

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, May 24, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
12 Morrill Hall

- Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch, James Pacala, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler
- Absent: Elizabeth Boyle, Carol Chomsky, Walt Jacobs, Elaine Tyler May
- Guests: President Eric Kaler; Dr. Peter Radcliffe, Daniel Jones-White (Office of Planning and Analysis); Vice President Tim Mulcahy, Andy Hill (Office of Information Technology), Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter; Professor Nita Krevans (chair, Graduate Education Policy Review Committee); Professor Michael Hancher (incoming 2012-13 member of the Committee); Professor Alon McCormick (incoming chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy)
- Other: Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with President Kaler (Itasca Project discussions with higher education and business leaders in Minnesota, his focus areas for 2012-13, the consultation process, salary increases expected in all units); (2) Morris faculty salary comparison group (and campus comparison groups in general, methodology for creating the groups); (3) enterprise systems upgrade overview (the structure for making decisions for new human resources, student, and financial systems, due to be upgraded by end of 2014, and cost questions); (4) revised policies on doctoral and master's degree completion (committee acted on behalf of the Faculty Senate to approve a deadline for turning in the final thesis/dissertation following the final oral and what happens to a student if he/she does not meet the deadline)]

1. Discussion with President Kaler

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00, welcomed the president, related that he and Professor Jacobs had met with President Kaler the day before this meeting to discuss the topics the president might address, and asked the president to speak to whichever items he believed of interest.

President Kaler began with the Itasca Project, which brings together thought leaders in higher education in the state and leaders from other sectors to work to improve higher education. The Itasca Project is chaired by the CEO of Cargill, includes a number of other private-sector chief executives, Chancellor Rosenstone from MnSCU, Macalester President Brian Rosenberg for the Minnesota private colleges, and him, and is staffed by McKinsey & Company, the management consulting firm. The Project has been supported by about 40 business leaders who have provided their views. There will be a white paper in June that will identify four areas of focus that are interesting, seem valid, and provide a foundation for the future. The focus areas are:

* 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.

1. Alignment of academic offerings with workforce needs: This will be a matter primarily for the two-year institutions in the MnSCU system. It is valuable and it will be meaningful to identify areas around the state that need training in certain disciplines, and it will be useful for the University to be involved in the conversations. President Kaler said there are two points to consider. One, the University does not produce widgets, taking students in and four years later producing something with them, and two, the process is four years; in a dynamic economy, the time required for a degree is problematic in terms of meeting immediate workforce needs. But there is a point: Some corporations that hire graduates of Minnesota colleges and universities are not happy with the skills the graduates have. Many of the larger corporations do test entry-level applicants and it could be useful for the University to know what skills they are tested for. Better understanding employers' needs could be helpful for both students and faculty.
2. Foster an ecosystem of research and innovation: The University has the opportunity to use the Itasca report to shape strategy around engagement with industry on research. The report could lead to a coherent set of conversations around food and/or medical devices, for example. One could imagine convening Cargill, General Mills, and commodity groups to identify food-related problems and opportunities that University research could address to increase the State's competitiveness nationally and globally. The results of that effort could lead to a partnership with the State to invest in the agricultural enterprise (which comprises about 20% of the State's economy). The partnership could take the form of something like a State Special appropriation and would have the support of the business community; this kind of approach would be investing in the future of the State of Minnesota.
3. Collaboration across systems to optimize courses, make transfer easy, and so on: This is an opportunity for a conversation at the University about, for example, how much teaching in basic areas should be offered
4. Graduating more students who can demonstrate capabilities and provide a structure for financial aid so they will be more successful.

There will need to be internal conversations before the University can move forward on these issues, President Kaler concluded.

Professor Cramer asked to what extent the legislature is involved in the Itasca Project. Not at all at present, the president said, but the legislature will be an audience for the white paper.

Professor Ben-Ner said he liked points 1, 3, and 4 and the idea of a more explicit division of labor between the systems with respect to skills courses. He said, however, that he did not understand point 2: Does that mean adding a funding base from private companies? It does not, outside the traditional funding opportunities, the president said; the idea is to create new partnerships between the University and industry and a compelling story about the need for the state to invest in basic research. Professor Ben-Ner commented that it would be valuable for those inside academe to have a brain-storming session with private industry to develop ideas for forward-looking research relevant to technologies, products and jobs. The president agreed that it would be good idea.

Professor Pacala inquired what skills it is that businesses do not believe graduates have? It is the ones one would think, President Kaler said: They do not communicate well, they do not write well, they do not speak well, they do not know how to work on teams.

Professor Hancher asked how the four foci got to the table. McKinsey? President Kaler said it was a collaboration that included McKinsey, industry, and the higher-education representatives.

Professor Sheets said, apropos of alignment with workforce needs as identified by business leaders, that it may appear there is no role for the liberal arts. In fact the notion of alignment is not a threat to the liberal arts and can be taken as another opportunity to articulate and emphasize their centrality to preparing an educated workforce. Critical thinking, the ability to write, the ability to listen, to read with comprehension, to work in teams, to 'think outside the box,' to suspend judgment, and to be open to divergent points of view are the very skills that business leaders say they need and that the humanistic disciplines claim to impart. He just finished teaching a lower division class on Roman civilization and was dismayed to see how incurious and uncritical many of the students seemed to be about history and its contemporary relevance. They needed to be turned on to the importance of these issues, not just as academic matters but as preparation for how to engage the challenges and opportunities they would encounter in their own lives and work. Students seemed to start from an attitude that reflects a current societal devaluation of humanistic learning. If the students do not expect to learn much from the humanities, they will not do so. A more explicit awareness of the alignment of humanistic study with what constitutes an educated workforce, both among business leaders and among students, would better suit the needs of both constituencies. There are, he noted, a number of advanced liberal-arts courses that only the University has the expertise to teach, but perhaps it could do so in partnership with MNSCU through distributed channels analogous to the MOOC movement.

President Kaler said he did not disagree. But faculty members cannot just sit in their offices and hope that things will happen. Faculty have to get out and keep telling the story. The interest in humanistic learning is declining; the faculty can either accept the decline or make it clear why such learning is important.

The alignment process is one venue in which that message needs to be communicated, Professor Sheets said. The crucial role that humanistic learning should play in that process is likely to be ignored if not explicitly brought onto the agenda.

President Kaler turned to other matters. He asked that the Committee continue to consider questions about the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance structure (e.g., relying on staff to meet with committees when the purpose is to provide information and call in the senior officers when consultation on a policy or issue is required).

The president shared six high-level focus areas for 2012-13 that he has also shared with the Board of Regents:

- Continue to build a compelling case for state investment in the University.
- Continue on the path of "rephrasing the conversation" with Fairview and advancing the ambulatory care center.
- Continue implementing operational excellence initiatives and advancing the message internally (which includes a website, focus groups, and implementation).
- Continue the work to move to an exceptional human-resources philosophy and employee engagement.

-- Fill leadership positions and build a strong senior leadership team (e.g., the Vice Presidents for Research, Equity and Diversity, and University Services).

-- Develop a broader national and international footprint for the University.

With regard to Fairview, Professor Bitterman asked if there will be an opportunity for faculty consultation on the conceptual framing of the relationship. There will be via University of Minnesota Physicians and the AHC governance structure, the president said. Presumably the AHC Faculty Consultative Committee will consult with Vice President Friedman about the discussion with Fairview.

The President commented that the his senior leadership team will look at where the University should be in five and ten years and suggested that when the Committee has its retreat in late August, it could look at where governance should be and ask if the current practices are a good way to do governance. And it could consider to what extent it represents rank-and-file faculty members and how more faculty members might be involved.

Professor Bearinger suggested that the administration should consider harnessing the capacity and enthusiasm of the faculty, many of whom are nationally and internationally renowned as individual scholars and experts. Together with the administration, faculty could play an effective and critical role in helping the University gain more recognition, both nationally and internationally. The president agreed that it is a good point.

Professor Ben-Ner asked the president if he had any thoughts about the role of this Committee in the larger scheme of the University. President Kaler said he believed it had been a good first year, that he valued the guidance of the Committee, and that the chair has been very helpful. He said he believed the Committee is a good mix of people and that he's received good advice. What about looking forward, Professor Ben-Ner asked? Are Committee members here as ears? As a transmission channel? As part of shared governance? All of them, the president said. The University has much shared governance, on policy issues, reviews of administrators, tenure, and so on. The relationship between the president and this Committee is a conversation where the Committee members listen and the president listens, President Kaler said. His only concern is whether the Committee members are representative of the faculty as a whole.

The president turned briefly to the question of salary increases and the rumor that some colleges may not deliver increases for next year. President Kaler said that it is his intent that the 2.5% salary increases would be delivered in every college and unit unless there were different contractual obligations (e.g., bargaining units).

Professor Cramer thanked the president for joining the meeting.

2. Morris Faculty Salary Comparison Group (and Campus Comparison Groups in General)

Professor Cramer now welcomed Dr. Radcliffe and Mr. Jones-White from the Office of Planning and Analysis to discuss faculty salary comparison groups, and specifically a group for the Morris campus.

Dr. Radcliffe provided copies of handouts and recalled that he spoke with the Committee about a year ago about developing a comparison process; today's presentation is an update on establishing the process and working with each campus to look at comparison groups and guiding them to identifying the

appropriate institutions. He noted that these comparison groups are used for many purposes, not just faculty salaries, including student profiles, graduation rates, spending patterns, enrollment patterns, and so on. What is important is transparency in identifying the comparison group members so that the group has credibility with the audiences with which the group is being used. If the audience rejects the validity of the comparison group, it is difficult to use it in making decisions or taking action.

Dr. Radcliffe used a handout titled "A Methodological Approach to Identify Institutional Comparison Groups" and he and Mr. Jones-White had prepared. The handout explained the process (between the * * *):

* * *

[OPA is the Office of Planning and Analysis, for which Dr. Radcliffe serves as Executive Director; OIR is the Office of Institutional Research, which reports to OPA.]

From the initial decision to review or create a comparison group through to the decision to retain or update the group, the Office of Planning and Analysis engages with campus leadership to support a participatory process grounded in evidence and institutional priorities. While the methodological approach to comparing institutions is stable, the application of the model and the choices of comparators from the universe of institutions is driven by campus leadership, reflecting the academic mission and goals of the institution.

The stages of the process can be broken down as follows:

1. Determine Need - Determine need for a comparison group review (campus, leadership, or review timeline)
2. Coordination - OPA coordinates modeling activity with OIR and campus identifies representatives to work with OPA and OIR
3. Preparation - OIR prepares model for campus consideration, and campus identifies key characteristics considered critical
4. Introduction - OPA introduces and discusses the model with campus leadership, honing in on comparison priorities, and OIR provides an assessment of the current comparison group
5. Model Adjustment - OIR adjusts the model based on campus needs (e.g. institutional groupings, critical dimensions of quality)
6. Training - OPA provides training and support for using the model to campus leadership
7. Consultation - Campus leaders consider a campus supported single comparison group
8. Recommendation - Campus leadership present a single comparison group to Academic Administration, University of Minnesota System
9. Approval - Academic Administration reviews the comparison group and recommends adjustments, support, or other actions

[Additional information is appended to these minutes.]

* * *

They have provided the model to the Morris campus and received information on how it is being applied, Dr. Radcliffe reported. As the discussions are completed, they will bring forward a

recommendation and ultimately a replacement for the current comparison group will be established (which may mean retaining the current group, or a number of institutions in it).

They also need to think about Crookston, Duluth, and Morris vis-à-vis the Twin Cities, Dr. Radcliffe commented. There are many more institutions that resemble the coordinate campuses than there are institutions that resemble the Twin Cities campus, so they need to work on which institutions to select for comparison with the coordinate campuses. For the Twin Cities campus, the comparison institutions are highly visible and there are not that many from which to choose. So there is a need for internal conversations on each of the coordinate campuses. [After the meeting, Dr. Radcliffe reported that "we didn't get to this in the discussion, but we have talked to UMR and they do want to explore creating a comparison group. The challenge for UMR is that they are in a start-up phase, so the available data for the campus is very limited, virtually no institutions are similar right now except other start-ups (who are likely also in different stages of their development and therefore do not necessarily compare well directly), and their mission is distinct enough that there are few highly similar institutions in general. We've discussed creating a model of what they will look like when they are fully developed and attempting to locate peers for that conceptual institution. We have not started that work yet, however."]

What they found was that of the institutions on the current Morris list, the institution most unlike it is Carleton, Mr. Jones-White reported. There are about 1000 institutions that would be better to use for a comparison with Morris, but there could be geographic or aspirational reasons to include Carleton in the Morris group. The Morris faculty and chancellor need to think carefully about these choices.

Professor Hancher commented that Mr. Jones-White had used the term "aspirational." Are the comparisons purely normative or can they be aspirational? They can be both, Dr. Radcliffe said, and can be in two sub-lists. Sometimes it's reasonable to look at the entire list while at other times one might use the sub-lists. Are they clearly defined, Professor Hancher asked? They are, Dr. Radcliffe said, and are completed for the Twin Cities and Crookston; they are recommending that Morris also develop such lists. What are the uses of these lists, Professor Hancher then asked. They are a way to see whether a campus is making progress in the direction of its aspirational group, Dr. Radcliffe said. What is the use of the normative list, Professor Hancher asked? To determine whether a campus is keeping pace with its peers, Dr. Radcliffe responded. The lists are used a great deal, for accountability reports and many other purposes.

Professor Ericksen asked how the model can use salaries as one of the factors in compiling the appropriate list when salaries are a variable in question. That question comes up frequently, Dr. Radcliffe said, but the purpose for identifying comparison groups goes far beyond faculty salaries. They want to find a comparison group that is valid for Morris for many reasons, that can, for example, be tracked over time to determine if Morris is losing ground. They can set up a model with different weights on the various factors, e.g., zero on the salary variable if they want to compare salaries across institutions that are similar in other variables.

Professor Ericksen observed that most of the factors used in the model are financial and have nothing to do with the mission. Dr. Radcliffe agreed that they use measurable factors but there are a number of filters that they use (e.g., the Carnegie classification). The Morris campus started with putting 0 weight on faculty salaries and then reviewing the data.

Mr. Jones-White said that they did not pick the variables. He noted the rules used to narrow the list of variables: less than 10% missing cases, correlation coefficients < 0.9 , and no linear combinations.

They did a factor-analytic analysis and reduced the list of 30+ variables [see the list appended to these minutes] to 7 factors, one of which relates to faculty salaries (but that is not the largest factor affecting inclusion in the comparison group—the largest is institutional size). They use the 7 dimensions identified by the factors to see where the institutions are and find where there are commonalities on those factors in order to develop a more objective comparison list. (The seven factors are based on variables related to size, high tuition/high aid, access, faculty salary, liberal arts, non-traditional, and institutional expenditures, respectively.)

Professor Cramer commented that there are a number of interesting variables in the factors but it is not clear that the very different units in which those factors are expressed should all be normalized to a range of 0 – 1. There is not an unambiguous way to express a distance metric. Dr. Radcliffe agreed that there are many ways to calculate distances, and observed that there are limited measures on the quality of the experience; they are working from IPEDS data because that is the only place one can obtain much of the information that is needed.

To what extent is it a real-time tool one can use to manipulate variables, Professor Cramer asked? It is indeed a real-time tool and it uses 2010 data, Mr. Jones-White said, noting that he runs it on his laptop routinely. That is what the Morris people are doing—they look at who percolates to the top of a comparison group using different assumptions (some institutions appear consistently on the list even with varied assumptions). The tool provides a way to make decisions, Dr. Radcliffe affirmed; the institution can use different assumptions and see what appears. This is not a data-driven process, Mr. Jones-White said, because it cannot mathematically produce a list of the ten "best" comparison institutions. The tool is instead a way to make transparent the process and to identify comparable institutions using data. Dr. Radcliffe amplified the point: The tool identifies the institutions that are most similar on the measured characteristics and with the weights they have assigned to each. There is, however, as Professor Cramer pointed out, no objectively "right" model of what similarities are most important. Those are human judgments. They can capture many of those decisions in the model by adjusting the weights and applying filters, but not necessarily all of them. So they like to think of this as a "data informed" process rather than a "data driven" one.

If Morris and Duluth are pilot projects, is the Twin Cities next, Professor Hancher asked? Dr. Radcliffe said he did not know who is next; they have considered the list for the Twin Cities campus but by and large the same schools come up.

Professor Bitterman agreed with a comment from Professor Hancher that what they are doing is scholarly activity that perhaps merits publication in an appropriate venue. He asked whether the list remains stable if one takes away a variable. There are some institutions that appear on the lists across all assumptions, Dr. Radcliffe said, but they have only made a first run at the data so it is too early to say.

How much different would the list of comparison institutions be if generated by a person knowledgeable about higher education, Professor Pacala asked? Dr. Radcliffe said that a number of institutions show up, especially for the Twin Cities campus, but one needs to know a lot about many more institutions for the other campuses. There can be surprises. For Duluth the group created by this process made more sense than the list being used now because a number of institutions on the current list have evolved and compare less well with Duluth. That is less true for the institutions in the Morris comparison group.

The Morris planning committee is working on the information now, Dr. Radcliffe reported in response to a query from Professor Cramer, and they will finish up in the fall.

Professor Luepker said that the comparisons tend to ignore the for-profit institutions; have they looked at them? They could, Dr. Radcliffe said, although they have not. One problem is that the financial and reporting requirements are different for the for-profit institutions, Mr. Jones-White said, and they are not required to report certain things. They are also very different models, Professor Luepker commented, when one thinks about the size of the University of Phoenix.

Professor Cramer thanked Dr. Radcliffe and Mr. Jones-White for the presentation and said that the Committee would like to hear back from them in the fall when they have developed the comparison groups.

3. Enterprise Systems Upgrade Project Overview

Professor Cramer turned now to Vice President Mulcahy and Mr. Hill to provide an overview of the project to upgrade the University's enterprise systems. Mr. Hill is the project director for the systems upgrade project.

Vice President Mulcahy explained that they would provide a high-level overview of the upgrade process. The University will upgrade three key PeopleSoft systems: student, human resources, and finance. One question that can be asked is why the Vice President for Research is chair of the Executive Oversight Committee for systems upgrade; the answer, Dr. Mulcahy said, is that there are four administrative offices that have an interest in the upgrades (human resources, finance, undergraduate and graduate education in the provost's office, and information technology). He was asked to chair because his office has no horse in the race, so he plays an institutional oversight role. He is working with the experts in each of the areas and is there to be sure the institutional view is heard and part of the discussions.

Mr. Hill reviewed briefly the history of PeopleSoft enterprise systems at the University, beginning with the 1998 implementation of the student and human resources systems. The process began in 1996, when University administrators looked at the paper processes used on the campuses and found that colleges and units were doing things in different ways, and when all organizations were facing the uncertainty of Y2K; the University decided to purchase PeopleSoft systems because PeopleSoft was and is a world leader in these kinds of systems. At that time, however, PeopleSoft was new into student systems so the University had to modify it a great deal—along with making changes to the human resources system to accommodate higher education business practices.

Since 1998 the University has made technical upgrades to the systems but did not spend a lot of money on them, nor did it bring in any new business processes. In 2008 the University began implementation of the financial system. In the meantime, the technology has changed a great deal and the University has modified the systems a lot, to the point that the human resources system doesn't even look like PeopleSoft any more. So the University will begin upgrading all three systems this year, with most changes rolled out in 2014.

Mr. Hill provided a more detailed set of reasons for the upgrade. They include, inter alia: an unsupported platform (support for the University's current versions (8.9) officially ends in December 2012, but has been negotiated to extend to 2014); outdated processes (the current system has been built to

support business processes that are more than a decade old); untapped potential (the University needs to upgrade its core technology to respond to environmental changes in application architecture, social media, cloud computing, and standards-based technologies for integrations). The upgrade will not just involve technical upgrades this time; the intent is to upgrade to meet new expectations and re-look at how the University is doing things (e.g., in hiring it takes 16 clicks, but with the new system it can likely be done in 4). They have engaged Oracle (which owns PeopleSoft) to review the University's systems for how they are serving faculty, staff, and students; Oracle has looked at about 600 business processes and identified where new software can do the job and where the University's processes are unique. Mr. Hill's summary of "why upgrade now?":

The bottom line [is that]

We can't keep using what we're using.
We can't keep doing what we're doing.

Solidifying the platform will enable us to take full advantage of emerging technologies for a more cost-effective, efficient, useful and user-friendly experience.

The technology upgrade is foundational, but it is not enough. This is a necessary investment, but without seizing this opportunity to reform our business processes and deploy new tools and technologies, even the upgraded systems will become quickly outmoded and increasingly costly and risky to maintain.

They hope to take advantage of the new software and avoid new costs by continuing to build the systems.

Mr. Hill provided the project vision, which is "to continue to contribute to the University's goal of establishing itself as a leading institution by providing an enterprise solution, backed by processes, systems and methodologies across administrative functions, that

- keeps information appropriately kept at an enterprise level;
- provides accurate, timely, comprehensive and access to that information;
- supports risk management;
- simplifies, streamlines and integrates business processes;
- reduces implementation, modification and support costs by using the packaged solution, as much as possible, out-of-the-box or "vanilla";
- increases value to the University through increased functionality, enhancements and user friendliness; and
- is flexible, adaptable, intuitive and reliable."

Professor Cramer surmised that if the University of Minnesota wants a change in a PeopleSoft system, one would think that this is not the only institution that would want the change. To what extent does Oracle find out what institutions need? Mr. Hill said that Oracle has incorporated in the systems a number of changes that Minnesota has made and the University works with Oracle and serves on its advisory board. It is a cooperative relationship. Does the University receive anything (e.g., money) when Oracle incorporates changes made by the University, Professor Cramer asked? It does not, nor do other universities contributing changes to the systems.

Vice President Mulcahy commented that in his view, the University of Minnesota is more customized than most institutions, and while Oracle has incorporated many changes made by the University, it has also decided NOT to take a number of changes that it views as customized uniquely for Minnesota. So as the University transitions to the new systems, will many people throw up their hands because they will lose the customized elements they have had, Professor Luepker asked? Vice President Mulcahy said that perhaps the most significant part of the process will be change management, something the institution did not do well with the Enterprise Financial System. It did not pay enough attention to how people experience the system and did not prepare the end users for the change—they need to be kept in the loop. For these upgrades, they have built in opportunities for user input and expect robust user involvement in the process, both in decisions made and feedback. What Dr. Mulcahy has said is important, Professor Luepker said, because once a system gets a bad reputation, it is difficult to overcome.

Professor Cramer said he thought he recalled similar things being said at the time EFS was being implemented, but the steps were not taken. That could be, Dr. Mulcahy responded, but involvement of users was not built into the design of the implementation plan. He suggested that the Committee "trust but verify": trust what they are saying but verify that it occurs.

Mr. Hill said, in response to Professor Luepker, that the new systems are very different than the current versions and are more easily configurable to meet needs (as opposed to customization). The University will, for example, keep the grad planner because there is nothing equivalently suitable from PeopleSoft, and they will judiciously customize to meet needs, but will aim to keep costs down.

Mr. Hill next noted the organizational structure of the governance of the upgrade process. There will be an Executive Oversight Committee, an Integration Steering Committee (that reports to the Executive Oversight Committee) and three functional steering committees (for the financial, human resources, and student systems, all of which report to the Integration Steering Committee). He serves as the project director and works with the Executive and Integration committees. The chair of the Executive Oversight Committee, as noted, is Vice President Mulcahy; the chair of the Integration Steering Committee is Lisa Warren, in the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the chairs of the functional oversight committees are Rob Super (financial), Lori Lamb (human resources), and Susan Van Voorhis (student). The structure was created with EFS in mind; accountability rests with the functional steering committees, which have representation from end users.

Vice President Mulcahy said that, for example, the human resources steering committee cannot make a change in the system entirely by itself; any changes must still be cleared by the Integration Steering Committee and, in some cases, the Executive Oversight Committee. Mr. Hill explained that each functional steering committee is reviewing all the business processes in its area and making decisions, all of which are reviewed by the Integration Steering Committee, which makes the final decision in cases when they cut across functional areas or require a policy change. If the Integration Steering Committee can't decide, it will refer the question to the Executive Oversight Committee.

Mr. Hill reviewed the timeline for the upgrades, projected to be completed by the end of calendar year 2014. The next steps are to acquire an implementation partner (for which a Request for Proposals has been issued and responses received, with Regents' approval of the selection expected in July). The implementation will start in August of this year.

Professor Hancher said he cannot help looking at the EFS crisis and asked what the administration learned from it. There was not adequate input from the end users, Dr. Mulcahy said, which is "baked into" this process. Nor did the University manage expectations appropriately (even though it may have tried). In addition, when decision in one area influence events in another area, there has not been an ultimate decision-maker that takes into account the institutional view—a perspective that is also an integral part of this process.

Vice President Pfutzenreuter said he had a slightly different view of what happened with EFS: He said he believed those responsible did talk to the users a great deal—but did not listen to what they said, did not pay enough attention. That is why this organizational chart was developed, something he urged be done, because user involvement can make or break a project. He said he has just created a new group that will be led by users to advise him, and he will also rely on a smaller group of users. He said he hoped that those responsible for other functional areas would do something similar.

One feature of EFS that was problematic, Professor Cramer said, was that it was adopted at a time when the University was extremely risk-averse. He said he hoped that the upgrades would not lock up the new systems in the way that EFS did.

Professor McCulloch asked, apropos of the University customizing systems a great deal, what would prevent that from happening again? The governance structure if it functions as it should, Dr. Mulcahy said. They will look to avoid customization, and if there are proposals to do so, the oversight groups will push back if they are not convinced that customizing is not cost effective or as efficient as it should be. Unlike with EFS, there is a final body that signs off on the decisions. At the same time, Mr. Pfutzenreuter commented, had the University simply purchased EFS "out of the box," people would have hated it even more than they did. The University will make changes and Oracle will incorporate some of them.

Professor Luepker inquired about the cost of software and staff for the upgrade project. Mr. Pfutzenreuter said they do not know yet. They know that the implementation partner will probably cost between \$24 and \$29 million; there will be software costs; and there will be the need to complete employee tasks for those who must spend time on training. The total cost could be in the \$40-60-million range or higher, but the Executive Committee has not signed off on anything yet.

Will the enterprise tax be used to pay for the upgrade, Professor Luepker asked? The tax is in place today, Mr. Pfutzenreuter said, and amounts to 1.25% of payroll. It has been used to pay off previous enterprise investments, including EFS, and the enterprise account at present has a negative balance. Based on the current enterprise tax, the balance would be paid off in 2016-17. What they are likely to do, Mr. Pfutzenreuter explained, is charge the expenses of the upgrade to the account, which will extend the time required to pay off the negative balance. In essence, the University is borrowing money from itself to fund the project, and it could take until 2021 or so to pay it off, assuming the lower end of the cost range.

Professor Cramer thanked Vice Presidents Mulcahy and Pfutzenreuter and Mr. Hill for the informative presentation and said he was glad to see that there is a good deal of oversight of the project. He added that he believed this is a good example of governance working, because at the Committee's retreat last fall it heard about the coming upgrades but saw no coordination. As a result, FCC leadership suggested to the President's office that coordination and oversight would be valuable, which in turn

played a part in creating the structure that was explained today. Professor Luepker agreed; he said that initially the University was on a path to buy three different pieces of software.

4. Revised Policies on Doctoral and Master's Degree Completion

Professor Cramer next welcomed back Professor Krevans to present an amendment to the policies on degree completion.

Professor Krevans provided copies of the proposed amendments and explained that the versions of the policies before the Committee are the ones approved by the Faculty Senate (except for the amendment being proposed today). These revisions reflect changes requested on the floor of the Faculty Senate, requests from technical support staff in Academic Support Resources, and this Committee. The policy owner, the provost's office, asked for an additional clause requiring timely submission of the final dissertation or thesis.

In reviewing the data, they were startled to discover at the significant number of doctoral students who delay submitting the final version of their dissertation, sometimes for two to four years. Not only does that have a negative effect on the University's time-to-degree statistics, it also violates Board of Regents' policy requiring timely publication of research. There are various reasons that students delay, such as immigration issues or insurance, or the adviser may sit on the final copy.

Most institutions have a time limit, Professor Krevans reported. In some cases, failure to meet the deadline can be draconian; at one of the Big Ten schools, failure to do so means the student must re-defend the dissertation. In others students must pay tuition again to remain an active student. They have merely proposed that the student becomes inactive and may not become active again without re-applying for admission to the program. Students are allowed to file a request for an exception (e.g., she just had a baby and cannot possibly get the dissertation revised).

How much time would a student have once readmitted, Professor Sheets asked? The student would not be eligible for readmission until the dissertation is ready to submit. Professor Bitterman asked about medical leaves. If a student is inactive, Professor Krevans said, and many are, they have created an expedited process for readmission, but they do not need to use it if they have taken a leave of absence. An active student can obtain a leave of absence.

Professor Pacala asked if the proposed revision might unleash a spate of grievances. Students could be pressured to stay on, as was reported by one Committee member, or have life exigencies to deal with? Does this open a can of worms and work against students? Professor Krevans said that pressures on students are already there, and conflicts between faculty and student already exist and are grounds for a grievance. And one way to avoid the imposition of the deadline is to delay scheduling the final oral, Professor Cramer pointed out.

Professor Cramer asked for a motion to act on behalf of the Faculty Senate to approve the additional amendment to the policies. The motion was made and the Committee voted unanimously in favor. The language that was approved (subsequent to this meeting of the Committee, based on suggestions made at this meeting) read as follows (revised language in CAPS):

All students who complete a doctoral dissertation must file a digital copy of the dissertation with the University in accordance with University standards. **THE FINAL DISSERTATION MUST**

BE FILED WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF THE DOCTORAL FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION. FAILURE TO DO SO WILL REQUIRE AN APPLICATION FOR READMISSION AND APPROVAL BY THE PROGRAM BEFORE THE DEGREE CAN BE CONFERRED. Students may request that the University embargo publication of the dissertation for a limited period of time.

In addition, two new FAQs were added:

9. What happens if more than 6 months elapse between the final oral examination and the time the student submits the final, approved dissertation with the University?

Students who have not maintained active status and fail to submit the dissertation within the 6-month time limit will be required to apply for readmission to the graduate program in order to graduate. Students who maintain their active status, but do not submit the dissertation within the 6-month time limit, will have a registration hold placed on their record and will be required to apply for readmission in order to graduate. Students may request an extension to the 6-month time limit. The extension must be approved by the advisor, the DGS, the collegiate dean, and the vice provost and dean of graduate education.

10. If I fail to submit my final, approved dissertation before the 6-month deadline and have to apply for readmission, is my readmission guaranteed?

No. In addition, if your program does readmit you, it may impose conditions on your readmission (e.g., repetition of coursework that is now out-of-date).

(Parallel changes were made to the policy on Master's degree completion.)

Professor Cramer thanked Professor Krevans for her continued work on the graduate-education policies, and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

Additional information, developing campus comparison groups

Data used in model

Variables drawn from the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Doctor's degree - research/scholarship
- Doctor's degree - professional practice

- Percent of total enrollment that are White
- Percent of total enrollment that are women
- Full-time, first-time, degree/certificate seeking undergraduates (GRS Cohort) as percent of all undergraduates
- Instruction expenses per FTE
- Research expenses per FTE
- Public service expenses per FTE
- Academic support expenses per FTE
- Student service expenses per FTE
- Institutional support expenses per FTE
- Graduation rate - Bachelor degree within 4 years, total
- Graduation rate - Bachelor degree within 6 years, total
- Instruction/research and public service FTE staff
- Executive/administrative and managerial FTE staff
- Other professional FTE staff
- Non-professional FTE staff
- Average salary equated to 9-month contracts of full-time instructional staff - professors
- Average salary equated to 9-month contracts of full-time instructional staff - associate professors
- Average salary equated to 9-month contracts of full-time instructional staff - assistant professors
- Tuition and fees, 2010-11
- Percent admitted - total
- Student-to-faculty ratio
- Full-time retention rate, 2010
- Current year GRS cohort as a percent of entering class
- Percent of full-time first-time undergraduates receiving federal grant aid
- Percent of full-time first-time undergraduates receiving institutional grant aid
- Percent of Undergraduate Degrees in STEM
- Percent of Undergraduate Degrees in Liberal Arts
- Part-time to Full-time Ratio
- Transfer to Continuing Ratio

Statistical methodology

The variables above were assembled from IPEDS for the 2010-2011 academic year. The analysis included all 1,472 four-year degree granting institutions in the United States reporting in IPEDS. Data was not available for every institution. After missing cases were removed, 1,279 institutions remained in the analysis.

Institutions can be thought of as existing in a multidimensional space, where each dimension corresponds to a characteristic of the institution. The distance between two institutions in this space therefore represents the relative similarity between those institutions on the various dimensions. Some of these dimensions are closely related to each other, so it is possible to reduce the number of dimensions to a smaller set that is easier to interpret and apply without sacrificing important patterns in the data. This is accomplished by use of a technique called factor analysis. To look at comparison groups, principal axis factor analysis with an oblique rotation was used to reduce the data into a manageable number of dimensions for comparison. Utilizing the Kaiser criterion (eigenvalue > 1.0) we identified a seven factor

solution and calculated factor scores for each of seven dimensions (the seven factors emphasized an institution's size, cost, financial need, faculty salary, STEM emphasis, and composition of undergraduate enrollment, and expenditures). Difference scores were then calculated for each of the eight factors which were subsequently squared and then summed to produce an overall difference score for each institution. These scores were then sorted from smallest to largest to identify an institution's "nearest neighbors."

Considerations in selecting institutions

The Office of Planning and Analysis recommends the following principles for selecting comparison group institutions:

Principles for selecting comparison groups:

- Sufficient number of institutions to make reliable comparisons
- Sufficient similarity in institutions that comparisons are relevant
- Sufficient information is available on the institutions to permit comparisons
- Sufficient knowledge about the institutions exists or can be created to achieve credibility with key audiences

Applying the above principles to the process of selecting comparison group institutions leads to the following operational recommendations:

- Groups should have at least ten but generally no more than twenty institutions
- Institutions should be identified as either "peer" or "aspirational"
- Institutions that are regarded as competitors are often less similar overall but share a particular characteristic relevant to the nature of the competition (e.g. geography in relation to student recruitment) and therefore such comparisons are more sensible as internal monitoring than the external reporting typically done with comparison groups
- Primary focus should be national, as each of our campuses aspires to a national and/or international reputation and standing (local/regional institutions that are less similar may still be desirable to the degree they are more familiar to key audiences)
- Selection process should be data-informed, but incorporate campus judgment and knowledge about institutions
- May include both public and private institutions, if relevant