

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 25, 2012
12:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, 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, George Sheets

Absent: Richard Ziegler

Guests: Russ Straate (Office of Technology Commercialization), Nan Wilhelmson (Human Resources); Provost Karen Hanson; Amy Phenix (Chief of Staff, Office of the President); Brian Steeves (Executive Director, Office of the Board of Regents); Peter Radcliffe (Executive Director, Office of Planning and Analysis)

Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents)

[In these minutes: (1) entrepreneurial leaves; (2) discussion with Provost Hanson; (3) administrative reorganization; (4) report of the chair; (5) metrics and measurement; (6) discussion with Mr. Steeves (Office of the Board of Regents)]

1. Entrepreneurial Leaves

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at noon and welcomed Mr. Straate from the Venture Center in the Office for Technology Commercialization and Ms. Wilhelmson from the Office of Human Resources to discuss the revised proposal on entrepreneurial leaves. Committee members were provided a copy of the revised policy; Mr. Straate spoke from a set of slides.

Mr. Straate reviewed the reasons for the proposal, initially for the University to help set up new companies and create jobs. The faculty members are key to intellectual property and can be involved in a start-up company, but there can be conflicts of interest, so he worked with the conflict-of-interest committees to help manage conflicts; out of that discussion came the proposal for faculty members to be able to take a leave and help develop University intellectual property. Following the preliminary proposal, discussions led to its expansion to include all faculty members who are entrepreneurial about commercialization of research or public engagement.

The biggest issue they heard about, while exploring the options, was that faculty members were concerned about losing their benefits, Mr. Straate related. So the proposal provides that while no salary is paid during one of these leaves, benefits are covered. Ms. Wilhelmson said that because of the IRS codes governing subsidized health benefits for self-insured medical plans and retirement contributions for qualified plans, a leave can either be (1) at 100% time or (2) at 50% time or less. In the case of the 100%-

* 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.

time leave, the University will provide the faculty member with a lump-sum payment equivalent to the value of the fringe benefits that may be used to pay to continue benefits (the IRS does not allow contributions to fringe benefits in situations of no compensation); in the case of 50% time or less, the benefits are simply continued as usual. The leaves are only available to faculty members, one is eligible every four years, and there is to be a monthly check in while the person is on leave.

Ms. Wilhelmson reported that both the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Research Committee observed that there will now be three faculty development leaves available, plus other externally-funded leaves (Guggenheims, etc.), and they suggested that there should be a time limit that one can be away from the University. The proposal now provides that "over a seven-year period, faculty members must serve in their units for no fewer than four years. Exceptions may be granted by deans and chancellors for additional leave time in rare circumstances (e.g., service to a federal granting agency)."

Professor Kohlstedt asked what the views of the two committees were. Professor Lanyon reported that the Committee on Faculty Affairs believes this is a good idea that makes sense. If the provost finds the language about the limits on leaves to be acceptable, that would address most of the issues the committee saw. The committee also talked about other leaves and the need for clarification about who is eligible (under the "public engagement"/public good provision). The language about eligibility leaves open a big door and a lot of discretion with the colleges and deans.

Professor Beringer reported that the proposal has come to the Senate Research Committee twice and questions were raised. With the changes that were made, the committee endorsed it unanimously.

Professor Kohlstedt said she was not as concerned about discretion as about eligibility and what "public good" can include. It should be a broad definition, Professor Lanyon said; the question of what it is is up to the department head or dean to agree, and the language is so vague that it would be easy to deny a proposal. The leave is much clearer when it comes to intellectual property. That isn't an issue with sabbaticals, which a faculty member earns.

Professor May was pleased to see the addition of language that makes it possible for faculty members in the liberal arts to qualify for entrepreneurial leaves. Nevertheless, it still describes projects in ways that seem to exclude the liberal arts. Whenever the Committee talks with President Kaler about these leaves, he says he wants the opportunities open to the liberal arts, but the language is still such that when liberal-arts faculty members see "entrepreneurial leave," they might simply delete the message because it does not appear relevant to them. There is still an assumption that prevails inside as well as outside the University that the liberal arts offer merely cultural "fluff" like music and art, to enhance the quality of life in the state, but that the real economic engine comes from the professional schools and sciences. That is simply not the case. Liberal arts graduates drive the state's economy as much if not more than the graduates of the other colleges, in all fields of business and the professions. Faculty in the liberal arts might be eager to take advantage of leaves that allow them to participate in non-academic institutions of all kinds. Perhaps the leaves should be called "non-academic leaves of absence" rather than "entrepreneurial leaves" to be more inclusive of the entire university faculty. Professor Kohlstedt observed that many faculty members do not take advantage of any of the leave opportunities; all of the leaves need to be promoted by the dean and the opportunities explained, and it needs to be made clear that it is healthy for faculty members to get off campus every few years.

Professor Durfee agreed with Professor May and suggested a rearrangement of language so that it is clear, if the leaves are to be institution-wide, that they are not restricted to those who are most likely to apply for patents. Professor Ben-Ner suggested providing examples, such as joining a non-profit for a year. Or becoming a school principal for a year, Professor Ropers-Huilman added. She clarified, in response to a question, that it would not be a question of training but of bringing expertise from the University to the school.

Professor Hancher said that the acronym "IP" (intellectual property) is an in-house term more familiar in some parts of the University than others. He suggested there is a need for broader language. The monthly check-in required could be a telephone call? (It could be, Mr. Straate affirmed.) He asked if a political science professor, for example, could go to the McKinsey consulting firm to bring expertise; would a college be allowed to grant that kind of leave? Professor Bitterman said that IP has a meaning for science and engineering; if the liberal-arts faculty could identify alternative language, that would help, because this is about inventions and patents. The policy needs to extend to other exportable expertise from the University.

Professor Luepker asked where the funds to pay the fringe benefit costs would come. The department, Professor Kohlstedt said; there is no central fund.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Mr. Straate and Ms. Wilhelmson for joining the meeting and for all their work on the policy.

2. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Provost Hanson to the meeting and noted that she had provided the provost questions in advance of the meeting; the two at the top of the list were about decanal reviews and gender equity in faculty salaries. A copy of the memo from the Committee to Provost Hanson about decanal reviews is appended to these minutes.

Provost Hanson said that she appreciated the effort that went into the history and recommendations about decanal reviews and that she is open to making changes in the process. She concurred with most of the recommendations (members of the review committee, data access for the committee, ensuring confidentiality); the most difficult one is #3 concerning feedback to the faculty—and she recognizes that may be one of the recommendations of greatest interest. It is useful for a dean to provide feedback to the faculty after a review, and at her previous institution, Indiana University, she was aware of some deans who posted the entire review on the web. This is a delicate matter, however; if the results of the review were very bad, the dean may not continue in office, and she would not want to see enshrined in the rules a requirement that reviews must be posted. One must think about the purposes of a review: They are to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement and whether the dean should continue in the position. The outcome may be obvious in some cases, but it is difficult to think about part of a personnel record being put out for all the world to see. The memo from the Committee, she observed, recommends using persuasion and jawboning.

At Indiana University, some portion of the faculty (an elected committee) in the college had access to the reviews of the deans and was sworn to confidentiality. But at least the faculty of the college knew that some of their elected colleagues had access to the report.

Provost Hanson said she was not sure where to draw the line. If there are areas that are correctable and others in which the dean is strong, it would not necessarily help to make everything public and would be better to work to improve areas that are correctable. She said she would like further discussion with the Committee about this issue.

Professor Kohlstedt said that response to discovery of ethical or legal issues must be very clear to everyone and they need to know there is a University procedure for dealing with them. Provost Hanson asked if a review had turned up something like this. Professor Kohlstedt said that one review had at least raised a question but nothing happened. That recommendation is a reminder that appropriate people must be informed about what is going on and that situation needs to be addressed not just handled quietly (as apparently occurred at Penn State).

Professor Luepker said that the concern in his college FCC is that everyone gets a pass and no one hears anything. He said one colleague commented that he had been in the college for 25 years and had never heard anything about reviewing the dean. Professor Luepker added that if someone is only performing adequately as dean, that should not be sufficient to retain the person. Professor Patterson reported that questions have arisen before in the Academic Health Center colleges about participation in decanal reviews; it was variable in the past but has been changing since the reviews are now conducted by the provost. Professor Bitterman commented that "variable" means it didn't happen.

Professor Bearinger said that a letter to the faculty following a review might identify the accomplishments of the dean, goals for the next three years, and so on. It should set out a forward-going plan if the dean is to be continued in the position. That is something the leader of a unit should want and not shy away from. Provost Hanson said there is a difference between the goals for the college and personal goals. Professor Bearinger responded that there are positive ways to deal with areas that need improvement and it is to the leader's advantage to tell the faculty what he or she is working on. This kind of letter would be a long way from "did we evaluate the dean?" Provost Hanson agreed it could be of benefit but asked what faculty member would want their reviews made public, their weaknesses made public?

Professor May said that Provost Hanson's question is related to the issue of the evaluative versus the developmental nature of reviews. If a review of a dean is so bad, goals for the dean should not be couched publicly and perhaps it is time for that dean to go. When she received a survey, everything was directed to development and nothing was said about the end of the dean's term. This Committee had a conversation recently with the Twin Cities deans and all of them said they do not serve a term; they serve at the pleasure of the provost. Faculty reviews are completely different from decanal reviews, Professor May maintained. Deans are members of the faculty and could be appointed for three years, for example, and reviewed, and if the decision is that the college needs new leadership, the dean can return to the faculty. What happens, however, is that deans become entrenched for years; there needs to be a term, not just service at the pleasure of the provost, because that puts the provost in the position of having to fire the dean rather than not renewing him or her after a periodic review.

Provost Hanson said she did not support the idea of having firm terms of appointment because the provost must be able to terminate a dean if he or she is at odds with the direction of the institution. She said she would have thought that the question of renewal would have been taken seriously in review and did not realize how much the review procedure appears to assume a dean will continue in office, that there was an expectation of automatic renewal.

Professor Kohlstedt said that terms of appointment is a big, contractual question that should be seriously addressed, perhaps at the retreat with administrators next summer, given that decanal reviews for this year have already started. Professor May disagreed and said the Committee's recommendations could have an effect on the five reviews being conducted this year, on how the provost thinks about the reviews.

Professor Lanyon said that the idea of providing a review to the dean and making it public is that the provost would choose what to be put in the part that would be shared publicly. The provost could provide a written summary separate from any private conversation with the dean. In some cases, it might be "thank you for your service" and be a joint statement from the dean and provost. He said that having deans serve at the pleasure of the provost makes sense, but what has been missing is the expectation that there would be a review that could be at the end of a term.

Professor Ben-Ner said that requiring that elements of a review be made public could have a beneficial impact on who would agree to take a deanship—knowing that there will be scrutiny and some measure of publicity about the person's performance. That could help the self-selection process. That discipline is weakened right now.

Provost Hanson commented that a written message to the faculty is not the only way to communicate; the provost can insist that a dean make improvements within a certain period.

What surprises and puzzles the faculty is that the deans are unwilling to share the results of a review, Professor Lanyon said, and why the process is so secret. He wants his colleagues to know about the result of the review of his performance as department head because he wants them to know that he heard them. Provost Hanson agreed that a report doesn't necessarily mean a document of current failures. She said she did not believe the faculty would want that, or want it about themselves. What is really important is that the faculty voice be heard and affect the decisions. If there are several problems, are they fixable? Are they balanced by other strengths? And if there are several problems, they should enter into a decision on reappointment. Dr. Hanson agreed that the faculty need feedback and authentication, and that reappointment should be an open question all the time.

Professor Sheets said he agreed with Provost Hanson that she should be cautious about a formulation of deficiencies that can acquire a life of its own and that could undermine the authority of any dean or department head if the information exists in codified form and can be referred to. There is no good organizational reason to publicize such information. But that does not mean that information should not be shared with faculty members who should know and who will keep it confidential. He also said, in response to Professor May, that there is a practical question about the expected outcome of a review and the presumption that someone will be renewed. At least in the larger colleges, as he understands things, the deans are appointed after a national search. That is an expensive process; if deans are not renewed because they are not outstanding, the faculty will grow because of a surfeit of ex-deans, who were not hired primarily because of their faculty work, and there would be budgetary implications.

Provost Hanson agreed that searches are expensive, and in addition a college can lose momentum when changing deans, which weighs in favor of retaining people, although that should not be a determinative factor. She said that the suggestion of three years seems short to her—and there should be

faculty opinion on decanal performance sought before three years of a dean's term have elapsed—but that is a short time to start initiatives and show results.

Professor Hancher asked what happens at the end of a review: Is there a reappointment or a renewal? Is a letter sent out or is the appointment continued? A letter would definitely be sent to the dean after the review concludes, Provost Hanson said, and it would either indicate that the dean will continue in that position—again, on "at will" terms (i.e., at the pleasure of the provost)—or that he or she will step down on a planned date.

Professor Bearinger observed that the quality of the survey data rests with the sample and response rate. A number of faculty members in her college did not know about the survey—if something doesn't come from the provost, or comes from an unknown sender, faculty may receive it but they may discard it. It must be clear at the beginning of the subject line that the message is from the provost. People will also stay away from responding when they see requests for a lot of demographic information; people will not provide all that because they are concerned they could be identified. It must be made clear that respondents can skip some questions. Professor Hancher affirmed the problem with a survey coming from a stranger, or from another vice president. The purpose of the message must be clear and the provost's name should appear as the sender. Provost Hanson said that change could be made.

Professor Kohlstedt suggested that Provost Hanson return to the Committee in November with further thoughts about the recommendations and if there is any further help the Committee can offer. Provost Hanson said she thought the suggestions were all good but that she struggles with the question of publicity. Professor Kohlstedt thanked her for joining the meeting.

3. Administrative Reorganization

Professor Kohlstedt next welcomed Ms. Phenix, President Kaler's chief of staff and the chair of an ad hoc task force to advise him on structuring the central administration in light of the imminent departure of Senior Vice President Jones. Committee members reviewed the office functions for the Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration (Jones) and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (Hanson). This is a follow-up from the discussion at the Senate Consultative Committee, Professor Kohlstedt explained, where the time was constrained.

Ms. Phenix noted that she had also had a conversation with Professors Kohlstedt and Hancher, will talk with the Committee today, and the task force will make final recommendations to President Kaler next week. This has moved fairly quickly for the sake of the staff in the various units in Dr. Jones' office and because Dr. Jones leaves at the end of December.

Professor Kohlstedt related that she had said earlier that irrespective of the arrangements that are made, some units and lines of reporting do not seem visible and need to be more so.

Professor Cramer asked if the task force is considering eliminating any of the boxes on the organizational chart. They are thinking hard about the senior vice president position, Ms. Phenix said. Any offices, Professor Cramer asked? They were not charged to be a base-closing commission, Ms. Phenix said, and their timeline did not allow the kind of evaluation that would be needed to decide to stop a program or close an office, so no, they did not.

Professor Hancher asked if some responsibilities would be moved to the provost's office. They will, Ms. Phenix said. When he saw the organizational chart for the provost's office, he gasped, Professor Hancher commented, and he worries about adding more to her table. That is a concern at all levels, Ms. Phenix responded. The president has 19 direct reports; the provost has a large number as well. The institution is under pressure for administrative costs, but the University does a lot and faces a lot of regulatory burdens, so it needs to be thoughtful about limits on the number of direct reports to administrators. There are ways to manage things with a layer underneath the leader (e.g., vice provosts to handle parts of the provost's responsibility).

Professor Durfee asked who decides whether a research center reports to the provost rather than the vice president for research. Ms. Phenix said she did not know how the decisions were made because they were made before she and the president were in office. Has the task force established a principle, Professor Durfee asked? It has, Ms. Phenix said, and one question is whether the research centers should be more aligned with the vice president for research.

Professor Luepker said he wished to emphasize that there are too many boxes, too many offices, on the organizational charts based on the recent Senate Committee on Finance and Planning review. There is no good time to make hard decisions but a reasonably insightful individual might ask "what is this here?" and "do we still need it?" rather than give more responsibilities to the president and provost. Professor Ben-Ner said he agreed completely with Professor Luepker. He noted that he studies organizational design, including of for-profit organizations and non-profits, and one problem is that the quality of oversight is negatively affected by a large span of control—and this is related to discussion about the oversight of the deans. These [organizational charts] look extremely complex and suggest difficulties in management, which reflects on the role of the president and provost and what they can and cannot do in oversight. It is never a good time to overhaul a system, Professor Ben-Ner agreed with Professor Luepker, but this may be such a time. It may be that problems come up that reflect on the quality of the organization, not on the individual.

Ms. Phenix said the task force talked with the leader of each function on the organizational chart to try to understand what it is and the role it plays in the University. They know that the people in the units work extraordinarily hard. They have tried to be thoughtful about their approach. But they are not the right group to decide, for example, if the Office for Public Engagement should continue or not. Should such an analysis occur? Should the functions be looked at? Should someone take a look to see if there has been mission creep and efforts redirected? There will be places where the task force may suggest further analysis. President Kaler is as open to that conversation as any president the University has been. Much of this was built up over time and it is work to determine if something still has a high institutional priority.

Professor Ropers-Huilman said she made her views known on a couple of points (i.e., diversity and international issues) at the Senate Consultative Committee meeting; she asked now if there are any sticking points in the reorganization that the Committee could be helpful with. Is there something the Committee believes the University should stop doing, Ms. Phenix asked? Much of the alignment seems to be clear. Is the "bucket" of system-wide, state-wide, public-engagement activities a clear opportunity to create a new concept of "extension" for the 21st Century? She said she believes there is the opportunity to create greater synergy among outreach and public engagement units, although the cultures in those units are very different. The leaders of those organizations need to look at the possibilities.

Professor Cramer commented that that would be a "fabulous idea" for an area where the University may need to improve.

Professor Cramer said he agreed with Ms. Phenix that the people in the units represented by boxes on the organizational chart are working very hard, but there are areas of apparent duplication where things are happening in central administration as well as, for example, in three colleges where there are programs for college readiness. Where there is duplication of resources, the University might benefit from moving some functions to the colleges.

Professor Bitterman said he interpreted Professor Ben-Ner not as calling for people to be fired but instead to capture the functionality of these wonderful people. There is a difference between "not needed" and consolidating groups of people doing similar work so that the organization is tractable.

Professor Bearinger recalled that when the Committee met with Vice President Friedman, it heard details about the demands connected with the entire clinical enterprise, i.e., services, buildings, contracts, partnerships, etc. She said she left that discussion with Vice President thinking about the value of having a Vice President for the Academic Health Center that is separate from the Dean of the Medical School, because of the enormous demands on each of the two positions. Or about creating a Director of AHC Clinical Services that would be a report to the Vice President for the AHC or, perhaps, depending on the findings in the AHC External Review, reconfigure the organizational chart such that the Director of Clinical Services reports to the Dean of the Medical School, in that the vast majority of clinical services are provided through the Medical School, as Dr. Friedman indicated during the previous FCC meeting. She said she believed there are other ways "to cut the pie" and now is the opportunity for innovation in considering the interface between the AHC, Medical School, and the Vice President for Research, all of whom have direct or dotted-line reports to the Provost as currently configured in the draft organizational chart. President Bruininks decided that the Dean of the Medical School and the Vice President of the AHC would be the same person. At the time of that decision, the question was asked whether the Vice President for the AHC could be from an AHC school other than medicine. The response was that he or she could be in that position only if he or she could manage the clinical enterprise. Has the University yet arrived at the optimal configuration? Professor Bearinger asked. This has also received a lot of discussion in the AHC FCC, Professor Patterson reported, but that further discussion on it awaits the release of the AHC External Report which currently is in President Kaler's office.

Professor McCormick asked if Ms. Phenix's task force is keeping an eye on what the University's aspirational peers do in administrative organization, such as where research institutes should report. They have looked at the organizational charts of some of the peer institutions, Ms. Phenix said.

Professor Luepker said he believed that some of the boxes should be crossed off the chart and some should be sent to other units. He recalled that the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning last year looked at all of the vice-presidential units and told the Committee that these charts are not different from those of the other vice presidents. Many boxes are on the charts because of history. He said he would not argue that the units do not have wonderful people and do wonderful things; the question is whether the University can keep them all if it is to cut \$28 million in administrative expenses. Can the University afford them all? The Senate Committee on Finance and Planning did not have the authority or the nerve to put any unit in the crosshairs but it did say that someone should look at these things and ask if the University is where it should be.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Ms. Phenix for joining the meeting and consulting further with the Committee.

4. Report of the Chair (including Decanal Review Recommendations)

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the candidates for vice president for equity and diversity will be on campus and Committee members should try to attend the discussions.

The Committee needs to consider the focus of the "intellectual future of the University" discussion on November 1; she will provide the list of questions that have been compiled.

Professor Kohlstedt suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the memorandum from the Committee to Provost Hanson should be appended to the Committee minutes. It is attached.

The Committee will have a discussion with newly-tenured associate professors later in the year.

5. Metrics and Measurement

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Dr. Radcliffe to the meeting.

Dr. Radcliffe said he wished to provide an update on what is occurring with metrics and measures and what his office, the Office of Planning and Analysis (OPA), has coming up. He said he wished also to learn what would be useful to the Committee and to academic departments. OPA is responsible for identifying data needs at the University, obtaining the relevant information, and sharing it with the relevant people. In the last few years they have focused on infrastructure: data sources, tools, and processes to get information to people.

There are three levels of metrics development at the University, Dr. Radcliffe told the Committee.

1. Performance-funding metrics at the central level, which provide accountability to the legislature. At this level they need measures that are clear, easy to understand, and that can be communicated. 1% of the FY13 appropriation is connected to a set of measures and they are starting to receive the data and will provide them when they are complete. \$11.5 million in measures is tied to the FY15 appropriation, measures similar to those used this year; they involve support for students, graduation rates, research productivity, and so on.
2. Institutional metrics that allow the leadership to communicate with the public but with information that is more reflective of the mission, but still at a high level.
3. College-level metrics, which they are trying to build up, that will be useful to deans and department heads, such as for the compact process. They want to engage with the colleges and faculty on what would be useful for them.

Professor Durfee inquired if the data and metrics provided to the legislature can also be put to the institution's own uses. They can, Dr. Radcliffe said, and are almost all part of the larger institutional metrics framework. The framework includes measures that reflect the trade-offs the institution makes in

pursuing its goals, so they help show whether the strategies it is pursuing are working and if they are leading to unintended consequences.

Research productivity is narrowly defined as dollars in the legislative measures but the University would evaluate it more broadly to determine how well it is doing in research, Dr. Radcliffe said. Professor Kohlstedt asked Dr. Radcliffe to expand on the thought. They have a new tool, Academic Analytics, that provides data on publications, grants, and awards, so covers units that do not have a large amount of external grant funding. It is an important point that much is not captured, Professor Kohlstedt said. If one believes that something is a measure of what the University is, if a measure is used, who is using it? Who asks for it? Academic Analytics is used in conjunction with the Graduate School to look at graduate programs, Dr. Radcliffe said. It was created because the National Research Council ratings were difficult to use in looking at doctoral programs and for counting scholarly publications. Academic Analytics has been expanding from its original focus on science but there will remain a lot of difficulty in measurement, such as with performance data. The University will need time as an institution to learn what Academic Analytics data are and are not telling it; they need to sort through them.

Professor Ropers-Huilman emphasized that it will be important to recognize that any data used will be inadequate before evaluation. She reported that her individual information on SciVal, another tool also being introduced at the University that tracks scholarly production, had significant errors and omissions.

Dr. Radcliffe explained that while Academic Analytics and SciVal draw on many of the same data sources for information on publications, citations, and grants, that they produce different output from that information. SciVal operates at the individual publication level and Academic Analytics at the programmatic level, and they serve different purposes. In SciVal, individual publications are tagged with labels relevant to the specific research topics they address, and the system is intended to help researchers identify colleagues at the University or other institutions that might be valuable collaborators based on the specific kind of research work they do. In Academic Analytics, publications and other work are aggregated at the program level, and the tool is used to benchmark programs in comparison to similar programs at other institutions. SciVal is more useful at the level of an individual researcher or a department because they look at information at a very detailed level, while Academic Analytics is more useful at a collegiate or administrative level as a holistic measure of a program's scholarly output. The two provide complementary information.

It is important to identify measures for individual faculty members that the Committee is interested in, Dr. Radcliffe said.

Professor Bitterman asked what the process is to establish the face validity of each measure. In some ways it is probably quite good. Dr. Radcliffe said that Academic Analytics is engaging with directors of institutional research across the country to discuss what they see and what the directors believe that Academic Analytics must do to fill out its sources. Because of licensing agreements, Academic Analytics, SciVal, and other services will not be able to include everything that a faculty member has done. Each service purchases data on publications and citations from existing sources, and supplements it with direct data gathering.

Professor Hancher asked who the audience is at a lower level of granularity. Central leadership, deans and department heads, Dr. Radcliffe said. The data with greater levels of granularity are for

internal use by individual researchers or departments. They have not tried to work with the aggregate data yet to give broad institutional measures of the University as a whole, although they will be examining it to see if it seems useful. The expected use is more about allocations and where the University wants to make investments based on the standing and performance of programs. Professor Hancher said this relates to what one hears about what happened in the UK, which is a cautionary tale (the controversy over economic and other impact factors used in the new Research Excellence Framework, REF2014).

All measures are an opportunity for conversations, Dr. Radcliffe commented, and they give a common base of information from which to start a conversation. He has learned a lot of tolerance for the roughness of the measures and they help identify where there should be conversations. The concepts that they are trying to measure are complex and difficult, but even approximate measures of them can focus attention on issues and provide some insight into what is happening. They face the same difficulties in most survey research, where they cannot independently verify the construct being measured, but what they can measure provides valuable information.

Professor May said she worried about the audiences, especially for research data, because those are areas where one could reach conclusions about the humanities that are unwarranted. Books do not show up in these measures. One of her colleagues has written 12 books, none of which were included in the National Research Council rankings. Dr. Radcliffe said that allocation decisions will be made regardless; if they can bring more information, some is better than none if one understands the limits of the data. People must make decisions. Professor Ropers-Huilman disagreed, saying that Academic Analytics is bad data. Professor May also disagreed and said that the humanities will be on the losing end and no data is better than some data. Dr. Radcliffe did not agree.

Professor Lanyon said that even if there are clean data, if they are biased in availability they will bias decisions. SciVal data are easy to get but dance and theater have their own measures of what constitutes quality in their programs. Dr. Radcliffe said that they have talked with Academic Analytics about this issue and they are interested in developing data about arts fields so that one can compare across institutions. They are trying to find their way through the complexity. Professor Lanyon said there are two kinds of comparisons: comparing the University of Minnesota units with other institutions (which requires that data be collected in a uniform way across institutions); and comparing the performance of University of Minnesota units over time. Both can be useful but the former requires that a standard set of data be collected which may or may not be equally useful for all kinds of units. In contrast, the latter can use whatever data is most appropriate for each individual unit. He said that with the emphasis on Academic Analytics and SciVal, that second kind of longitudinal comparison is getting lost. Dr. Radcliffe agreed that it would be useful to have those data, which would require having faculty activity reporting systems, without which such an effort is beyond what they can do, and ultimately to find out if there are consistent ways that it can be done across institutions. But that is years off since trend data by definition take time to collect even after systems are implemented, he concluded.

What is difficult to measure but important to the University and its constituents: what the graduates are doing/have accomplished, Professor McCormick said. Dr. Radcliffe said the biggest, initiative in this area is the State Longitudinal Education Data System, known by its acronym SLEDS, which tracks pre-K to higher education and into the workforce; it has just started and will in theory give the University the opportunity to look at placement and salaries (although it does not track federal or military employment). That will provide data the state will find important and on which the University

will be judged. One problem with the traditional way of collecting this information is that alumni/ae are not always interested in answering University surveys, so response rates have been low.

Dr. Radcliffe said he also wished to talk about SERU, a survey of students at 23 research universities. The survey goes to all undergraduates and measures student engagement and maps to the Student Learning Outcomes and Student Development Outcomes that have been established for the Twin Cities campus. They hope to use the survey data as an indirect measure of student learning for assessment and accreditation. They need to strike a balance between privacy and making the data useful. They are working on building reports related to the Student Learning outcomes so that units can see what is going on in the programs and what students are experiencing.

They are trying to measure self-perceptions, Professor Kohlstedt asked? They are, Dr. Radcliffe said. There are difficulties with test-oriented surveys because there is no return on taking them for the student. Can they track individual responses year by year, Professor McCormick asked? They do, Dr. Radcliffe said, so can connect the responses to retention and graduation and whether students are in a program or not. They have to be very careful about confidentiality but they can track students as individual and serve as the firewall between units and privacy considerations.

If assessment is of interest, it is to be hoped they are thinking about how to obtain local data, Professor Kohlstedt said. If administrators are going to be looking at data, the departments will want to be sure they are good data. Is there ongoing consultation with the faculty, Professor Hancher asked? In the first round of work with Academic Analytics, they talked with people from the Office of the Vice President for Research and from University Libraries, Dr. Radcliffe said. Many other people have been involved in discussions around SERU, including associate deans, advisors, First Year Programs, some individual faculty, groups of students, and administrators. The survey has been done twice at the University, and will be repeated this spring, so there is a much more established community around it than there is so far with Academic Analytics. Professor Hancher said he would echo Professor Kohlstedt's comment: Faculty members have an interest in these data, both individually and collectively, so how will they be engaged, and when? Measures of what the faculty individually and collectively have accomplished are important to the faculty. He also suggested that this Committee might be the best one to which proposals should be brought. Much of what they are working on came out of the report of this Committee's subcommittee on metrics and measures [which can be found here: <http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fcc/metricsreport.pdf>.]

Professor Cramer asked if anyone finds SciVal useful for anything. Professor Sheets said "only as a punching bag." He asked if Dr. Radcliffe had reported to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs about SciVal and Academic Analytics; he has not, Dr. Radcliffe said. Professor Sheets said that committee would be interested in them and has some well-informed individuals who are critical of deficiencies in information and who have pointed out that Google scholar will often turn up more citations than SciVal or Academic Analytics.

Professor Ratliff-Crain commented, apropos of post-graduation surveys, that the Morris campus has gone through the exercise of trying to track students down, and said it is important to know about graduate school as well as employment. Dr. Radcliffe said that he has talked with the Graduate School and has nothing more to report right now, but said they hope to find ways to improve the data, which are highly variable. They have also talked with Academic Analytics, Thompson-Reuters, and Elsevier because they are all involved in pursuits that could lead to tracking the scholarly work of graduate

students and where they are employed as faculty if they stay in academia. Dr. Radcliffe affirmed that he talks with individuals on the non-Twin-Cities campus as much as he can.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Dr. Radcliffe for his report and commented that it is astonishing the volume and complexity of what is occurring, and said that oversight is critical.

6. Discussion with Mr. Steeves (Office of the Board of Regents)

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Mr. Steeves, Executive Director and Corporate Secretary to the Board of Regents.

Mr. Steeves said he was glad to join the Committee and began with comments about governance and the Board of Regents. The principle organization for representatives who serve on governing boards is the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), on which they rely for model policies, statements of responsibility, and other documents to guide boards of regents/trustees. Having governing boards composed of citizens is unique to the United States and sets American higher education apart. According to the institutions a high level of autonomy, separate from direct government intervention also sets American higher education apart from the rest of the world. That model speaks to the success of American higher education and why it is leading the world.

The AGB points out the major areas of accountability of governing boards; they are four-fold.

1. Advance the mission and heritage of the institution: That is first and foremost in Regents' minds and Board policy lays out the mission. The mission statement is widely used and people can cite it.
2. Maintain the values that guide higher education, such as autonomy in decision-making, academic freedom, and shared governance—which also differentiate American higher education.
3. Uphold the public trust, both fiscal accountability and academic quality, and develop knowledge and provide solutions to public problems.
4. Balance the interests of the various constituencies: The public, faculty, staff, students, and others. This item, Mr. Steeves commented, can often be the most difficult to achieve. At a public institution, where the public and the legislature are involved, people want tangible results, but the process used to achieve them is as important as the results. The institution must have buy-in and engagement from its constituents in order to be accountable.

Mr. Steeves said that the Board of Regents has three fundamental planning documents for the University:

1. The University Plan, Performance, and Accountability report, which may not receive much faculty attention but which provides the Board an extensive set of metrics and allows it to understand how the institution is doing on a number of fronts. With a lay Board whose members are not on campus every day, the plan provides snapshots on how the University is doing. [The 2012 report can be found at http://www.academic.umn.edu/accountability/pdf/2012/2012_UMN_Accountability_Report.pdf.]

2. The operating budget and the capital budget: There is no better place to determine what an institution values than to see where it is investing its money.

3. The 92 Board of Regents' policies, which provide the framework for the governance of the institution. [Board policies can be found here: <http://www1.umn.edu/regents/polindex.html>.] The policies have the force of law for the University because the Board has governing authority for the institution. They send out the policies for review and there is a consultation process that identifies the route for each policy. Mr. Steeves said he believes the process works quite well: The Board office sends a policy to a senior administrator for review, who consults with the appropriate groups and individuals, including Senate committees as appropriate, and brings them back to the Board office with any suggested revisions. They inquire what committees the administrator has spoken with and what comments were received; the Board values the process and the comments that are made.

Mr. Steeves said there are a number of other big-picture topics that are worthy of attention and thought.

-- The Audit Committee is starting a year-long update of the institutional risk profile and will develop a "heat map" identifying areas of high risk.

-- The Finance Committee is working on a long-term financial model for the University, to cover a number of budget cycles.

-- The Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee is looking at a more comprehensive compensation report and having discussions about how to shift the emphasis in human resources from a transactional orientation to one focused more on employee engagement.

-- The Facilities Committee is considering long-range planning for facilities, and continuing to transition to more efficient space.

-- The Educational Planning and Policy Committee is discussing what academic accountability means and how it can be measured.

All of these items are at the cutting edge of higher education and the Board needs advice. These are worthy of discussion in the institution.

In addition to the annual dinner that this Committee has with the Board of Regents, there are other opportunities for communication between the two groups. There are the "3x3x3" meetings three times per year, when the Board chair, vice chair, and executive director (3), the president, provost, and chief of staff (3), and the Committee's chair, vice chair, and staff (3) meet to identify topics of interest and provide updates on what is going on; the Committee chair provides a report to the Board three times per year; the Board chair and vice chair meet with this Committee once per year; and there are other informal opportunities, such as the chairs of Senate committees sitting in on meetings of Board committees, and those individuals are encouraged to talk with Board members. Other ways that communication occurs is that the staffs of the Board office and the Senate office meet twice per year and Mr. Savary from the Board office attends many of the meetings of this and other Senate committees and reports on major issues.

Professor Kohlstedt commented that one way the University may avoid problems such as those that recently confronted the University of Virginia is because of the direct and personal interactions Mr. Steeves has described.

Professor Cloyd asked how Board members come to know the University. A variety of ways, Mr. Steeves responded. When Board members are elected by the legislature, the Board office provides a lengthy orientation on what Board members need to know about the University, including their responsibilities as regents. Beyond that, they have conversations at meetings and presentations, events on campus, and interacting with people at the University. It takes a considerable amount of time. Professor Kohlstedt reported that she had asked Regent Larson how many of the Board members are University alumni/ae; it is about 75%, a number that could be quite different at other institutions.

Professor Cloyd asked if there could be a planned way in which Board members could be introduced to the University through such activities as attending classrooms, shadowing a graduate student, going to labs, and attending performances so that they can understand the lifeblood of the institution. Board members do many of those things within their first year of service, Mr. Steeves said, although he was unsure how many attended lectures or classes. The Board meets eight times per year and orienting regents can take time in order to touch all the pieces of the University (Board members serve a six-year term). Mr. Steeves noted that the Board position is unpaid and many serve in conjunction with full-time jobs of their own. Professor Lanyon commented that it would be a wonderful idea for Board members to visit classrooms, especially the active-learning classrooms that are now being used.

Professor Lanyon went on to comment that the recent dinner with the Board was an excellent event. The topic of one conversation with a Board member was how easy it is to assume that one's own personal experiences in one University unit is representative of the way all University units function. It can be very difficult to get a sense of how different even basic activities (e.g., teaching, research, budgets) are across the diversity of units at the University.

Professor May agreed with Professor Kohlstedt that the University is less likely to have events similar to what happened at Penn State or Virginia, but recalled that it did have the "tenure war" in the mid-1990s that left a lot of bad blood. The Board of Regents seems very remote, although she knows Board members and is impressed with them when she meets them. Is it possible for individual regents to meet with faculty and student groups? That would be valuable and much is at stake for Board members, so it is important they learn as much as possible. Mr. Steeves said he would take the suggestion back to the Board but cautioned that he did not want to leave the impression that Board members do not already participate in many events with faculty and students, because they do.

Professor Ben-Ner asked if Regents can be sued individually related to their service on the Board. To his knowledge they cannot, Mr. Steeves said.

Professor Bearinger recalled talking with one member of the Board who is very interested in what is taking place in the Minneapolis Public Schools, where she does a great deal of work. That is an example of the kind of work that Board members could be invited to attend and understand. Professor Cloyd said he wants Board members to understand the work that faculty do, and the best way to do that is to be where they are doing the work. He said he has no doubt the Regents do try to know the work and it would be nice to see a systematic way for them to get broad exposure to the work that goes on. Professor Durfee said that once one knows members of the Board, there is nothing that prevents anyone from

inviting them to come to a classroom. Mr. Steeves said that his office would also be glad to help facilitate such requests.

Professor Hancher noted that there is an events list published every day and it may be that a selected number of the event notices could be made available to the Board members.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Mr. Steeves for joining the Committee and adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

October 23, 2012

To: Provost Karen Hanson

From: Faculty Consultative Committee

Re: Recommendations Regarding the Decanal Review Process

Purpose of Report

In response to questions at the retreat, Provost Karen Hanson expressed an interest in faculty opinions on the process of decanal reviews. At its meeting on September 6, the FCC approved a subcommittee to report back to the Faculty Consultative Committee with comments and recommendations that could be forwarded to her and made part of her conversation with the FCC in October. The charge was to review the current formal review process and the survey instrument used to solicit faculty opinion.

Background

1. When Tom Sullivan became provost in 2004, there was a different decanal review process that was felt to be too laborious (some took one to two years to complete). He worked to create the current system.
2. The current survey instrument was created by Sullivan working with Human Resources and with consultation from the FCC. The instrument evaluates the dean in 4 leadership areas: strategic initiatives, results, people, and personal.
3. Each Review Committee assists the provost or vice-president (the "responsible administrator") with the reviews. The committee includes the FCC chair and 2 faculty members of the college appointed by the provost.
4. The individual faculty members completing the survey are kept confidential. Prior to 2009, the dean being reviewed could look up x500 respondent numbers and review that individual's responses. This was changed in 2009 and now the only data provided to the dean is in aggregate and de-identified form.

5. There is no requirement for the results of the review to be shared with the faculty. The current review policy states:

Communication at Conclusion of Evaluation

The responsible administrator and dean being reviewed determine how and what will be communicated regarding the Three-Year Evaluation. To share summary or other information from the review requires written authorization from the dean being reviewed.

6. After a review was completed, Tom Sullivan usually wrote a polite and somewhat cryptic message to faculty of the college, thanking them for their participation. In FCC discussions last year, there were numerous comments that this feedback was insufficient to foster faculty ownership and buy-in of the process.

Assessment and Recommendations

1. Changes to the composition of the review committee should be considered. Regarding the composition, the current policy states, "Two additional faculty and/or academic professional or administrative members of the college will be selected and appointed to the committee by the responsible senior vice president." The FCC recommends that following this statement a sentence be inserted to ensure adequate faculty representation: "At least one of these two individuals must be a faculty member without an administrative appointment."
2. The review committee must be given full access to the complete data set, both qualitative and quantitative.
3. Meaningful feedback to the faculty in colleges whose deans are being reviewed should be expected and provided. The FCC recommends that the responsible administrator write a summary of the decanal review and present it to the dean. The dean would be informed of an expectation, but not a strict requirement, to share that summary with the college. The faculty of the college would be informed that the dean has been provided the summary and strongly encouraged to share it with them. Sharing of the results—and the level of trust it would engender with the faculty—would then be at the discretion of the dean. A dean's decision not to share the summary with the faculty would be factored into the dean's performance review by the responsible administrator.
4. The evaluative function of decanal reviews should be emphasized as much as the developmental aspect. There is concern in the FCC that the review process presumes the reviewed dean will continue in the role, rather than the review being undertaken in order to determine whether or not the dean should be re-appointed to the position. These are very demanding positions and in these dynamic times, new vision and leadership is frequently in the best interests of colleges. Only deans who have achieved clear-cut goals and have a strategic vision for the further development of their college should continue as dean. One of those goals should be the leadership performance of a dean as reviewed by the faculty. The FCC recommends the review policy and the solicitation for faculty participation in the decanal review include language that part of the purpose of the review is to determine continuation of the dean's appointment. The developmental aspect of the reviews— using the faculty responses to improve performance—should be retained and equally emphasized with the evaluative component.

5. The survey instrument's four leadership dimensions adequately capture the qualities of a dean's performance and should be continued.
 6. Further provisions for ensuring confidentiality should be implemented. There are some concerns that the opening section of the survey instrument, in which demographic data are gathered, could undermine the confidentiality of responses. Certain respondents may be able to be identified by virtue of their demographic categories, even if data are provided in aggregate form. For example, if a dean performed much more poorly on a survey item among newly hired Hispanic faculty versus other demographic groups, and there was only a single young Hispanic faculty member in the college, confidentiality would be broken. Suggested strategies for ensuring confidentiality are:
 - Requiring a "cell" size of at least 6 for reporting quantitative survey results by demographic data. A minimum of 6 subjects in a group is used by researchers and IRB committees as a threshold for reasonable assurance of anonymity. If a demographic item in the dean's survey instrument has fewer than 6 respondents in any of the response cells, then a cross tabulation of other survey items with that demographic item should be EXCLUDED from the report to the dean.
 - Redacting potentially identifying language from qualitative data in the report to the dean. For example, there would be a likely breaching of confidentiality if a respondent wrote a comment starting with "As the lone female tenured professor in the department. . . ." Perhaps one of the members of the review committee, such as the FCC chair, could take on the responsibility of redacting any potentially identifying language in the written comments reported back to the dean being reviewed.
- A full description of how the quantitative and qualitative survey data will be handled and reported should be described in the Policy and in the introduction to the survey.
7. Potential ethical or legal violations revealed by the review process should be handled through usual channels. If any data collected for the decanal reviews reports an alleged ethical or legal violation, the committee and provost must handle the report in a manner consistent with a report made through the University's anonymous ethics reporting mechanism. The allegation requires investigation with a report back to the review committee and appropriate action recommended to the appropriate administrator through the Institutional Compliance Office.