

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, June 14, 2012
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Jan McCulloch, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler

Absent: Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, James Pacala

Guests: Professors Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Michael Hancher, and Alon McCormick (incoming 2012-13 Committee members); Professor Emily Hoover (College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences), Professor Brad Hokanson (College of Design), Provost Karen Hanson, Deans Robert Elde (College of Biological Sciences) and Allen Levine (College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences), Associate Vice President Michael Berthelsen, Monique Mackensie (University Services)

Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents), Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) future of the St. Paul campus (general discussion based on 2008 report); (2) report on the regental discussion of the workforce analysis (which seeks to analyze the nature and number of University employees); (3) thanks (to Professor Cramer); (4) senate centennial (events); (5) reviews of committees (look for and enable more effective use of committee time)]

1. The Future of the St. Paul Campus

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed the several guests to discuss the future of the St. Paul campus. He noted the report, issued in 2008, prepared by a group charged to look at the geography and programs on the St. Paul campus, copies of which had been provided to Committee members. [The "key findings" from the report are appended to these minutes.] He turned first to Associate Vice President Berthelsen and Ms. Mackensie for a discussion of the St. Paul campus physical plant.

Mr. Berthelsen distributed copies of a color-coded map of the St. Paul campus that indicated the condition of each of the buildings. The color scheme rated the buildings on a 5-point scale from excellent (green) to critical (red). There are 8 green buildings and 4 red buildings but the majority is either pink (poor condition) or yellow (fair condition). The condition of these many facilities, Mr. Berthelsen said, raises the question of how to use the limited funding available for facilities—which should be renovated and which should be replaced? What one learns from the map is that the St. Paul campus has many facility needs.

* 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.

Mr. Berthelsen next referred to the Six-Year Capital Plan, approved by the Board of Regents, which includes \$80 million for research labs on the St. Paul campus (\$40 million in 2014 and \$40 million in 2016). He observed, in addition, that some St. Paul facilities can be updated or replaced while others can be converted to offices. They have also invested in the infrastructure of the St. Paul campus (chiller, steam plant) so that it is in good shape; it is the individual buildings that are not in very good condition.

With respect to space utilization, faculty and students go back and forth on the bus to the Minneapolis campus and the St. Paul classrooms have the lowest utilization rate on the campus. Some of those classrooms have been converted to other programs that have a higher use. Mr. Berthelsen pointed out that any space planning that Facilities Management will do will follow from academic plans; they will help design the infrastructure to meet academic needs.

Ms. Mackensie reported that Facilities Management staff had conversations with the St. Paul colleges about their facilities needs, which is how the funding request for the labs was incorporated in the Six-Year Capital plan. It was clear that the research facilities on the campus are in dire need of upgrading. They consulted the 2008 report, which also noted that need. They are also pursuing the idea of more active-learning classrooms on the St. Paul campus and are looking at space in the student center. Building them, if it were to happen, would add more buzz and make St. Paul a more vibrant campus. Reaching that objective requires taking several steps and ensuring that there are appropriate facilities for faculty and students—which now there is not.

What the Committee heard from the chairs of academic departments on the St. Paul campus is that lower-division students spend little time in St. Paul because they are taking liberal-education and other introductory courses in Minneapolis, Professor Cramer related.

Dean Levine began by observing that there is no sense of community for faculty on the St. Paul campus, in part because both students and faculty spend so much time on the Minneapolis campus (viz., this meeting!). There is no sense of community for students, either. A major issue is a place where people can meet. They see the new microbiology space as flexible for research and would also like to see it include food and a place for people to meet. The problem for St. Paul is "out of sight, out of mind," Dean Levine commented, and administrators acknowledge that they forget about it. There is also not the right commuter system between the St. Paul and Minneapolis campuses; if there is to be a Twin Cities campus, not Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses, there needs to be better connectivity. Finally, in the view of many faculty members on the St. Paul campus, there is a need for more residence halls (there is now only one). In terms of the 2008 report, Dean Levine concluded, nothing much has happened.

Professor Hoover told the Committee that she and Dean Levine have talked about the topic of the St. Paul campus and that she has talked with students about it as well. She agreed that there is no sense of community on the campus—but said she loves the campus because it is a great place to be a faculty member and scholar. Students face a lack of amenities, beginning with a lack of any place to eat. The challenge is how to vision the St. Paul campus; it is easy to have a vision at the department or college level but the University has not been good at stewardship of the campus as a whole. She agreed that little has been done with the recommendation from the 2008 report. (She added that she and Professor Ehlke support the idea of building new residence halls in the center of the St. Paul campus.)

Apropos of the residence hall idea, Dean Elde commented that he worried that if the critical mass of programs and students is so great on the Minneapolis campus, there is a risk that the University "will

build it but they will not come." Dean Levine recalled that Senior Vice President Frank Cerra had suggested the St. Paul campus be a research center, and the Board of Regents has determined that the campus has capacity (for what is not clear).

Professor Ben-Ner noted that the St. Paul campus has existed for a long time but wondered how it could be turned into a center of activity given the mass in Minneapolis, especially during a financially difficult period. Dean Levine said it would help if there were more rapid transit between the two campuses, and as the Minneapolis campus expands in the direction of St. Paul, that will also help. If there were a tram between the two campuses, that would also help.

A number of additional points were made in the ensuing discussion.

-- Dean Ames (Veterinary Medicine) has been involved in the conversations about the St. Paul campus; the other Academic Health Center deans have less interest in the subject.

-- The College of Biological Sciences is fragmented and all over the two campuses. So are the College of Design and the College of Education and Human Development. In the view of the faculty in one college, the fragmentation that resulted from the college rearrangements has been a six-year problem; they cannot effectively schedule meetings in St. Paul, and faculty members teach on both campuses but the departments are not connected as a college. Units have difficulty consolidating because in some cases they are landlocked, so are stuck with fragmentation for the foreseeable future. In some disciplines, it was noted, proximity creates advantages, both in administration and in cognitive effects.

-- Mr. Berthelsen said that from a capital planning perspective, it helps to have projects in the Six-Year Capital Plan, rather than doing one project at a time. The goal needs to be more campus-focused and multi-step so that one can identify what the next five steps will be. Such a plan, and consistency, leads to greater support (e.g., from the legislature).

-- The St. Paul campus is significantly underfunded and needs large research labs as well as teaching space. The \$80 million in the capital plan will only replicate the Cargill plant facility.

-- In thinking about the problems, it is important to think about building conditions, but in order to make connectivity workable, there has to be consideration of reconfiguration of units. There is always a great deal of resistance to relocating, and while one can fix buildings, one has to think about synergies as well. The Twin Cities campus may be among the most fragmented campuses in the country, which is a challenge, and one cannot be optimistic about synergy, collaboration, and the water-cooler conversations where much can happen.

-- The situation will be helped to some extent once the light-rail line is completed, but it would have helped more if the line had come closer to the St. Paul campus. But St. Paul faculty are forced to teach on the Minneapolis campus and must go back and forth, which makes it more difficult for them to do their research. Someone on the West Bank can spend 15 minutes walking to Morrill Hall, and one could spend the same amount of time getting to and from St. Paul. (But there are also faculty members on the West Bank who know nothing about the East Bank of the Minneapolis campus. Once there are expectations that one will go to use another campus, the transportation between them is not a big deal.) But the difference is that to walk from the West to East Bank is that one is not dependent on someone else for the transportation (i.e., the inter-campus shuttle service).

-- One Committee member said that improved transportation would help but would not solve the problems nor would it deal with the underlying fragmentation of college and disciplines, and the two campuses are too far apart to operate as a single campus.

-- The 2008 report talks about providing amenities and the problems with the facilities—and calls for plans to identify broad themes that could be the foundation for the future of the St. Paul campus. Does one do the amenities first, with the themes to follow? Or should the themes be set with the expectation that the rest will then follow? Dean Levine suggested the former; Dean Elde commented that people will make the effort to do the latter at first—but will not continue because it will make them tired.

-- There are about 5000 undergraduate students on the St. Paul campus, so about one-sixth of the undergraduate student body on the Twin Cities campus. Those 5000 take many of their classes in Minneapolis. Has anyone talked with the undergraduates about how to get them to participate more in St. Paul campus activities and programs? About what frustrates them about St. Paul? Have they been asked about amenities? One issue could be study space in St. Paul.

-- The 5000 students on the St. Paul campus live primarily in Minneapolis; it may be that they are voting with their feet, but it is difficult to live in St. Paul when there is only one residence hall. But the University should not try to bend the market; the lack of demand is a symptom, and the mass is in Minneapolis. The University should not throw money at the problem. (Provost Hanson demurred, citing master-planning experience she had at Indiana, and said there are professionals who can plan these kinds of changes. She also noted that the St. Paul residence hall has the highest return rate of any on the Twin Cities and that the St. Paul campus provides an atmosphere that is attractive to a number of students. Nor is it certain that letting students vote with their feet will produce the best outcome for them; it could be that the University needs to structure some of their experiences.)

-- The light-rail line will be a hub and provide access, and with apartments going up along the line, it will be a bigger force. The University could look at bus line spurs to the St. Paul campus. (But it will almost certainly be quicker to get from the Minneapolis to St. Paul campus, and vice-versa, on the University's transit system than to take a bus to the light rail and then to Minneapolis.)

Professor Cramer inquired if there is any low-hanging fruit that could be picked. The department heads who spoke with the Committee suggested that some sections of introductory courses be taught on the St. Paul campus to help avoid demanding that the undergraduate students travel so much back and forth. Dean Elde said that the situation will be helped when the light-rail line is completed and the intercampus transportation can return to its normal route, but said that there was a proposal to bundle certain undergraduate courses because it just takes too long for a student to go between campuses for just one class. Mr. Berthelsen reported that light-rail construction has had a dramatic impact on the transportation between the campuses and that the hope is that buses can resume a normal schedule by the spring of 2013—although probably more likely for the 2013-14 academic year.

The next step in master planning is how to do district planning, how to build neighborhoods, Mr. Berthelsen said. Right now they are pulled apart; the question is how to put them together so people want to spend time together? They have created the arts district and the humanities district and have been putting biomedical researchers together; how can they create groups that belong together and work best—and that create short streets to adjacent neighborhoods?

-- One specific proposal that would help would be providing on-campus office "hotel" space for faculty from St. Paul program who must spend time on the Minneapolis campus.

Professor Cramer thanked the Committee's guests for joining the meeting—he thanked those who came from St. Paul—and said that he would not at this point propose specific Committee action.

2. Report on the Regental Discussion of the Workforce Analysis

Professor Hancher next reported on the discussion that took place at the recent Board of Regents meeting about the analysis of the University's workforce, a discussion that he attended at the request of Professor Cramer. Vice President Brown and Lincoln Kallsen gave a preliminary report to the Board on the progress of that analysis, illustrating main points with slides.

The president introduced the report as "myth-busting," Professor Hancher reported, and one myth that was busted was that comparative (federal) IPEDS data (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) could frame discussion of this campus (for IPEDS data are inconsistently reported from institution to institution and even from year to year). Part of the analysis presented to the Board was about coming up with better data for the University of Minnesota. At this stage of analysis, headcount data are the focus of attention; however, discussion with the Board suggested that it would also be useful to track Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) numbers because there are a number of employees who are part-time.

Regent Brod was disappointed that the analysis did not identify who counts as an administrator and that the word "administration" appears nowhere in the report, Professor Hancher reported; she feared that if the University does not define what administration is, others will do so. Vice President Brown assured the Board that the analysis is a work in progress and that some categories of employees are large and amorphous and need further analysis. The "coordinator" category is one that the analysis team wants to scrutinize more closely, Professor Hancher said, as is the category "director." The P&A category as a whole was also discussed as an uncertain area.

Professor Cramer noted that the analysis attempted to categorize people into direct instruction, instructional support, and so on. There were a number of such categories, Professor Hancher agreed, some of which were identified as essential to run a university—categories that "go without saying," such as those in the bursar's office and those in athletics. But no category was identified as "administration." Professor Cramer said that one point that is the focus of much discussion is whether the University has the right balance of employees; did that come up? Professor Hancher said they are still gathering information and trying to get their hands on the numbers.

Professor Bitterman asked what the concern is. Too many faculty members doing clerical tasks? One would not hire a college professor, at professorial wages, to do clerical work. Or is that not being considered? At what level did the discussion take place? To fix something? Or because of a belief that the administration is too big? The latter, Professor Hancher responded. The project started with the talk about "administrative bloat," Professor Cramer commented. One does not know if there is bloat or not, but the governance system should make it clear that there is a need for support staff to make the University run. It is easy to ask the question, Professor Hancher said, but it is very difficult to gather the data to answer it. Professor Cramer said he was glad that the administration and Board of Regents are

engaged in the exercise because it allows the faculty to contribute to the discussion of what the proper proportions are of faculty, staff, and administrators, and the degree to which those proportions may well vary from one discipline to the next.

Professor Cloyd suggested looking at other service organizations; what are Target's administrative costs? He said he did not know the number of such organizations that must deal with the regulatory rules that the University faces. What is the next step?

Professor Hancher said the analysis will break down the numbers further. There are categories that need further study so it is possible to get an idea of what people do. Professor Cramer said that Vice President Brown meets with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, which is the opportunity to provide advice about the process. The process should also allow the University to compare colleges, and the point about external comparisons is a good one—but private organizations do not make public the data that are needed to make the comparisons.

Professor McCulloch inquired how the workforce analysis is connected to the job classification study. There is concern about too many "coordinators"; her concern is that there are idiosyncratic things that people do in different units, and the faculty would be in a worse position because an analysis suggests there are too many people in certain positions, so the system should be simplified and there should be fewer such people. Will the analysis allow the provision of staff needed to run the University? This is a work in progress, Professor Hancher repeated; there is no written report yet, and the Committee will see more. Professor Cramer said the answer to Professor McCulloch's first question, per Vice President Brown, is that the two analyses are loosely coupled. The workforce analysis is trying to figure out who is doing what; the job classification study is designed to establish career tracks that are more transparent and more readily managed.

Professor Bearinger said that from a faculty perspective, not all things are equal: It is necessary to distinguish between college missions, and the Committee must insist that occurs.

Professor Cramer thanked Professor Hancher for the report.

3. Thanks

Professor Kohlstedt delivered to Professor Cramer a gift and expressed thanks for doing "a spectacular job" as chair of the Committee.

4. Senate Centennial

Professor Kohlstedt reported for the ad hoc Centennial Committee. She noted that the Senate has grown from the (faculty) Senate, established in 1912, to four senates (faculty, students, P&A, and civil service), and reported that Professor Marti Hope Gonzales, the chair of the ad hoc committee, is seeking to involve students and staff in the events.

There will not be one long day of events; instead three of the Senate meetings will be started 30 minutes early (2:00 instead of 2:30) in order to have a brief discussion of the history and then discussions of some of the major challenges that face the senate (and the institution). There will also be an extra

session, at 3:00 on January 31, with President Kaler, Provost Hanson, Regent Simmons, and Professor Fred Morrison, devoted to a conversation about institutional governance.

Professor Chomsky suggested looking at peer institutions in order to put the events in comparative perspective. Professor Sheets suggested that any history should cover the origins of universities in the 12th Century. Professor Kohlstedt said that both suggestions will be incorporated in the planning, as will a look at what happened in the 19th and early 20th Century that led to the creation of senates.

5. Reviews of Committees

Professor Cramer next recalled that about two years ago a small ad hoc group studied the Senate's committees to try to determine if there were too many or if there was inefficiency introduced through overlapping jurisdiction. The group recommended two mergers of committees and elimination of a subcommittee; the recommendation provoked a negative response and nothing happened (except that the subcommittee was retired). This Committee then decided to ask the Committee on Committees to review committees and their charges; it agreed to do so. The review process started last year, but no part of the process suggests that mergers or elimination should be considered.

Given the president's challenge, viz., his inquiry whether there might be 10% "slack" in governance that could be eliminated, Professor Cramer said, and the question is how to address the president's query. There is at present no role in the reviews for this Committee, which could bring a broader view. Some administrators spend considerable time, valuable time, with committees, and a number of faculty work weeks are also involved in the work of a committee; if there are any committees that are spinning their wheels, they should be examined. Professor Kohlstedt suggested that rather than eliminate or merge committees, it might be appropriate to advise them on the frequency of meeting in order that the time and energy of faculty members is also most effectively used.

Professor Chomsky observed that this Committee is the executive committee of the Faculty Senate and it has the authority to direct committees to reduce the amount of time they take or to evaluate their agendas and discussions. Committee chairs can also be urged to cancel meetings and to cluster agenda items in order to use committee time more efficiently. Professor Bitterman suggested combining Professors Kohlstedt's and Chomsky's points: Give committee chairs permission to meet less often, let them know, for example, that meeting only once per quarter is acceptable. Committees should not meet simply because they believe they are supposed to meet. Professor McCulloch suggested that this Committee could consider that advice as well.

Professor Cramer promptly adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

The key findings are as follows:

1. The St. Paul Campus' future is as an integral part of the Twin Cities campus, rather than as a freestanding or branch campus. The campus' strengths are seen as key to University mission.
2. The proposed themes to characterize St. Paul programs include environmental sustainability; the bio-economy; safe and healthy foods; education and human development across the life span; and healthy communities.
3. St. Paul is a global campus with many ties to international themes in research, education, and campus residences, with potential for greater synergy and visibility.
4. The St. Paul Campus can be a magnet of interdisciplinary scholarship and a key go-to place for expertise around the identified themes.
5. Increasing the critical mass of undergraduate activities is a key to the vitality of the St. Paul campus, and can be achieved through better logistics and support for innovation.
6. The St. Paul Campus can build on current strengths in outreach and engagement to become the public face of the University for diverse groups of constituents.
7. The St. Paul Campus can develop as a 'green campus' and be a demonstration site for renewable energy, sustainable development, and a healthy urban environment.
8. Retention of open and agricultural spaces is key to campus function as a 'living laboratory', as well as to the character of the campus and its connection to surrounding communities.
9. The proximity of the St. Paul Campus to the State Fair grounds and to the transit way offer opportunities for partnerships with the State Fair, the private sector, and the cities of Falcon Heights, St. Paul, and Minneapolis around the proposed themes.
10. Perceived transit difficulties and relative lack of amenities are obstacles to attracting activities to St. Paul. To thrive, the St. Paul campus must function as a village, with frequent and rapid transportation links to the Minneapolis campus and surrounding communities.