

Thursday, April 9, 2018, 2:00-3:30 p.m.

CAFNR Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

Attending

Laura McCann, Committee Chair

Andrew Clarke

Toshihiko Ezashi

David Larsen

Tom McFadden

Jon Simonsen

Zhanyuan Zhang

Guests: Tim McIntosh, Director, UM System Executive Initiatives

Bryan Garton, Associate Dean (Chair of Associate Dean for Research Search Committee)

John Lory, Associate Professor of Extension

Joanna Whittier, Assistant Research Professor

Teresa Davis, Staff Support

Discussion

Dr. Laura McCann thanked everyone for coming, and began the meeting by asking for approval of the minutes for the February 22nd meeting. A motion was made, seconded, and passed.

Dr. McCann asked the committee for input on what we are looking for in the next Associate Dean for Research (in preparation for the discussion with Tim McIntosh and Bryan Garton, next on the agenda). The committee noted the following important abilities and characteristics:

- Highly respected in their field
- Experience attracting and managing large grants
- Understanding of research centers, Hatch funds, McIntire-Stennis funding and state match
- Understanding of the broader land-grant mission
- Good financial manager
- Good interpersonal skills, ability to create and work with teams, transparent
- Be proactive in enabling faculty to pursue major funding opportunities (DOD/DOE, multi-institutional, inter-disciplinary)
- Experience with intramural, seed and bridge funding programs
- Someone who will facilitate faculty research success, especially junior faculty, by creating access and opportunity

- Comfortable reaching across disciplines on campus

Tim McIntosh and Bryan Garton joined the meeting and provided a brief overview of the search process. All of the above desired abilities and characteristics for a successful candidate were shared with them.

Mr. McIntosh asked the committee if it would be OK for the AD/Research to be research active – would it be possible to be successful in the ADR role AND do research or manage a research lab? Initial reaction was No. The AD/Research position is full-time. However, some indicated that the successful candidate would not be *required* to be research active, but could maintain his/her research, if desired. It was noted that the Dean of the College of Engineering is an active researcher.

In response to a question about what disciplinary backgrounds would be required, the committee expressed the desire that the next AD/Research complement Dean Daubert. Someone in biology/production technology would be good.

Mr. McIntosh asked how the committee would “pitch” the job.

- Bread basket (location)
- Land-grant mission
- CAFNR is a powerhouse with funding
- Lots of opportunity
- Research infrastructure in place
- New dynamic dean and MU administration

He asked about the current state of faculty. Concern was expressed regarding low faculty morale, however, the faculty is ready to mobilize and eager to move forward.

Timing may be good for this new hire to provide input on the strategic planning process underway in the college.

Dr. McCann requested that the CAFNR Policy Committee have the opportunity to meet with the candidates when they are on campus for interviews.

Dr. Garton shared a working timeline for the search. By May 30 the position description should be approved, and advertising/recruiting will begin. An invitation to serve on the search committee has gone out to 15 individuals... the membership should be finalized soon. June and July will be devoted to recruiting, however, it could continue into August, depending on the quality of the pool. The initial vetting process will begin in late August/September, as well as preliminary interviews. Finalists will then be identified and campus interviews scheduled in October and November. A hiring decision could happen early next year. The start date will depend on the candidate’s personal and professional situation.

Tim McIntosh and Bryan Garton were thanked for interacting with the committee and left the meeting.

Drs. John Lory and Joanna Whittier joined the meeting to discuss the attached NTT proposal. They indicated that CAFNR has been forward-thinking in its support of NTT faculty. In a recent meeting with the division directors and Marc Linit, it was noted that they were supportive, but had questions about how it would work.

The committee reviewed the proposal and discussed the question posed “How do we move this forward and implement at the college level?”

Concerns were raised regarding differing circumstances across NTT positions (those funded by soft money vs. those that are not), and the resulting budget implications.

The question was asked “How many NTTs are currently on 2-year rolling contracts (defined as a 2-year contract signed every year...)?” No one could provide an exact number.

Currently, the campus provides no transition assistance pay. It was recommended that the college set aside a pool for bridge funding for successful researchers. Someone else suggested that in this budget-cutting environment, it would be fair to do this across all NTT functions (teaching and research).

The question was asked “How often is an NTT faculty not renewed?” No one could say.

CAFNR loses good faculty to better contracts at other institutions (5-year)... two recent examples were cited.

There needs to be strategic planning to create a pool of funding for transition/bridge assistance. “Administration needs to be able to manage around that.”

Small city/location means opportunities are limited if an NTT contract is not renewed and the family needs to stay in Columbia... many are in specialized fields.

The question was asked about how policy is created in CAFNR. It was suggested that Lory and Whittier look at similar policies at other institutions and come back with a draft proposal with more details.

Drs. Lory and Whittier will update the proposal per the discussion today and submit again for review by this committee.

Dr. McCann introduced discussion regarding the proposed change in the bylaws with regard to voting. She noted that we would likely need at least 90% participation by faculty in the upcoming vote to get enough support for the proposed change. The dean, division directors and committee members need to push this election. She encouraged committee members to mention the importance of participating in the election at faculty meetings. We need to help faculty feel that voting/participating in college governance make a difference... NTT faculty, in particular, may not feel that voting is relevant.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Davis
Senior Executive Assistant to the Dean
College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources