

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, May 26, 2011**  
**1:00 – 4:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Chris Cramer (chair pro tem until 2:30), Kate VandenBosch (chair), Melissa Anderson, Peter Bitterman, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Carpenter, Shawn Curley, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch, Michael Oakes

Absent: Elizabeth Boyle, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Caroline Hayes, Jeff Kahn, George Sheets

Guests: Provost E. Thomas Sullivan; Assistant Vice Provost Suzanne Bardouche (Undergraduate Education); Vice President Tim Mulcahy (chair, Provost Search Committee); Professor Peter Hudleston (Council on Liberal Education); President Robert Bruininks

Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the President), Katherine Himes (Office of the Provost), Coty Jen (graduate student, member of the provostal search committee), Amelious Whyte (Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, member, provostal search committee)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Sullivan; (2) educational policies approved on behalf of the Faculty Senate; (3) provostal search; (4) update from the Council on Liberal Education; (5) committee business; (6) discussion with President Bruininks]

### **1. Discussion with Provost Sullivan**

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00, explained that Professor VandenBosch had a conflict until later in the meeting, and welcomed Provost Sullivan to discuss the responsibilities of the provost.

Provost Sullivan said he would provide the broad parameters of the position of provost. On the organizational chart there are 19 deans, 17 of whom report to the Provost (the deans of Extension and International Programs report to Senior Vice President Jones). Deans at the University's Twin Cities campus are selected and reviewed by the Provost. He meets monthly with each dean and collectively with the deans once per month also.

Professor Carpenter asked if any coordinate-campus administrators report through the provost's office. They do, Provost Sullivan said, and he noted that his office has two titles: Provost (which means responsibilities for the Twin Cities campus) and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (which carries with it system responsibilities). In the case of the latter, he has responsibility for promotion and tenure for all campuses except Duluth, all curricular modifications, and as a member of the Budget 5 he is involved in recommendations to the President on ALL budgets.

---

\* 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.

In his office, he has a Chief of Staff, one administrative assistant, a receptionist, and four assistants to the provost who do a variety of projects and tasks and also serve as staff for decanal searches. One of the assistants is responsible for the statutorily-required accountability report and for reviewing curriculum changes.

There are five vice provosts (there were six), for student affairs (Rinehart), distance education (Wahlstrom), faculty and academic affairs (Carney), graduate education (Schroeder), and undergraduate education (McMaster). The chief financial officer for his office also provides support to the President's office and to Senior Vice President Jones's office (as well as a number of other University-wide units). There are two vice presidents (Mulcahy and Friedman) who report directly to the President but also through the Provost. Two University research centers also report to the Provost: the Institute on the Environment and the Consortium on Law and Values in Health, Environment, and Life Sciences.

The provost has specific primary responsibilities, Provost Sullivan said. The role of chief academic officer suggests the person has responsibility for increasing academic excellence at every opportunity, in everything from recruiting students to the research portfolio. For example, he is frequently involved in faculty retention cases, when the dean or department head asks for assistance.

Professor Luepker recalled that Provost Sullivan had discussed at length the responsibilities of his office with the Committee on Finance and Planning; he said the Committee was overwhelmed and impressed with the range of the provost's duties. The deans report to him and the compact process works through the provost's office. He asked Provost Sullivan to say more about the compact process.

Provost Sullivan said his office manages the process for all support units in the fall and then devotes two to three hours from January to March with each of the deans. These sessions require an enormous amount of preparation, and there is now less focus on the budget and more on the strengths, weaknesses, and aspirations of the programs. It is a qualitative assessment. These discussions are a great deal of work and are one of the most important jobs the Provost does after promotion and tenure and the selection of deans. They are what one wants a provost to be doing, developing contacts in and understanding of the units in order to have the information needed to make recommendations. The Budget 5 spends hundreds of hours integrating the information from the compact discussions and developing recommendations to the President. The process takes a lot of time but it is not disproportionate to the provost's responsibilities.

Another activity in which he engages, which he enjoys, but which is not normally in the portfolio of a provost is fund-raising, Provost Sullivan said. He spends considerable time fund-raising for the University, and it has been a joy to do so. He noted his involvement in fund-raising for the Weisman Art Museum, in obtaining a \$1.16-million Mellon Foundation grant for the University Press and humanities, in raising money for the renovation of Pillsbury Hall and Northrop Auditorium, as well as for scholarships. If the provost likes and is interested in fund-raising, it connects directly with the University's mission and success, especially as state funds decline, he noted.

Professor Cramer commented that, given the organizational chart of the provost's office, one could imagine that management takes 100% of the provost's time. Does he feel he has enough time for vision and for University-wide initiatives? Is there time for a balance between vision and day-to-day management?

Everyone has a different way or style of doing the job, Provost Sullivan said, and in his case it is the team that makes it possible. He has a very talented chief of staff and administrative assistant. A provost must have a talented staff in order to free up the time the provost needs. There is never enough time, but he would hope that academic leaders spend time on vision and the long-term perspective.

Provost Sullivan said he had a couple of observations to offer. In terms of the organizational chart, the job is manageable but the provost must have a superb staff. It is very important to manage one's own calendar. He has to decide what has priority.

Professor Oakes said that Provost Sullivan did not mention one role of the provost, that of chief promoter and defender of academic freedom at the University. That should be on the record. Provost Sullivan thinks about it all the time, Professor Oakes observed, and has been one of the strongest advocates for academic freedom. Provost Sullivan said he did not mention that element of the job because he hopes it is self-evident. Every week he receives one to three calls about academic freedom, a question about it, a complaint about it, and so on. Some of the calls can take only a few seconds to deal with, but it is the 2% that are in the gray areas that require his time and additional follow up.

When it comes to academic freedom, what should the Committee and the faculty think about when they consider the next provost, Professor Oakes asked? Professor Oakes said that Provost Sullivan has been a champion of academic freedom his entire career; how can the University find someone who shares that view? It is an important question to ask of candidates, Provost Sullivan said, and one should listen both to the answer and to the vigor of the response.

The provost also has 160-180 promotion-and-tenure cases per year, Provost Sullivan said. It is a massive task to evaluate the files, and the person must have an appreciation for the different cultures of the University. The provost is or should be the "traffic cop" for academic quality at the University. That is a key delegation from the Board of Regents and President.

Professor Oakes recalled that the Committee had heard from the chair of the Faculty Academic Oversight Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics and the two Faculty Athletics Representatives and had talked with them about the tension between (1) the need for winning teams to generate revenue and (2) academic standards. Does the provost have any role in addressing that tension? All academic counseling for intercollegiate athletics reports to the provost (through the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education), Provost Sullivan pointed out, and all student-athlete academic issues come to his office. The office plays an important role with respect to standards, admissions, and dismissals. While he loves sports, he has made it clear that this is an academic institution first. He has participated in recruiting coaches, an activity not normally within the provost's portfolio. It's a question the Committee might wish to ask prospective candidates. At least one of the major athletic conferences seems to have different academic standards, Professor Oakes said, while at Minnesota there are higher standards, so it struggles to win games. It starts at the top, Provost Sullivan said; the academic leaders set the culture and aspirations. If they do not do so, one can read about the problems in athletics in the newspaper.

One of the discussions the Committee has had has been about budgets, Professor Curley recalled, and about the cost of administration. Where would the Provost cut 15%, if that turns out to be the cut in state funds, and with what effect? Provost Sullivan said there are two general budgets in the provost's office, the college budgets for all deans and the provost's office budget. In the latter category, four of them are critically important: undergraduate education, graduate education, the libraries, and the admissions and financial aid offices. In the last three budget years, the provost's office has taken large

budget cuts amounting to \$10,300,000 (a 12.7% budget reduction). Other cuts at 15% would see significant devastation of undergraduate and graduate education, the libraries, and financial aid. In the seven years he has been in office, he has tried to protect the libraries (there have been no cuts in the acquisitions budget) and financial aid (again, there have been no cuts). New cuts will have to come out of operations budgets and they will be devastating for the support of these core units and responsibilities. For example, in admissions, the number of applications to the Twin Cities campus has gone from less than 16,000 to nearly 40,000 during his time as provost. Each file is evaluated holistically and by several people. If he cuts admissions and the Registrar's office, would the University need to switch to a numbers game in evaluating applications? That would be a sea change and would drastically alter the entire approach to recruitment and admission. Cuts suggested by the question would change the University so that it would not be recognizable.

Professor Hancher said that the Committee has observed that national trend to increasing reliance on non-tenured/non-tenure-track instructors (NTTT faculty). The Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported on a survey of presidents, who prefer that instruction be carried out by NTTT faculty. He said he knows the situation at the University but does not know the trends. What is the provost's responsibility for monitoring the situation and providing remedies? The provost has a clear responsibility and this is an ill-advised shift, Provost Sullivan said. The University wants faculty members in the classroom, especially its very best faculty. The University cannot and should not accept that trend and should say "no" to it.

Is that a question the Committee should pose to candidates, Professor Hancher asked? It is a core question, Provost Sullivan said. It comes down to "values" and setting standards in high-quality instruction. If this is to be a world-class research university that cares deeply about teaching and learning, it must put its money where its values are. It does not have all the money it needs for all of its priorities, so it must set priorities—and discuss carefully and identify the tradeoffs.

Professor Brothen commented that the Provost had described a complex organization. There are a lot of critics, both inside and without the University, who say it is too bureaucratic and top-heavy. Is it true that the complexity has increased in the last several decades and that that change drives budgets? Provost Sullivan said he did not agree that the University is too complex. While the organizational chart may suggest complexity, he does not see it in daily life. The institution faces increased demands from everyone—parents, students, faculty, staff—which does drive up budgets. There are examples of changes that came out of the strategic-planning process that were very successful and benefited the University (e.g., writing across the curriculum has been very successful but is expensive, the honors program includes 2400 talented students with average 32 ACT scores, better than virtually all the liberal-arts colleges in the country, and an expansion of the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program). All of these are important, Provost Sullivan said, and all are expensive. They did not exist in their current form ten years ago but they each have added quality and distinction to the University. Each was a response to demands.

The university of 100 years ago was cheaper, Professor Brothen commented. It was, Provost Sullivan agreed, but it was not doing what the University is now doing in world-class research and teaching. This is a much larger university today, with over 68,000 students and 4,000 faculty members on five campuses, and a budget of \$3.58 billion.

Professor Luepker inquired how the 17 deans who report to the provost are evaluated for performance. He noted that there are nodal points where someone could be evaluated—three, five, seven

years—and asked if at such a point an evaluation could result in termination. He said he has never heard of a dean being terminated. The Provost described the annual and three-year comprehensive review process that is used to evaluate the deans and said he would be glad to talk about it at greater length when time permits. He also suggested the Committee might wish to speak with some of the deans who have gone through the process.

Professor Cramer thanked Provost Sullivan for joining the meeting.

## **2. Educational Policies Approved on Behalf of the Faculty Senate**

The Committee turned next to two policy changes from the Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) that it is being asked to approve on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Brothen introduced the first policy change, an elimination of the "skills courses" limitation in the grading policy (the provision sets limits on the number of courses in such areas as physical education and applied music that can be counted toward a degree). He reported that SCEP looked at whether the requirement should be retained and if there could be criteria established to identify the courses that should be on the list of skills courses. The concern was that students could graduate with many skills courses, but SCEP concluded unanimously that majors would not allow that to happen and the best course of action is to drop the requirement. Ms. Bardouche reported that the list of courses (for the Twin Cities campus) is an historical artifact and has not changed in years. (The Morris campus has a similar list of skills courses but decided it did not wish to review the issue at this time.)

Professor Oakes said he would rather see students receive credit for science, math, or English courses than for taking volleyball. Ms. Bardouche said that when one thinks about the courses offered, all have been reviewed by a department and by college curriculum committees and should be respected.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the change on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

The second policy change deals with adding or changing academic programs, Professor Brothen reported. SCEP suggested changes to the initial draft, which were made, and approved it unanimously. What is new in the policy, Dr. Himes reported, is that new Ph.D. programs go to the Graduate Education Council, a new body. That is a higher level than undergraduate programs, which stop at the college, Professor Cramer observed. Dr. Himes concurred, and said that approval for Master's programs is also within the colleges. The Board of Regents must approve all of them, Professor Brothen noted.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the changes on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

## **3. Provostal Search**

Professor Cramer now welcomed Vice President Mulcahy to the meeting to discuss the provostal search. Several search committee members also joined the meeting.

Dr. Mulcahy said that the search for the provost is critical for the University, and given the circumstance of a new president, it is even more important. They recognize how critical the provost is to the smooth operation of the University. He was asked why students should care about the provostal search; his response is that the provost is closer to students than any other administrative position. The provost is also involved in academic and faculty matters as well as college organization. They have a

strong search committee and want to engage the University community as much as possible in the process before they start interviewing candidates. They want insights from students, faculty, and the deans on what they should be looking for in the next provost.

The search committee has met twice, Dr. Mulcahy reported, once with President-designate Kaler, who charged it and provided a general view of the role of the provost, and once with the search firm (one that Dr. Kaler has used before).

In terms of the timeline, the biggest task has been pulling together the position description and pulling together an institutional profile for potential candidates. The position description has been approved by Dr. Kaler and will now be posted. The Committee was provided copies.

One priority is a large, well-qualified, diverse applicant pool, Dr. Mulcahy said. They want all the names they can get early in the process so there are many in the hopper. All search committee members are forwarding names and the search consultant is contacting the individuals. They do not want to reach the point where there is no decision to make because there is only one candidate—they want to be able to select from a number of outstanding candidates.

The search committee will begin compiling paper dossiers in July and arrange a significant number of screening interviews in August, with the intention of retaining a large number as semifinalists who would be invited back to meet with people on campus. President-designate Kaler would like a slate of names in order to be able to identify the next provost by the end of September.

Vice President Mulcahy asked Committee members to suggest the primary qualifications and assets of an outstanding academic leader.

Professor Brothen asked if Dr. Mulcahy had the sense that the provostal search will have the same problem as the presidential search: People will not want to be identified in the process? Dr. Mulcahy said the University will always be handicapped by the law and rules, but said he thought there would be slightly less of a problem with the provostal search. They are telling candidates that the search will be confidential up to the point that finalists are named.

Professor Hancher noted three items on the list of "expectations and responsibilities" on the position description related to the academic agenda, access and support for students, and a strong faculty. There are a number of metrics that could be used to measure performance on these items; one might be the fraction of the curriculum delivered by the TTT faculty. There is national pressure to reduce the number of TTT faculty. His question to a prospective provost would be how attentive he/she will be to this issue; what might the search committee ask to bring the issue to the foreground? Is this a question the search committee should use in screening candidates or one to be asked when a candidate is on campus, Dr. Mulcahy inquired. It is a question that should be asked early, Professor Hancher said, and has to with the structure of the faculty and the integrity of tenure. It is the responsibility of the provost. Dr. Mulcahy agreed that the search committee should probe on this issue when it first brings candidates to campus.

Professor Gonzales noted that there is nothing in the position description indicating the expectation by the faculty that there will be consultation on major issues, not just conveyance of information. The candidates should be asked to think about the benefits, liabilities, and past experiences related to timely and meaningful consultation with faculty governance representatives and other faculty

groups. Dr. Mulcahy said that he personally believes that one of the most important characteristics of leadership is communication—talking and listening. It is a benchmark he would use and he agreed entirely with Professor Gonzales. He said he understands the role of governance in this institution and would not want to see the provost an impedance to it, no matter the person's academic qualifications. Will this Committee meet with the finalists, Professor Cramer asked? It will, Dr. Mulcahy affirmed.

Professor Oakes said the University has been fortunate to have Vice President Mulcahy and Provost Sullivan, both strong promoters and defenders of academic freedom. That subject is not mentioned in the position description. Dr. Mulcahy agreed and said the position description is not a script for questions to be posed. As an absolute principle, the candidates' views on academic freedom must be probed.

The person also needs experience in the management of downsizing, Professor Oakes said—and that does not mean cutting all units equally.

Professor Luepker said he wished to emphasize the need for the person to be an accomplished academic who has contributed to his or her field, not just someone who has administrative credentials. Dr. Mulcahy said that President-designate Kaler has been explicit about wanting an accomplished academic who has been through the ranks and who did not go into administration because he or she could not succeed in the discipline. He values a scholar. What questions does one ask to get to that issue, Professor Bitterman asked? One way to tell is to look at the track record, Dr. Mulcahy responded. Is the position the person has been in better because of that person's service, or did the person serve as a caretaker? Has the person made difficult decisions? If they get the caliber of scholar they are looking for, the record should be evident.

Professor Bitterman said it is important to determine if the candidate has been a thought leader. Vice President Mulcahy observed that no one coming into an interview will detract from his or her own candidacy, but there are "pat" answers. They do not want to have to rely on pat answers; they want to probe in the interview process and determine if the responses are innate or just a front. And they do expect to do a lot of background work themselves.

It is a schizophrenic position, Professor Carpenter said. The Morris campus has had a lot of trouble with the ambiguity of reporting responsibilities; how will they evaluate candidates with respect to strengths in dealing with a multi-campus system versus a large research university? Will the candidates meet with the coordinate-campus chancellors? The challenges of a multi-campus system have to be addressed in the search. Dr. Mulcahy said that President-designate Kaler has approved the language in the job description that speaks to the need for a strong collaborative working relationship between the Provost and Senior Vice President Jones. The interests of the coordinate campuses will also be within the Provost's portfolio, but as is true currently, those issues will be addressed cooperatively.

Dr. Mulcahy said he wished to be explicit about one point: They did not wish to send the message that they are only interested in outside candidates. He said he believes there are strong leaders on campus as well. When they asked the campus community to identify candidates, some interpreted the request to be only for external candidates. That is not the case, but they also want external candidates. There may be the perception that this is a "wired" search and he said he wished to emphasize that it is a completely level playing field and an honest national search. He said he would be glad to provide updates on the search to the Committee as it wishes.

Professor Cramer thanked Vice President Mulcahy for the report and turned the gavel over to Professor VandenBosch.

#### **4. Update from the Council on Liberal Education**

Professor VandenBosch welcomed Professor Hudleston to provide an update from the Council on Liberal Education (CLE).

Professor Hudleston distributed three handouts with data about the number of seats and classes offered for the cores and themes established by the most recent liberal-education requirements that took effect last fall (which were approved by the Faculty Senate three years ago). He also provided a handout proposing a change in the CLE requirements.

CLE reviewed courses to ensure they met the new criteria, Professor Hudleston related, and they match closely the previous ones. There is the same total number of requirements (one fewer core course, one additional theme), so the requirements remained constant as a proportion of the curriculum. CLE believes the theme courses are meatier than they were in the past because now the theme must be infused in the entire course rather than be one-third of it. Because of this new requirement, some courses that met theme requirements in the past are unable to do so now. As a result, there are fewer "double dipping" opportunities, and a concomitant concern that students will need to take more courses or will take courses only because they meet requirements.

In response to the reduction of double-dipping options, CLE will bring to SCEP in the fall a proposal to reduce the required number of themes a student must take from five to four (i.e., instead of one of each of the five themes, the student may satisfy the requirement with four of the five). When CLE reviewed the theme courses, it discovered there was significant overlap in content and a number of the courses could cover more than one theme. CLE concluded that students will generally be exposed to the concepts embodied in the five theme requirements even if they must only take four of the five.

Professor Cramer suggested it would have been useful to reduce the number of required core courses from seven to six. There would be much more resistance to that proposal, Professor Hudleston surmised, and there would be strong arguments about privileging certain parts of the core over others. Cutting the theme requirements, however, seemed to be a modest way to approach the problem of inadvertently requiring students to take additional courses.

Professor VandenBosch inquired of Professor Brothen how he thought SCEP might receive the proposal. Professor Brothen said the arguments seemed persuasive but he did not know what SCEP might think about it. Professor Hudleston said that CLE spent considerable time talking with Vice Provost McMaster about the change.

Would the change affect only new students, Professor VandenBosch asked? The proposal suggests the change apply to all students who are covered by the new liberal-education requirements, (which went into effect fall 2010) Professor Hudleston said. Most students falling under the fall 2010 will not have taken all of the theme courses by the time the change takes effect, so it will have the effect of reducing requirements even for currently-enrolled students.

Professor Cramer asked if every major fulfilled at least one core requirement. Professor Hudleston said he could not say for sure but said the supposition is certainly almost true. Ms. Bardouche

said there may be a couple of outliers (no one could think of any), but even if so, prerequisites for majors would certainly sweep everyone into meeting at least one of the liberal-education requirements. Professor Cramer said he was only thinking about students' time to graduation. Ms. Bardouche responded that sample plans in PCAS (for every major) show what major courses fulfill liberal-education requirements and there is a matrix at the beginning of every sample plan that outlines what liberal education requirements are satisfied by the major and elective courses in the sample plan. Many students graduate with extra liberal-education credits beyond the minimum core and theme requirements. Professor Cramer clarified that he is not opposed to liberal-education requirements but he wondered if there are majors that require too much. Professor Brothen commented that Vice Provost McMaster would not have supported the change if it were to increase students' time to graduation.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Professor Hudleston for his report.

## **5. Committee Business**

Professor VandenBosch reported that on the matter of clinical research and working with patients, she and Professor Cramer had received a message from Vice President Mulcahy offering to provide financial support for scholarly work, discourse, and/or a symposium on the issues that have been raised in recent discussions. Vice President Mulcahy will join the Committee this summer to discuss how best to proceed.

Later in the meeting, Professor VandenBosch also reported that an ad hoc committee on Open Access has been appointed. Committee members are enthusiastic about considering the issues and will report back next year.

## **6. Discussion with President Bruininks**

Professor VandenBosch welcomed President Bruininks to his last meeting with the Committee and asked him to provide a retrospective and any words of wisdom he might have as he leaves the presidency.

The President began with some brief remarks on the political events in St. Paul, noting that neither he nor others knew what would happen in the next month in the standoff between the legislature and the Governor. State agencies will be out of money on June 30; the University has operating reserves it can draw on to remain open for a period. He will take the annual budget framework to the Regents in June, based on the most recent legislative conference committee budget action (vetoed by Governor Dayton). The budget framework contains items that have been discussed during the year: tuition, changes to health care costs, changes in Faculty Retirement Plan, a salary freeze, etc. (Some colleges are recommending increases in college fees; the President suggested that the Committee on Educational Policy examine course and college fees because, he said, they should not slip in the back door as tuition increases. The course fees should be largely for consumables used in the course.)

The University will balance its budget by taking tough medicine that is not good for the institution in the long term, the President said. It is decreasing its investments and is not able to stay competitive in compensation, especially in certain fields. There will be options to amend the budget if the final state appropriation is more favorable than the one contained in the conference committee report. He emphasized, as he has before, that there must be a compensation increase in the second year of the biennium; that will likely cost \$70-\$80 million.

The President related that he had received a respectful request from the University Education Association (UEA), the union that represents the Duluth faculty, asking that the administration reconsider the proposed changes to employee benefits. He said he could not agree with one of the UEA's positions, that "this too shall pass," that the current financial situation will improve. The cuts that are being made in state support are permanent cuts and the cost increases will not stop. The University is asking employees to pick up about one-third of the cost of the increases in benefits costs, including an adjustment for under-recovering in the past two years. There appears to be some feeling around the campuses that the situation is temporary; the President cautioned that it does not serve the University well to believe that.

Professor McCulloch asked if there have been any conversations about layoffs or furloughs. President Bruininks said he would talk with the Regents about "what if" scenarios. State agencies may be required to shut down on July 1; the University has about 20,000 students in summer school, thousands returning in the fall, and millions of dollars in grants and contracts. The University needs to remain open for business, but every month without state funds costs \$50 million, and there will have to be contingency plans if a government shutdown lasts longer than a few months. 348 people took advantage of the Retirement Incentives Option (RIO), which saves units a substantial amount of money, but that cannot be offered every year. With RIO and other steps, the University can likely greatly reduce unplanned layoffs, which are not a good idea because research shows an organization loses its most talented people, institutional history, and productivity when such unplanned layoffs occur.

The President then turned to the recent discussions about UMore Park at the Senate Research Committee (SRC) as a way to reflect on other issues. The SRC discussions included first a meeting with the appropriate administrators and then later a meeting with a group of faculty members to express their concerns about research. The President observed that this and other committees are often asked to consult on major issues by their faculty colleagues; it could be academic freedom, it could be research issues, and so. What often is missing in the interactions at the committee meetings, he said, is attention to what is going on to solve the problem(s). When the full context is not presented, one can read the minutes and believe that people are not doing their jobs or creating solutions. What he appreciated about the discussions about academic freedom and the film *Troubled Waters* was that this Committee developed a set of questions, people went to work answering them, and there was a presentation at the Senate. That was a very comprehensive approach. He said he was concerned that the governance system could be used by people to get a hearing about something, and it could then issue a statement devoid of context and solutions that are reasonable responses to the challenges before the University.

There will be more trying incidents ahead, the President said, because these are tough times. As the Committee thinks about the role of governance in the University's academic future, and it deals with more difficult issues, he suggested it put together joint governance-administrative ad hoc groups. He said the Committee might think about this, as it has its retreat in the fall; if it wants governance to be a substantial and powerful part of the University, it needs to consider how to approach these kinds of complex and often controversial issues.

Professor VandenBosch said she would stand by the conversations that SRC held. The matter came up because this Committee, every year, asks faculty members what issues they believe the Committee should take up. The UMore Park development has come to the Committee on Finance and Planning several times, but those discussions did not focus on research issues, so a number of level-headed and thoughtful faculty members were asked to participate in a discussion at SRC. She said she

takes the UMore Park discussion as a work in progress and it will help if Senior Vice President Jones can provide an update on how the faculty members' concerns are being addressed.

His main point, the President said, is that the University will increasingly face difficult issues; it will face right-versus-right issues, where there are a number of "right" answers but where the institution must make a decision. With a web-based world, the University still needs to have conversations in public, but they need to include broad context and responses of the University community.

Professor Anderson noted that when SRC was asked to learn about issues of concern to faculty at UMore Park, she agreed that it would do so but insisted first on hearing from the administration to set the stage for what the faculty would discuss. SRC members did not hear from the administration about the problems that were the foci of faculty concern.

Tough issues cut across institutional boundaries, the President said, and UMore Park is about broadening the University's research mission, about people thinking creatively about the land in a way they have not done before. It is difficult to think long-term in these times, and UMore Park is long-term; the University will not realize significant return for another 10-20 years. Taking the long view will be harder to do in the future. The University needs to build an environment where it can take the long view about what will be required to sustain quality and greatness over five, ten, twenty years, etc.

A number of macro-level issues will require a rethinking of governance and relationships, the President said. During his tenure as provost and president, from 1997 to now, he and the governance system have dealt with many tough issues. His view is that the best practice is to put together a group of faculty members and administrators together to vet an issue in order to figure out how to deal with it. Doing so forces a small group of people to work quickly and wisely and be accountable both to the Faculty Consultative Committee and to the administration. The question is how to get people out of the blocks quickly in solving the right problem. What has sustained him, the President said, is identifying the problem and identifying the principles and values that will be used to make the decision. That process allows the institution to reach consensus more quickly.

The President also said it is important to "make sure we as a community pick long-term strategies that make a difference." "We know that the University must drive down costs," and he believed it necessary to identify the major cost drivers (such as space). But the University needs to act prudently, quickly, and wisely in this challenging environment.

The University also needs to find ways to plan and deliberate more in real time, the President said.

The way that decisions are vetted makes a difference in the long haul, the President said. The ones that last are the ones that are strongly embraced by the broader University community. Short-term decisions that are top-down are seldom sustained.

The University needs to find the "sweet spot" between high quality, excellence, and value. The University is close to the ideal position but the situation has to be watched closely; it must keep costs in line with the quality of education it provides. The University is in a place to win if the state can continue as a modest partner in providing critically-important long-term support.

One thing he worries about, the President said, are that economic pressures may reduce the public mission of the University. He said he believes universities should find the best combination of quality and value and make investments in areas where it has strength or comparative advantage—but also pay attention to the public good (and leverage investments enhance education and research).

How is the University to do this in an era of attacks on K-12 to higher education, Professor Oakes asked—in an era that is anti-intellectual and anti-skill? The international trends are in the other direction, the President responded. What is the role for the University in that conversation, Professor Oakes asked? It must try to keep getting its message across about the University's leadership role, the President said; it is taking chances in branding to identify its unique mission, by telling stories about the impact of the University, with the return-on-investment data and other qualitative information. What about the arguments about the public good and an educated citizenry, Professor Oakes asked? The President agreed that those are important arguments, but in a utilitarian age that has an anti-intellectual streak, it is not just about dollars, it is also stories of true impact. The humanities today are nothing like they were 200 years ago; what will they be like in another 50 years?

People are negative about K-12 education because they don't know what to do, and they go for quick fixes, the President said. People know education is important, and that it is slipping, but they don't know what to do about it.

In University polls, the results demonstrate that people think highly of research and education at the University, and somewhat less of administration (although even that has approval in the 60% range). In general the public has a high regard for the University, and it needs to build on that respect—but it has to earn it every day, the President said. It must take the longer view to achieve continued support (e.g., discussions during strategic planning about departments and interdisciplinary activities led to investments that have been enormously beneficial).

The University also needs to be better in how it communicates, the President said, and how it manages communication in the current environment.

The President concluded by saying he wished to thank the Committee because it has been an extraordinary resource during his tenure and has been an extraordinary center of leadership. He said he could not think of a single instance when it did not help to work though big issues together, and the issues he's worked on with the Committee are many of the important highlights of his tenure as provost and president.

Professor VandenBosch thanked the President for his service. She adjourned the meeting at 4:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota