

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, September 27, 2012**  
**12:00 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Richard Ziegler

Absent: Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, George Sheets

Guests: Vice President Scott Studham, Bernard Gulachek (Office of Information Technology); Amy Phenix (Chief of Staff); Christine Tschida (Director of Northrop)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Vice President Studham; (2) the Itasca Project compact; (3) decanal reviews; (4) Consumer Reports article on hospitals; (5) Northrop Auditorium]

**1. Discussion with Vice President Studham**

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting and announced that the discussion with Vice President Studham would be an extension of the fall retreat, and thus off the record; she asked for a motion to close the meeting. The motion was made, seconded, and adopted unanimously.

The Committee took up questions that Mr. Studham had posed in advance of the meeting, including the extent of faculty awareness of the "disruption" coming to higher education, an explanation of governance at the University, and key opportunities for the use of technology at the University. Mr. Studham also outlined the governance of information technology at the University. Several other topics were touched on in the course of conversation:

- The Office of Classroom Management is one of the best-run units in the University and is always very helpful; it serves as model for providing infrastructure in technology
- MOOCs
- The availability of University-owned laptops to faculty members
- The ability to work across campuses and to facilitate meetings across campuses and internationally
- Standardization, centralization versus decentralization, and alignment of systems and efforts
- Active Directory
- The Academic Health Center and information technology
- Google drive
- International travel issues.

---

\* 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.

It was agreed that the Committee would schedule an additional session with Vice President Studham in the near future. Professor Kohlstedt thanked him for joining the meeting.

## **2. The Itasca Project Compact**

Professor Kohlstedt turned to Ms. Phenix, the president's Chief of Staff, to discuss the Itasca Project compact.

Ms. Phenix explained that the president has been a member of the Itasca Project's Task Force on Higher Education. The Task Force, chaired by Greg Page, CEO of Cargill, also includes MnSCU and the private colleges. This spring the group issued a white paper outlining goals that business and higher education could agree on. As well, the group developed a higher education-employer "compact," which includes commitments from employers and higher education institutions to achieve mutual goals. Before signing the compact on behalf of the University, President Kaler asked for faculty consultation.

The University has made editorial suggestions on the compact document for higher education institutions, copies of which Ms. Phenix provided to Committee members. President Kaler would like to sign the compact, she related, and he believes the University already does much of what it contains, although at different levels in different colleges. She invited the Committee to look at the compact and said that it remains open for edits; when a final version is prepared, the president will likely sign it.

Professor Lanyon commented that the University could sign the document and say it's done with it, or it could go back to the units and follow up on the elements of the compact. What is President Kaler's view? Ms. Phenix said she believes the president would like to see units pursue the compact elements and, ideally, the University can improve and standardize measurement of compact elements, such as internships and other industry partnerships, across colleges.

Professor Durfee said that the draft compact misses the opportunity to celebrate entrepreneurial students because it focuses on the education of students going to work for companies. It does not mention students who start a company or have an impact as an artist, for example, and the University should encourage them as well.

Professor May said she had no disagreement with the provisions of the compact but said the University is in the business of educating students as citizens, as people who understand the world, and the compact does not speak to the mission of the University. She said she has a problem with the whole compact, not its specific items.

Professor Lanyon commented that the compact focuses on connecting with Minnesota businesses and industry but the University is an international player. While he likes what is in the compact, in part it misses the point. Professor Kohlstedt pointed out that this is a compact with Minnesota employers and is not intended to capture the entire mission of the University. Professor May observed that it is dangerous to commit the University to training employees; that is too narrow a focus.

Professor McCormick asked if there is a carrot in the compact in that the companies might become even more helpful to the University. If the University does not sign, Ms. Phenix said, it might harm the good will that has been built up through the Itasca Project, and those relationships that have been built could help the institution in the future.

Professor Luepker commented that the four goals the president has presented to the Board of Regents all have potential connections to industry. The University needs local industry on its side for many reasons. The University should report on what it is doing in the areas itemized in the Itasca compact at regular intervals. If the University signs the compact, one can see that there would be benefits to being proactive.

Professor Hancher agreed with Professor May that it could be a hazard to define workforce needs so narrowly; the compact "does not speak to what we do." The compact could also be hazardous to companies if focused too narrowly in that it could mean the University would not be called up on to provide the educated people they actually need. He said he would like to see more attention to what is needed to work at and run companies. Professor Bitterman added that he would like to see more emphasis on collaboration as well.

Ms. Phenix said that the process is looking for dialogue. Professor Hancher said if it is a one-way street, the role of the University is limited. If it is a dialogue, "we can help."

Professor Kohlstedt said she assumed that Ms. Phenix would take into account comments made by Committee members and asked for a motion to endorse the president's continuing discussion with the Itasca Project members. The motion was made and adopted unanimously.

### **3. Decanal Reviews**

Professor Pacala, who had agreed to chair a small ad hoc committee that also included Professors Lanyon, May, and Ropers-Huilman, provided a draft memo to Provost Hanson that the Committee might wish to send. He said he sought discussion today, after which the memo would be recrafted and provided to the provost.

Professor Pacala emphasized one point in the draft: Individual faculty responses to surveys about a dean are kept confidential; the dean may not look up individual responses and the data provided are aggregated and de-identified.

In terms of assessment and recommendations, the ad hoc committee report has four points. One concerns feedback to the faculty, the second concerns the function of the evaluation, the third addresses the extent to which the survey instrument captures leadership dimensions (which no one seems to have any reservations about), and the fourth addresses remaining concerns about confidentiality. With respect to the second point, the ad hoc committee believes there is not enough language in the process about the evaluative function of the review, particularly that the review factors in a decision about whether the dean will continue in office; most of the language is formative, intended to improve the dean's performance. The process must have teeth. On the fourth point, there remains a concern about confidentiality because of the demographic data (e.g., could one identify a particular faculty member because of gender or ethnic background?). There were questions about why demographic data are even included in the survey, but the ad hoc committee believes they should be, although great care must be taken to avoid any violation of confidentiality. But the review committee and provost should know, for example, if the responses of the women in the college are different from those of the men.

Professor Kohlstedt offered two additions to the draft. One, that the decanal review committee must be given full access to the complete data set, both qualitative and quantitative, and two, that if any data collected report alleged ethical or legal violations, the review committee and provost must handle the report in a manner consistent with the procedures of the Office for Institutional Compliance. Professor Kohlstedt recalled that when the Committee discussed the compliance process last year with Ms. Zentner, who runs the compliance office, she said that they do a systematic investigation to determine if there is an issue that needs to be addressed. That is why, Professor Kohlstedt said, she recommends that any such allegations be handled through the University's normal process, which includes confidentiality. That process also protects people from allegations that may not be true, Professor Bitterman pointed out.

Professor Kohlstedt said the Committee would not vote on the draft today; this was a discussion to garner ideas. The memo will not carry the force of law; it is something the Committee will give to the provost, who will decide to what extent she wishes to build the recommendations into the process.

Professor Patterson expressed a concern about the composition of the review committee, which is to include two faculty members. He said he is not sure that process is always being followed and the provost may need to think about the extent of compliance with the review process. Committee members discussed at length the role the dean and others should play in identifying a faculty member to serve on the review committee. Professor Lanyon offered the view that the selection process works and the problem is that there are not enough teeth in the overall process to deal with deans who are not performing well.

Professor Ben-Ner repeated a point he made at an earlier meeting: The question is underperforming deans and how to prevent situations that have arisen recently because the provost has inadequate information. How can the process provide her adequate information? There needs to be some party in the process who does not feel vulnerable and who can come forward. Professor Bitterman said that some are fearful about the process because there is no implication that the dean will be removed; the emphasis is on development, not evaluation. If there is a sense that the evaluative element of the process is strong, people will be more likely to come forward. Professor Ben-Ner suggested that the review committee could include a full professor from another college who could gather information from the faculty.

Professor May suggested, apropos of the point about encouraging meaningful feedback to the faculty about the review, it should include the proviso that "in the event the dean is offered reappointment. . . ." She endorsed Professor Ben-Ner's idea of having a senior faculty member from outside the college participate in the review. Professor Luepker noted that the chair of this Committee serves on the review committee for all of the deans and said that that is a good approach because she is the elected representative of the faculty.

It was agreed the Committee would revisit the draft recommendations in the near future. Professor Kohlstedt thanked the ad hoc committee members for their work.

#### **4. Consumer Reports Article on Hospitals**

Professor Kohlstedt accepted a motion to close the meeting for a discussion with Professor Patterson; the motion was adopted unanimously.

Professor Patterson reported on the discussion held by the Academic Health Center (AHC) Faculty Consultative Committee about a recent article in *Consumer Reports* rating hospitals on various safety measures. The article did not give Fairview-University hospital a particularly good ranking. Committee members discussed the methodology of the study and several additional issues.

The point was made by several Committee members that the University does not run the hospital, that the University and Fairview are inextricably linked, and that the University's reputation is affected by actions taken by Fairview.

## **5. Northrop Auditorium**

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Ms. Tschida to the meeting to discuss the status of the Northrop Auditorium renovation and future plans.

Ms. Tschida described the vision for Northrop when the renovation is complete and what it will entail:

- To create a destination central to campus life:
  - Northrop will create a sense of belonging with good design, open spaces, comfortable furniture (so students do not enter the building only for convocation and graduation and never in between)
  - Informal study, meeting, and conversation areas available
  - High quality café and coffee bar will operate on an expanded schedule
- Programming:
  - Honors and IAS will have opportunities to expand their programming reach with larger spaces, higher visibility
  - Concerts and Lectures will seek synergies with Honors and IAS programming
  - Artists series will take advantage of the new, state of the art venue, which will meet the technical demands of artists at the top of their professions
  - Connectivity will allow us to broadcast speakers, debates, public issues programming throughout the state and beyond
  - Smaller venue will allow for more experimental work, jazz or chamber music series, film series

She also provided information on space allocation:

	<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
• University Honors Program	0 sf	6,000 sf
• Institute for Advanced Study	0 sf	5,300 sf
• Innovation by Design	0 sf	1,000 sf
• Concerts and Lectures	1,500 sf	2,000 sf
• Collaborative / study space	3,000 sf	13,520 sf
• Café and dining	0 sf	1,300 sf
• Lecture / recital hall seats	0	170
• Shared seminar rooms	0	4
• Shared classrooms	0	2
• Main hall:		

Seating Capacity	4,765 seats	2,700 seats
Acoustics	Dreadful	World-class
Sightlines	Bad	Excellent
Technology	Obsolete	Cutting-edge

The academic departments are scheduled to move into Northrop in the fall of 2013; the theater will open in the spring of 2014.

Professor Lanyon recalled that for a long time colleges paid a rental fee for graduation ceremonies; does that remain the plan? It does, Ms. Tschida said; the question of how to integrate the auditorium with University needs arises, as does the question of how to protect space for University events. Historically, about 2000-2500 attend and for rental events there were 3000-4000. The auditorium will no longer have that capacity so it will be in competition with other Twin Cities facilities. Professor Lanyon commented that Ms. Tschida will want to ramp up service to the University community and at same time not interfere with rental income, which events sometimes must be scheduled years in advance. He wished her good luck.

Ms. Tschida said that graduations can be scheduled years in advance but many commercial events have a short timeline, so she hopes to be able to avoid conflicts.

Professor Kohlstedt asked how Ms. Tschida would work with departments and colleges. Ms. Tschida said she invited the Committee's recommendations. She said she hopes the departments in Northrop find connections across the University, and she is using a student advisory group about works they would like to see produced and sponsored. She is just starting to explore ways to make the space available and welcomes its uses.

The University includes the non-Twin Cities campuses, Professor Kohlstedt pointed out; what facilities will help create linkages with them? Ms. Tschida said both theaters will have camera capacity to record and broadcast; she will explore all opportunities to extend the reach of the building as far as possible.

In response to a question from Professor Hancher, Ms. Tschida said she is bringing the Institute for Advanced Studies and the University Honors Program together to try to create synergies.

Ms. Tschida explained the goals they have in mind as they consider vendors for the café. She said they hope the operator will be able to offer something different and special and provide service in the evenings that has good wine and beer selections and perhaps a menu to match the performance. The café will have a capacity of about 150.

Professor Luepker inquired about financing the building; will it be supported by a cost pool or will it earn income and pay into a cost pool? Ms. Tschida said she was not sure how cost pools function but she reported that a Concerts and Lectures operation at universities never pay for themselves. The model across the country is that they are doing well if they pay for 50% of their operations and receive underwriting for the other 50%. The question is the size of the subsidy, which is related to ticket sales and rental income—and the extent to which she can create a fund-raising group for Northrop. Fund-raising in the past, beyond funds for the renovation, has not been robust; she is looking to increase it beyond supporting the building to supporting programming. A member of the Concerts and Lectures

staff has been working closely with the University of Minnesota Foundation on the capital campaign, and it is likely that there will be continuing fundraising needs for programming as the building becomes operational.

Will departments and colleges be charged for commencement, Professor Hancher inquired? That has not been decided, Ms. Tschida said. Charges are likely, but will they be rental or just the labor cost? Will departments be charged for events in the smaller venue? Possibly, Ms. Tschida said; will they need staff and equipment? They will look at what is needed for an event and whether it will have costs. They will figure out a system for events that are University-sponsored and it is still being discussed.

Professor Durfee inquired who is involved in the discussions of the financial model. Ms. Tschida said that people from the Office of Budget and Finance and from University Services; she reports to the provost through Vice Provost McMaster.

Professor Bitterman inquired what Ms. Tschida would do if she booked a rock concert and found that there were more people who wanted tickets than there were seats available; does she have a relationship with TCF Bank Stadium or Mariucci Arena? Ms. Tschida said she would be unlikely to book a rock concert; local promoters book those and they are savvy about venues—and they would be unlikely to choose Northrop.

Ms. Tschida noted that there is information about the revitalization project on the web at [Northrop.umn.edu](http://Northrop.umn.edu), with photographs of the construction process. There will not be two grand openings; there will be a "soft" opening in the fall, when the academic programs move in, but the major opening will be when the hall itself opens in the spring.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Ms. Tschida for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota