

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, March 14, 2013  
1:00 – 3:00  
Room 300 Morrill Hall**

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler

Absent: Linda Bearinger, Brian Buhr, Will Durfee, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Elaine Tyler May

Guests: Andy Hill (Director, Enterprise Systems Upgrade Project), Julie Selander (chair, Portal Leadership Team); Stacy Doepner-Hove (chair, Faculty Committee on Committees)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) Enterprise Systems Upgrade project; (2) committee business; (3) athletic matters; (4) statement on governance service; (5) report from the Committee on Committees]

**1. Enterprise Systems Upgrade Project**

Professor Kohlstedt called the meeting to order at 1:00 and welcomed Mr. Hill, Director of the Enterprise Systems Upgrade Program (ESUP), to the meeting to provide an update on ESUP. Mr. Hill in turn introduced Ms. Selander, chair of the Portal Leadership Team.

Mr. Hill began by commenting that the enterprise systems run the back-office systems at the University, such as human resources, student services, financial management, payroll, and so on; he is in charge of the project to upgrade the University's existing systems. Each of the three major systems being upgraded—student, human resources, and financial—has a different work stream. Over the years the University had to customize the systems a great deal; in the meantime, PeopleSoft has incorporated many changes, including many from the University, so it was time to step back and see what the upgraded systems have compared to the University's, which were 12 years old (Human Resources and Student).

Mr. Hill outlined the primary reasons for the ESUP: compliance (regulatory and security support for the University's versions of the human resources and student systems ended in 2012 but has been extended to 2014), the highly-customized services are costly to maintain (about \$15 million per year), PeopleSoft functionality is now on a par with or superior to the University's customized versions, upgrading enables the University to take advantage of new technologies, and there is a need for more consistent data to help make better decisions. They are also looking at mobile technology, which would be very expensive to implement with the current systems.

---

\* 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. Hill described how the governance structure for the project, which includes an Executive Oversight Committee (chaired by Dean Elde and including Vice Presidents Brown, Pfitzenreuter, and Studham and Vice Provost McMaster), an Integration Steering Committee, composed of representatives from the offices involved, and functional steering committees for each of the three systems. They learned from the EFS upgrade that they need a robust governance structure because these systems affect every faculty member, staff member, and student and because they must have executive buy-in. He also pointed out that the decisions being made (hundreds of them) are not being driven by IT needs, they are being driven by users.

In addition to the three systems upgrades, there are three other work streams in process: technology, portal, and reporting and data management. Mr. Hill said they learned that reporting and data management must be part of the process, rather than something looked at once an upgrade is complete, and the portal will be the way into these systems. The portal will bring the existing one-stop and the existing portal into one site with a single sign-in.

The three key challenges arise from the difficulty of bringing all three systems live at the same time, Mr. Hill related. (1) Timing includes the confluence of many different work streams. (2) The complexity of the organization, with its different campuses and calendars. (3) The scale of the change, which is huge; it has a budget of \$84 million (15% for contingencies) and will take three years, time needed for consultation and personnel. He reviewed the timelines for the systems, for reporting, and for the portal, all of which are to be operational in late 2014.

Professor Kohlstedt reiterated with Mr. Hill a point that she made at a previous meeting with Vice President Studham: The testing and design of the systems will begin later this year and it will be important for faculty and staff to be involved in that phase as well as the analysis and design. People who will be using them must see them as the systems are being rolled out.

Ms. Selander said that in the case of the portal, they will build, design, and measure, and want users involved with an iterative design process and get feedback from them. They will do that every few weeks. Mr. Hill said that the portal is more agile and they can keep circling back with changes, and that is already happening. For the three systems they are using more traditional methods because they are much bigger pieces. The analysis and design phases take a number of months (a little less for the finance system because it is newer); they are at the start of "analyze and design" for the student and human resources systems and are getting out to people as they proceed; they will do that with each of the three systems and then again with all three together. There will be multiple opportunities for people to be exposed to the systems as they are developed.

Professor Bitterman asked if the portal will have a Google-like intuitive search function (it will). Most important, he said, is that if one doesn't know the magic letters to find something, one can still do so with a search. Mr. Hill said such a function would be included. Professor Pacala emphasized the importance of Professor Bitterman's point. He asked how much of the portal can be customized by college without a lot of other clutter; for example, the Medical School courses, access to PubMed, and so on). The medical records system is the big monster in the corner and these systems now require different sign-ins. Ms. Selander said the issue is finding a balance between standardization and customization for the colleges.

Professor Ben-Ner said that integration means integrating the Medical School, Morris, and so on with the Twin Cities campus; this is a very complex system and one can see the benefits and costs. Was there consideration given to less than full integration, like Google, which is not integrated but draws on information as one needs? Full integration is very costly and vulnerable to glitches that can bring down the whole system. He urged them to think of the possibility of several fully integrated systems, like islands that are connected by bridges. Ms. Selander said they are early in the stage of gathering information and the reality is that there must be a defined scope, date, and budget, and they want to build a foundational system that supports sustainability for ongoing innovation in the portal. Mr. Hill said they have examined alternatives. The market is evolving for enterprise products and it will be difficult for the University to move away from PeopleSoft, but not after the technology is updated; then the technology can be used in the cloud. (The cloud applications are not built for higher education yet but they do want to take advantage of fast-paced technological change so that they do not have to do \$80-million upgrades in the future.)

Ms. Selander reviewed the portal questions. There is an existing portal, she noted, that needs to be upgraded because it relies on outdated technology that is no longer supported. They are trying to understand why people do not use the portal, if they do not, because this is a great opportunity to create a portal that will be useful for all faculty, staff, and students. The questions they are posing are these: "What are the opportunities in a new portal?" "How can a portal enhance your role at the University?" and "What capabilities or functionality would you like see in a portal?" They have a faculty advisory committee but would also like advice from this Committee.

Professor Lanyon commented that the portal would be helpful if, a la Amazon, it suggested additional things someone might be interested in, based on the choices made (e.g., if someone is a department chair, the portal could suggest items of interest to a department chair). Is that option in the technology? It is possible to suggest things based on roles or affinities defined in the University's identity management system, Ms. Selander said, but they need to evaluate it because they do not want people's portals cluttered. Professor Lanyon said that people frequently take on new roles at the University, some of which may have a steep learning curve, and providing information for those roles to people who assume them would be helpful. Ms. Selander said that role-based definitions would provide people with alerts and with information about what they need to do.

Professor McCormick said that in the student system, it will be important that faculty members are able to see what the students see.

Professor Sheets said it has been frustrating to have duplicate portals; it is planned that there will be only one? Ms. Selander said they learned long ago that there are multiple entries to the University that can be confusing. They plan to integrate the One Stop, employee self-service, and other portal type sites at the University, but how that will be accomplished has not yet been determined.

Professor Sheets asked if the faculty-expertise database will also be created, with data, publications, professional activities, and so on, as is currently the case with SciVal. Mr. Hill said that is not within the scope of the ESUP. Professor Sheets said that SciVal is in competition with the portal and it may be that resources will be wasted, and SciVal could end up operating in isolation. Mr. Hill said they would look at the issue and said they continue to hope for one sign-on site.

With respect to open access, part of the Libraries' digital conservancy, the Libraries are part of the user group that they are working with as an important stakeholder, Ms. Selander reported.

Professor Lanyon said that with respect to reports, it would be helpful to be able to select a group of people to be included in the report (e.g., full professors in a department) rather than automatically including everyone in a unit or department.

Committee members raised questions about the extent to which alumni data will be included and whether if there will be bookmarks or history of the last 10 web sites visited.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Mr. Hill and Ms. Selander for keeping the Committee informed. Mr. Hill said they would welcome the participation of the Committee in the process and said the upgrade website has a great deal of information [at <http://upgrade.umn.edu/>]. They want to get this right, he assured the Committee.

## **2. Committee Business**

The Committee approved unanimously the Faculty Senate docket for April 4, 2013.

Professor Kohlstedt said that she will seek individuals who would be willing to serve as Clerk of the Senate during 2013-14.

The Committee considered individuals who had been nominated for or expressed interest in the position of faculty legislative liaison, a position that will be open next year with Professor Sheets' going on to phased retirement. Several points arose in the discussion:

- Whoever takes the position should commit to at least one biennium of service because it takes a year to get to know the individuals and the process.
- The reporting function is less important than it was because of Mr. Rohloff's regular updates from the legislative sessions.
- The work is concentrated for three months in the spring, attending legislative committee hearings and meeting with legislators.

Professor Kohlstedt agreed to contact the individuals whom the Committee believed would be the best candidates for the position.

The Committee has been asked for the names of individuals to participate in a decanal review (for a dean who is not the dean of a collegiate unit). The process allows for the person being reviewed to nominate faculty members; the Committee concluded it wished to identify other individuals to participate.

Professor Lanyon asked what the role of these faculty members is in the review; Professor Cramer said it is primarily to provide information about the unit and how it functions from an insider (faculty member's) perspective. Professor Lanyon said that perhaps they should play a more evaluative role; Professor Kohlstedt observed that nothing is written down about the role and that it plays out in a variety of ways. In response to a query from Professor Cloyd on the frequency with which deans are reviewed, Professor Cramer said that the provost has a spreadsheet and all of the deans are scheduled for three-year reviews.

### **3 Athletic Matters**

Professor Kohlstedt next noted the recommendations from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) about how to increase faculty involvement in the governance of intercollegiate athletics; she also noted the response of the University's Faculty Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (FAOCIA). The recommendation calls for creating a panel composed only of tenured faculty members and a senior athletics representative to the NCAA, both to be created and appointed by the faculty governance body (e.g., the faculty senate), separate from governance of athletics appointed by other individuals or groups. FAOCIA indicated that the recommendations reflect in large part the practices at the University.

Professor Cloyd asked if the members of the Committee are satisfied with the faculty role in the governance of athletics on this campus. Professor Cramer, with the assent of others around the table, said that they are and noted that the Committee will receive annual reports from FAOCIA and the Faculty Athletics Representatives later in the semester.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the recommendations of the Coalition to the NCAA.

Professor Kohlstedt next asked if Committee members were satisfied with the draft document from the Big Ten Conference "Standards for Safeguarding Institutional Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics." She noted that when an earlier draft was discussed by the faculty senate leaders of the CIC schools, there was a question about whether there should be more explicit language about faculty governance. She said the draft language appears to be adequate but the Committee can say to President Kaler that it expects that the faculty role in the governance of athletics will continue.

Professor McCormick asked if the Faculty Senate would have any liability if there were a scandal. Committee members expressed considerable doubt that it would, as an advisory body.

### **4. Statement on Governance Service**

Professor Kohlstedt drew the attention of Committee member to a draft statement the Committee might adopt concerning participation by faculty members in the governance of the University. She said that in the discussions with the newly-tenured associate professors, they made the point that once they achieved tenure they were suddenly expected to do a great deal more service. They wondered if there should be some kind of incentive for such service. Professor Hancher told them that people participate in the work of committees such as this one because they believe it important to the governance of the institution and because there is a reward in meeting colleagues from across the institution.

Professor McCormick said he has wondered if service on bodies such as this committee are on par with other kinds of service; it would be interesting to know what administrators and deans think about the statement. Professor Ropers-Huilman said it is an important statement in a number of ways, including that it explains to people who are not involved why they should be; it establishes a model, and it is activity that is endorsed in departmental 7.12 statements. Professor Luepker said the statement reflects something worth saying regularly because junior faculty members do not have the perspective and need to be reminded of it. Sometimes governance service is viewed as diversionary.

Professor Sheets agreed on the value of statement and suggested making a distinction between institutional and other kinds of service. The 7.12 statements focus on professional service; institutional service tends to be un- or under-appreciated—but it is directly linked to the vitality of the institution.

Professor Pacala said it was a good statement and that he would like a dialogue with administrators and deans about whether faculty governance is a "may" or a "must." In the Medical School, service on the admissions committee, promotion and tenure committee, and IRB committees are a "must," but he does not know about governance or where the deans sit. Professor Kohlstedt said she would put the topic on the list of issues to be discussed with the deans the next time they have lunch with Committee members.

Professor Cloyd asked who the audience is for the statement. It was written with the faculty in mind, Professor Kohlstedt said, and now the suggestion is that it could be directed to the deans as well. One key group is the associate and full professors who shape the views of incoming faculty, Professor Cloyd maintained; they need to be reminded that service is noble. Professor Bitterman suggested that it also be provided to new deans.

The Committee voted unanimously to adopt the statement, which read as follows after minor editorial changes following Committee discussion:

### Reflections on Governance Service

#### A Statement by the Faculty Consultative Committee to the Faculty

Both in recent discussions and from time to time over many years, the question of recognition (financial or other) for service by faculty members to their department, college, and at the University level has arisen. The members of the Faculty Consultative Committee (who self-evidently value service to the institution) offer reflections to their colleagues about service.

The idea of "service" in an institution such as ours arises from the ancient conception of the university as a self-governing community of scholars. While modern law recognizes only a corporate structure and vests plenary authority in governing boards, the prevailing ethos and the actual practice of a major research university is that of a democracy where scholars make the important decisions about carrying out the mission. But the university cannot strive to reach the ideal of the self-governing community of scholars unless some of us participate in decision-making processes at all levels of the university.

It would be possible to leave all major decisions in the hands of deans and vice presidents and the president and provost. It is perhaps even likely that many of their decisions would have positive effects for the faculty, the university, and the state. But it would not be all of them, and even when administrative officers could be seen as moving in the right direction, there are often—usually—nuances of decisions and policy that those in governance can inform them about in order to significantly improve the decisions. Moreover, the members of the community of scholars have a responsibility to seek changes and decisions that they believe important to the well-being of the university; it is not primarily, or even mostly, the responsibility of the institutional administrators to do so.

Some have urged that there be a financial reward or incentive for participation in service in intra-institutional governance service. While we are sympathetic to that proposition, we believe there are good reasons why an explicit provision of financial incentive for service is most often counter-intuitive to the idea of shared governance.

First, as we pointed out, one of the obligations of a faculty member in an institution like ours is to participate in its governance. It is part of the definition of a faculty member that he or she has a role in governance. There are intrinsic rewards to participation beyond the financial, including having a voice in determining actions taken and, outside the department, the almost-invariably rewarding experience of meeting colleagues from other departments and colleges.

Second, as far as we can tell, virtually every department 7.12 statement, required by the Regents' tenure policy, has language that recognizes service. When decisions about merit and promotion are being made, a department that pays no attention to institutional as well as departmental, collegiate, and disciplinary service does so at the cost of understanding and recognizing how we conduct the university's business.

We are also concerned that the practice of sheltering probationary faculty members from almost all service responsibilities can be a mistake. By doing so, they have a distorted view of what it means to be a full-fledged member of the community of scholars, with its attendant obligations. While we concur that probationary faculty members should not be expected to perform significant levels of service, we believe they should be involved at a level that will not harm their prospects of achieving tenure but that will provide them an understanding of what it means to be a citizen of a major research university.

## **5. Report from the Committee on Committees**

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Ms. Doepner-Hove to the meeting to report on the Faculty Committee on Committees review of committees that report to the Faculty Senate.

Ms. Doepner-Hove began by noting that this year is the second year or what will be an annual process of review of senate committees by the Faculty Committee on Committees; over five years, they will review all senate committees in order to provide them help, review charge, and evaluate how they are doing. The chair of the Committee on Committees talks with the chair of the committee being reviewed, Committee on Committees members meet with the committee, and a draft report is then prepared for review by the committee.

They had three general comments: (1) There is need to improve the technology for meetings to allow coordinate campus members to attend without traveling to the Twin Cities. (2) There is a need to integrate e-learning appropriately in the governance system, whether through an ad hoc or new standing committee or through existing committees. (3) They encourage communication among committee chairs in order to coordinate discussions of topics; the biannual meetings of committee chairs helps facilitate such coordination.

The Committee on Committees found that the committees it reviewed were generally working well. The Council on Liberal Education requested small changes in the language of its charge; the

Committees on Faculty Affairs and on Research asked for a postdoc member; the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure asked for two graduate students as members. The Committee on Committees has endorsed all of the requests.

Professor Ratliff-Crain emphasized the importance of connectivity for coordinate campus committee members.

Professor Kohlstedt asked about responses to requests to serve on committees; Ms. Doepner-Hove said it is generally quite good. Are new committee members identified by Committee on Committee initiative or in response to the survey of interest, Professor Kohlstedt asked? Both, Ms. Doepner-Hove said. Professor Cramer asked which colleges have the least participation on a per-capita basis; Ms. Doepner-Hove said it is the professional schools (Law, Public Affairs, Carlson School).

Professor Cloyd asked if the Committee on Committees ever takes a look at the representatives on all committees in total to consider diversity and college representation. They have not but they will do so, Ms. Doepner-Hove said, in response to a request from Professor Cloyd that the Committee request such an analysis.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Ms. Doepner-Hove for the report and for the work of the Committee on Committees. She adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota