increased police presence frames student protests and its effect on students' perceptions and experiences.
- However, others noted that there is variation in how police presence is perceived among students, with some finding it intimidating and others feeling it provides safety.
- There is confusion about the authority behind the one-year ban from campus for civil trespass. Details on the decision-making process and whether it involved the UMPD or the Office of General Counsel (OGC) are unclear. Members questioned the role of the administration in decisions regarding student arrests and bans, highlighting the need for clarity on how such decisions are made and communicated.
- The administration emphasizes its legal obligation to follow policies in a viewpoint-neutral manner.

The provost then continued with the rest of her updates:

- Unit/Departmental Statements Policy: The Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee (A&T) plans to deliver recommendations by May 2024. The administration will charge a University-wide task force to address institutional neutrality and review the AF&T report. The goal is for the task force to develop a policy over the summer and conduct consultations in the fall so that the policy can be in place in December 2024.
- Core Curriculum: The Core Curriculum 2025 Committee has been working for about two years. There will be a discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting in May, with a vote tentatively scheduled for the fall. There are concerns about voting on the curriculum in the fall due to senate turnover on July 1. The proposed curriculum aims to generalize foundation areas, allowing more departments to contribute. The committee raised concerns about the financial impact on departments if student enrollment shifts. The provost said that the administration has allocated \$500,000 recurring and \$5 million one-time to support the new curriculum, including course development and bridging funds for affected departments.
- Board of Regents: At the May Board of Regents (BOR) meeting, Croson, Bee, and Vice President for Human Resources Ken Horstman will present the Workforce Resolution to

the BOR. The presenters will cover the original resolution, the advisory group report, and the response.

Hearing no further discussion, Bee thanked Croson for her time and she departed.

2. FACHS Charge

Next, Bee turned the committee's attention to proposed revisions to the charge of the Faculty Advisory Committee on the Health Sciences (FACHS). Co-chair Pawel Mroz explained the proposed changes:

- Membership Update: The Center of Allied Health Programs will no longer have an independent representative; it is now part of the School of Pharmacy.
- Operating Model: The committee has been using a co-chair model due to members' dual roles in clinical care. This model will be formalized in the charge.
- Tenure Requirement: The revised charge will include a stipulation that one of the co-chairs must be a tenured faculty member.
- Diverse Representation: The requirement for a majority of tenure-track faculty on the committee is proposed to be removed to allow for more diverse representation.

Feedback and discussion:

- Eric Van Wyk expressed concern about the need for tenure protections for effective faculty governance and the importance of academic freedom.
- Jenn Goodnough asked if the tenured faculty member would handle FCC duties or if both co-chairs would share responsibilities equally. Mroz clarified that the co-chairs would share the responsibility.

Bee thanked Mroz for incorporating the feedback from FCC members at the previous discussion.

3. Committee Business

Bee addressed the following items of committee business:

- Congratulated David Brown on receiving the President's Award for Outstanding Service.
- Reported that he had approved non-substantive revisions to two policies on behalf of the FCC: *Open Access to Scholarly Articles* and *Creating and Evaluating Interdisciplinary Centers*.
- Invited the two candidates for vice chair, Subree Subramanian and Perry Leo, to say a few words to the committee, and they each did so. Bee said that an electronic vote would be sent out by email.

4. Workforce Reinvestment Resolution Response

Bee then initiated a general discussion on the administration's response to the Workforce Reinvestment Resolution. He noted that co-chairs of the response committee, Mary Rohman Kuhl and Beth Lewis, would be at the University Senate meeting later that day to discuss the response. A brief survey will be shared to collect senators' feedback on the resolution and responses. Bee said he aimed to facilitate a positive discussion, while allowing senators to express where they feel the response fell short.

At the upcoming BOR meeting, Bee said, he planned to balance recognizing the administration's efforts with advocating for further progress. There will also be a discussion on how to ensure that the BOR understands their role in making faculty compensation a priority. Bee informed

members that President-Designate Cunningham had demonstrated awareness of faculty compensation issues and was expected to attend the upcoming board meeting.

Members discussed the need for a clear, aspirational strategic vision for the institution, noting that MPact 2025 did not fully resonate with faculty or provide a coherent vision. Members also expressed a desire for the next strategic plan to prioritize the workforce.

Members also discussed strategies for demonstrating the importance of the University's workforce to the state legislature, as well as alternate strategies for increased funding, such as reconsidering the balance of in-state vs out-of-state students.

Amber Bathke
University Senate Office