

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, March 4, 2010**  
**12:00 – 2:15**  
**325 Coffman Union**

Present: Marti Hope Gonzales (chair), Melissa Anderson, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Janet Fitzakerley, Kathryn Hanna, Emily Hoover, Brian Isetts, Walt Jacobs, Jeff Kahn, Jan McCulloch, Michael Oakes, Martin Sampson, Kate VandenBosch, Cathrine Wambach, Becky Yust

Absent: Shawn Curley, Caroline Hayes, Russell Luepker

Guests: none

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) statement on the desired qualities in the next University president; (2) Legislative Liaison report; (3) minutes and mailing lists; (4) the budget situation; (5) presidential search-advisory committee; (6) public engagement]

Professor Gonzales convened the meeting at 12:15 and asked for a motion to close it in order to discuss personnel and political matters. The motion passed unanimously.

**1. Statement on the Desired Qualities in the Next University President**

The Committee reviewed a draft statement of desired characteristics in the next president it wished to send to the Board of Regents as the presidential search begins. The Committee unanimously adopted the following statement:

The Faculty Consultative Committee respectfully suggests to the Board of Regents that the attributes listed below are critical for the next president of the University of Minnesota and should be considered when evaluating any candidate for that vitally important position. We recognize that members of the Board are likely to seek many of these same attributes, and we convey our suggestions to reaffirm the goals and values that we share with the Board as the search process moves ahead.

We begin with the assumption that the Board will seek an individual of unimpeachable personal and professional integrity so we do not list that as a separate characteristic. We believe the most critical qualities of the next president include:

-- the motivation and ability to balance wise and timely responses to immediate fiscal challenges with a clear eye toward long-term challenges and a vision for how best to reshape the University in the decades to come;

---

\* 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.

- experience engaging with and in the academic culture, including demonstrated academic leadership at an institution we would consider a peer or aspirational peer;
- a track record of assembling an outstanding and cohesive leadership team;
- an understanding of the role and importance of the University of Minnesota as a public research university and a land-grant institution, and a vision for the future;
- a strong commitment to consultation with representatives in faculty governance, and an understanding of what meaningful consultation entails;
- a commitment to timely, informative, and transparent communications with both internal and external audiences, and demonstrated ability to engage in meaningful communication with diverse constituencies;
- an appreciation that the University of Minnesota comprises five campuses, each of which uniquely contributes to our institutional mission, and an understanding of the implications for leadership of the entire university system; and
- a national or international reputation as a scholar; and
- a commitment to maintaining and enhancing the international stature of the University of Minnesota.

## **2. Legislative Liaison Report**

Professor Sampson had a number of matters to lay before the Committee.

- He suggested that Committee members meet again with legislative leaders, as they did last year. There was agreement that he organize such meetings.
- The February state economic report anticipates about a billion dollar gap in expected revenues for FY 2011 that has to be fixed with budget cuts. Cuts to higher education are limited by the stimulus fund regulations; a state loses higher education stimulus money if it cuts below what the state allocated in 2006 to higher education. For the University that floor is \$591 million, which is a \$36 million cut. The Governor has proposed cutting FY 2011 higher education by \$47 million, which drives both MnSCU and the University to their 2006 levels.

The magnitude of the state's financial situation cannot be gauged by the \$36 million cut to the University's budget for next year, Professor Sampson warned. Higher education is about 9% of the state budget. Were higher education absorbing 9% of the billion dollar shortfall, the higher education cut for 2011 would be about \$90 million, not \$47 million, and the University's share would be far higher than \$36 million. For the next biennium there is no stimulus protection.

Professor Hoover asked how the University is handling state special appropriations. Professor Sampson replied that he does not know but observed that there is an array of state support for the

University in addition to the basic appropriation. This includes the standard two-thirds of the bonding obligation on new buildings, 70% of the bond obligation for the Biomedical Discovery District buildings, state financial aid, HEAPR funds, special appropriations of various kinds, and so on—so the annual total is considerably higher than the basic appropriation for a given fiscal year. In the state government and here, however, the working figure for the 2006 state level of support of the University is \$591 million.

-- The legislature's revision of its own 2011-2012 bonding budget proposal currently contains all the items requested by the University but not all in the amounts requested. There is money for design of a physics building rather than for the building itself, HEAPR is at \$56 million rather than \$100 million, and the other categories are as requested by the University. The bill has to be reapproved by the legislature, and the Governor's reaction is uncertain.

-- Professor Sampson commented on a recent hearing at the House Higher Education and Workforce Committee at which the President's detailed statement about the importance of the University to the state seemed to leave the entire committee strongly agreeing with the argument. One Representative who is typically highly critical of the University budget prefaced his questions with compliments on how well the university does its job. The point is that well substantiated arguments of this kind are very difficult to refute, but they coincide with, as the President noted in his remarks to the committee, a drop in the priority ranking of higher education. It is important that we all keep making these arguments.

### **3. Minutes and Mailing Lists**

The Committee agreed that no messages should be distributed to the mailing list used for committee minutes and adopted amendments to the protocol governing treatment of email lists.

### **4. The Budget Situation**

Apropos of the 27th-pay-period issue, one view is that if one looks at one's W2 statement from the University, it becomes clear that salaries are a little short over ten years, and the shortfall is made up in the 11th year, versus the view that people are paid an annual salary and should not be paid more. In general, it is clear that the budget situation at the University of Minnesota is significantly less bad than it is at some places elsewhere around the country, at least so far.

Committee members discussed how budget information from the President was communicated; it seems that it was haphazard, and instead of being sent to the Senate, it should have been sent to everyone. Professor Gonzales reported that she has been forwarding budget questions to Vice Presidents Brown, Carrier, and Himle, and expressed the hope that the administration would have a timely communication out well before the March 25 Faculty Senate meeting so that faculty members can have discussions with their colleagues. Professor Sampson said that there is no sense of what is being preserved as a result of the furloughs (it could be that key staff will be retained in departments, but people don't understand that). It would also help if the administration made clear what cuts have been made to administrative budgets; if people knew that significant cuts had already been made, that would make it easier to vote for furloughs. Professors Gonzales and Oakes both emphasized that they have made that point repeatedly with the senior officers. In response to Professor Sampson's point, Professor Oakes commented that if one is to be completely honest, the furloughs will save the staff positions for next year, but they could be gone after that.

## **5. Presidential Search-Advisory Committee**

Professor Gonzales noted that one FCC member made the suggestion that the current and past chair and vice chair of this Committee should be the faculty members nominated to serve on the presidential search-advisory committee. Professor Hoover (the past chair of FCC) said she didn't want the job but that the idea is a good one; those four individuals have worked with the Board. Those four also know a great deal about the recent issues affronting the University because of the many FCC discussions, Professor Hanna said.

Professors Gonzales, Hoover, and Oakes were excused from the room.

Professor Anderson wondered if FCC members and its chair already have access to the Regents. Professor Chomsky (a past chair of this Committee) said they really do not, except for meetings two or three times per year.

Professor Chomsky asked how the Committee would choose faculty members to represent the voice of the faculty on the search-advisory committee. How will it pick them? Anyone on this Committee has been elected, and if they have served recently, have been chosen by the faculty as their representatives. How can this Committee say that this person should be nominated to serve on the search advisory committee, but that one should not? Professor Cramer said it is impossible to pick three or four faculty members to represent the entire faculty, and it should be made clear that these four faculty members would welcome views from all faculty. Professor Yust said she liked the idea of having the past FCC chairs and vice chairs serve (noting that by the time the search is underway, Professors Gonzales and Oakes will be "past"). These four have been involved in recent issues and have been elected by their peers twice, once to FCC and then by their peers on FCC as leaders. They also represent a good cross-section of the University's disciplines: Mechanical Engineering, Psychology, Epidemiology, and Horticulture.

The Committee members in the room (that is, minus Professors Gonzales, Hoover, and Oakes) voted unanimously to nominate the four individuals for the search-advisory committee. It was agreed that Professors Chomsky (as a past chair) and VandenBosch (as chair-elect) would transmit the names of the four faculty members to the Board of Regents.

## **6. Public Engagement**

The Committee returned to the topic of public engagement and the draft statement considered at the last meeting as a result of the CIC discussions in November.

Professor Kahn said that he asked that the issue be brought back for discussion because he was not at the meeting when it was brought up. He said that while he might not agree with all parts of the draft resolution, he believes that institutions should recognize public service and outreach; he felt that the FCC minutes were overly negative regarding the importance of outreach. He expressed his view that it is the wrong message to be sending. He said he did not know how best to react to or revise the CIC resolution, but he did not want to see the record left as it was, suggesting faculty have no role to play.

They did talk about getting faculty involved, with the administration, Professor Chomsky said, and that there is a faculty role.

There was also discussion of changes to the tenure code, Professor Kahn noted; that occurred because the steps proposed by the CIC recommended reconsidering the relative importance of external service and outreach when evaluating promotion and tenure cases, Professor VandenBosch said. Departments have public service in their 7.12 statements, Professor Gonzales observed. There are two issues that CIC draft statement addressed, Professor VandenBosch said: One, to show the University in a good light, and two, to value public engagement and outreach. Her concern is that, while public engagement and outreach are appropriately considered in merit, promotion and tenure decisions, "showing the University in a good light" should not end up in the tenure code.

Professor Oakes said that he had participated in the CIC discussion, and it focused on how faculty involvement in the community or the state is really important and should be recognized and appreciated because it will be important to the survival of the institutions. And that the institution should be more encouraging about such activity, Professor Gonzales added. Life inside the ivory tower is dead, Professor Oakes said; faculty are a part of society.

One way to engage the issue is to encourage faculty to think of themselves as citizens of the University, Professor Kahn suggested. He said he was worried about the message being sent out, concerned about the way the issue is being articulated, and concerned about the way faculty are representing themselves. There are different expectations at other institutions about the faculty role in outreach and public engagement, he noted. Professor Hoover pointed out that in some parts of the University, they are a required part of the job. Professor Kahn agreed but pointed out that is not true in all units. At the private institutions, public engagement/outreach is expected; one returns a call to a reporter because that is one important way to represent the institution in the public eye.

Professor Anderson recalled that there had been discussion that outreach and public engagement is a collective faculty responsibility, and that all faculty are expected to do it, not just junior faculty. Professor Chomsky said there is a difference between sharing expertise with the public and being part of a public-relations effort. She said she was uncomfortable with the proposition that faculty should be part of a public-relations effort because some faculty members will do unpopular things (that are protected by academic freedom). Faculty should share their expertise, and people should be informed about what faculty do, but they should not be part of a PR effort. Nor should they receive stipends from the Provost; that would create the perception that the faculty are bought.

Professor Kahn said he recently read an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education about iTunes University, and the extent to which universities were using it to extend the reach. He said it shows the possibilities for very wide distribution of teaching and scholarship, and the distinction between "inside" and "outside" of universities is beginning to go away. He further pointed out that such channels for sharing the work of faculty illustrate the compatibility of scholarly effort and outreach.

Professor Hanna said she has observed a phasing out of the word "service" by administrators and use of the term "engagement" instead. They are not the same thing. What effect will this have on the tenure code in the future?

Professor Yust said that "engagement" can be teaching or research, but faculty will deplore it if one says it's one more thing to do. If engagement equals service, does that mean it does not count toward tenure? She agreed that they are not the same; service is to the institution or one's discipline or

professional community, and it can be engaged service, but that is not the only form of engagement. But there is much talk about the engaged institution, Professor Oakes pointed out. This has been a land-grant institution, presumably "engaged" since the 19th Century, Professor Yust observed.

Professor Chomsky said that "public engagement" means that University faculty and staff do not swoop in, do research, and leave, and it is not "we are doing this for you"; it is a matter of being engaged with the community in which one is doing work. That is why the term is used and that is why it is different from service—and both of them are in the tenure code. One can be engaged in teaching, research, and service. Public engagement is doing "with," not "for," Professor Yust concluded.

Professor Gonzales adjourned the meeting at 2:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota