

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 6, 2003
1:15 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Judith Martin (chair), Jean Bauer, Susan Brorson, Charles Campbell, John Fossum, Emily Hoover, Marc Jenkins, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Martin Sampson, Carol Wells
- Absent: Gary Balas, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Arthur Erdman, Dan Feeney
- Guests: Executive Vice President Christine Maziar, Vice Provost Craig Swan (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost); Distinguished McKnight Professor David Bernlohr
- Other: John Ramsay (American Council on Education Fellow); Sandra Ecklein (Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost); Katherine Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) Mt. Graham telescope resolution; (2) discussion with Executive Vice President Maziar (admissions and branding); (3) discussion with Distinguished McKnight Professor David Bernlohr (branding and perceptions of the University); (4) report on the annual meeting of the Big Ten faculty leaders]

1. Mt. Graham Resolution

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:20 and said the first item of business was deciding where to direct the resolution concerning the University's participation in the Large Binocular Telescope project at Mt. Graham, Arizona.

Professor Wells said she was disturbed by the whole motion--not per se but for what it represents. It is a challenge to the academic freedom of the research program of the Astronomy Department. What if someone were to bring a resolution calling for a ban on the use of all animals in research? Would the Senate debate that? What about a resolution to stop abortion training? Or to stop the teaching of evolution? Where does this stop? She recalled that former Provost Brody went to the legislature and said it should link the appropriation to changes in personnel rules in the Academic Health Center; one legislator took advantage of the invitation to include a ban on teaching abortion. This resolution opens the door for that kind of action. She said she had two thoughts about what to do. One, propose a counter-resolution that no resolution that controls research that is not in violation of state or federal law will be considered (which may be inappropriate since all faculty have academic freedom). Or two, perhaps the Astronomy Department should file a complaint with the Judicial Committee.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

The second is not possible, Professor Morrison said, because individuals have academic freedom, not departments. Viewed narrowly, as an objection to University ownership/participation in construction, there may not be an academic freedom issue, although the resolution is still troubling. But it does not stop the Astronomy Department from looking at the stars. But without being able to participate in such a project, Professor Marshak responded, the Astronomy Department cannot look at the stars at a level appropriate for a major research university.

It might be useful for the Social Concerns Committee to hear from Professor Raymond Duvall, who is serving as chair of the task force on academic freedom, Professor Martin commented.

Professor Kane said she disagreed with Professors Wells and Morrison. The Senate is eager to hear both sides; the vote to extend time on the debate was approved overwhelmingly. Senators wanted to hear the issues. Any sense of heavy-handedness is a bad idea, given what the University stands for, and would be politically inept as well. The Committee should not try to stifle or limit discussion; that would be counterproductive. Most Committee members around the table concurred with Professor Kane's view.

The decision about the telescope has already been made, Professor Fossum noted. The impact or result of the resolution is primarily an academic freedom issue. Imagine that the telescope already exists and the University of Arizona faculty invite University of Minnesota faculty to participate in a project using the telescope. The University would then be involved with it but there would be the same potential religious problems as if the University had extended financial support. So this is primarily an academic freedom issue. Professor Martin said she was worried that the effort, with the arguments about religious and sacred space, is an attempt to embarrass the President and Board of Regents. The Senate should not be in that position, she maintained.

Professor Marshak said he agreed that it is an academic freedom issue. The Committee should not be heavy-handed, and should bring the resolution back to the Senate, but he said he is bothered by the academic freedom issue. Professor Campbell agreed; the issue, he said, is what role the steering committee (the Senate Consultative Committee for the University Senate) can play to be sure that issues are ripe for Senate discussion. It can send issues back to committees with instructions that a proposal is not adequately prepared.

Professor Morrison agreed and suggested that the steering committee send the resolution back, both to the Social Concerns Committee and the Research Committee, and ask them to prepare, jointly or separately, resolutions for the Senate. With respect to asking Professor Duvall to speak to the committees, Executive Vice President Maziar--who had joined the meeting--noted that she and Professor Martin, in the charge, had asked to be apprized of the progress of the task force on academic freedom. Perhaps this is the time to learn if the work of the task force has jelled enough to bring it to this discussion. Professor Marshak endorsed Professor Morrison's proposal and said that both committees should be told that steering committee does not expect anything back until it has a resolution or resolutions from both committees.

Professor Wells said she would broaden the resolution: Nothing that has an impact on research should be brought to the Senate without going through the Research Committee.

Later in the meeting, after the discussion with Drs. Maziar and Swan, the Committee agreed that Professor Martin would communicate with the chairs of the Social Concerns and Research Committees to

inform them that the steering committee wanted resolution(s) for the Senate. It was agreed that the deadline would be set so that the resolutions could be presented to the March meeting of the Senate.

2. Discussion with Executive Vice President Maziar

Professor Martin at this point directed the discussion away from Mt. Graham. Dr. Maziar said she had asked Vice Provost Swan to join the meeting because they had identified issues from the last meeting around admissions practices and the coordinate campuses. She suggested that Professor Ratliff-Crain articulate his concerns again so that she and Dr. Swan could clarify points or respond so that any outstanding problems could be addressed.

The main issue they see in admissions is inter-campus competition for the same good students, Professor Ratliff-Crain explained. The perception at Morris is that it is losing good students to the Twin Cities campus, partly because of visibility and partly because institutional practices prevent Morris from getting in touch with and keeping in the pipeline talented students. Part of the problem is in the way information is shared. The issue of visibility is tied in part to the University's home page on the web: the coordinate campuses are not there. Students already know about the Twin Cities campus; for the University home page to be the Twin Cities campus means that the coordinate campuses are at a disadvantage and that one almost must know about them before going to the University's web page. Professor Brorson said that the Crookston campus was also concerned about the structure of the University's home page.

Dr. Swan discussed with the Committee the relationship between the Twin Cities and Morris admissions office and related issues. He pointed out that his office had no authority with respect to the University's web page or the decisions about branding.

There is also a structural issue related to the decline in the rural population, Professor Marshak reflected. The long-term health of Crookston and Morris require more than solving administrative glitches. There may need to be incentives to get students to matriculate on those campuses. The campuses that are readily accessible by freeway will not have the same kind of problems; because Morris and Crookston are more remote, they may have to take extra steps.

Dr. Maziar responded that the coordinate campuses have signatures that students choose because they want them. She said she did not believe that the Morris campus and CLA or CBS on the Twin Cities campus were the same and expressed doubt that they go head to head for students. She agreed that Crookston and Morris may need to make extraordinary efforts to recruit students, just as the private colleges do, by building a strong relationship with the high schools and a strong alumni network. In the past, large research universities did not have to make those efforts, and are only starting to do so now. She reported that she has provided additional money to Morris through the compact process to help them with recruiting.

As for the web, Dr. Maziar said she looked at the web pages for the University's peer institutions. The University of Minnesota does a much better job of highlighting the coordinate campuses on its web page than do other Big Ten schools, for example. In some cases, the web pages contain no reference at all to other campuses in a system. It would be possible for the University to have a system web page, she said, but she expressed doubt that many web users would come to the University through such a page. People use the University's home page as their own home page because it has interesting content.

Professor Ratliff-Crain noted that the argument for use of the Twin Cities campus as the home page is that 90% of the 60,000 daily hits on the web site are for the Twin Cities. That leaves a lot of hits that are not for the Twin Cities, however. Dr. Maziar said she believed the coordinate campuses are likely seen by more people than they would be on a system page, as a result of the links on the Twin Cities home page. They could do a marketing study. Professor Ratliff-Crain agreed that there were no data to support either view, at this point.

A larger number of students who fit the profile for Morris say they have decided to attend the Twin Cities campus, Professor Ratliff-Crain said. Morris is losing students who likely would have come there. Dr. Maziar said that Morris should be pleased that the quality and reputation of undergraduate programs on the Twin Cities has improved dramatically--but, she agreed, that change does affect the distribution of students. She said she is hearing from the private colleges that they are also displeased by the fact that the Twin Cities campus is attracting more high-ability students. What Morris needs to do is bottle the intensity of the experience students have at Morris and let prospective students know about it, Dr. Swan said.

Dr. Swan said that he and Mr. Sigler, the Director of Admissions on the Twin Cities campus, would come to the Morris campus to try to resolve the difficulties and problems.

Professor Martin thanked Drs. Maziar and Swan for joining the meeting.

Dr. Maziar reported that she had had a first meeting to discuss the President's initiatives, which are as follows.

"1. The **biosciences and biotechnology** initiative is a large umbrella for some fascinating, rapidly evolving fields such as industrial biology, where University researchers are turning renewable raw materials, such as corn and soybeans, into biodegradable plastics and textiles. This initiative will also encompass elements of our renewable energy strategy and bioinformatics and material sciences, two disciplines that now underpin many areas of progress in the biosciences and biotechnology, and which require powerful computational facilities and sophisticated new experimental tools.

"2. The **translational research in human health** initiative will reflect some major investments we are making in connecting our basic science knowledge to treating disease, including a new translational research facility made possible by a gift from William and Nadine McGuire in partnership with the state. The facility will help provide the intermediate step between the laboratory and the bedside for many of the most promising therapies and cures our researchers are investigating. The Mayo-University Partnership for Biotechnology and Medical Genomics will build on each other's distinctive research strengths with the help of a \$2 million initial appropriation from the state. We will also continue targeted investments in areas like oncology, neurosciences, cardiac disease, organ transplantation, applications of stem cell development, and clinical research.

"3. The **healthy foods, healthy lives** initiative will draw upon the university's unique mix of strengths in agriculture, foods and human health as well as our proximity to major areas of food production and food processing. The University is well positioned to provide accurate unbiased knowledge about how our eating habits affect our health, and can help reframe the public discussion

about foods and health from its current emphasis on how foods can hurt us to how foods can be used to promote healthful lives.

"4. The **environment and renewable energy** initiative will be largely aimed at "tying together" the multitude of environmental and energy related work happening at the University. As one example, we are actively seeking private foundation support for an ecosystem science and sustainability initiative. A second aspect is our renewable energy and the environment work that will be funded by Xcel Energy under a mandate from the legislature. This work includes clusters of scholarly activity around hydrogen fuel cells; bioenergy and bioproducts; policy, economics and ecosystems; and conservation and efficient energy systems. A third aspect of this initiative will be more of a research and demonstration project aimed at integrating sustainable practices and energy conservation across the full range of University activities. It will involve applied sustainable resource applications at the University- including renewable energy projects at the Twin Cities, Morris and Duluth campuses.

"5. The **brain development and vitality over the life span** initiative (also referred to as cognitive developmental neuroscience) will bring together many research strengths-from basic neuroscience to education-to help broaden our understanding of how the brain changes over the life span and how aging influences the way we think. This exciting area has the potential to help us understand when infants and children are ready to learn and how best to teach them. It will help us understand what can go wrong with the developing brain and how best to treat developmental disorders and psychopathology. It will also help us understand the declines that accompany aging with the potential to diminish the ravages of Alzheimer's and other age-related disorders of the brain. In this interdisciplinary collaboration we possess many well-regarded academic programs, including the Center for Magnetic Resonance Research.

"6. The **children, youth and families** initiative will explore and implement the recommendations of our Children's Summit this spring in several areas. These include creating a new Center on Excellence in Children's Mental Health, improvement of educational and life outcomes for low-income children, and addressing the disparities in health, development, income and legal concerns we see among children of color and new immigrant populations.

"7. The **arts and humanities** initiative will focus on a new interdisciplinary arts curriculum, a deepening of our collaborations with other arts organizations in the community, and a system-wide resource in our Humanities Institute.

"8. The **law, ethics and policy** initiative has leveraged the University's strengths in the life sciences, the humanities, law and public policy. Its success has underscored my conviction that the truly "big" questions raised by new knowledge or technology are best tackled at a university like ours, in close proximity to the scholars performing cutting edge research."

3. Discussion with Professor David Bernlohr

Professor Martin next welcomed Distinguished McKnight Professor David Bernlohr to the meeting to discuss issues that may be of concern to the Distinguished McKnight Professors or that they believe this Committee should be thinking about.

Professor Bernlohr began by telling the Committee that in his field he deals with a lot of people who have no association with the University and he is able to learn about outsider perceptions of the institution. He said he has never heard so many positive comments about the University as he has in the last 12-24 months--about its programs, its buildings, and the improvement of the grounds. He is also hearing that people with children who are top students want to send them to the University as their first choice. With the budget issues, there is a question about whether the University will be able to continue to make progress so it is not seen as "plan B" by outstanding students. Right now more and more of them see the University as the place to be in the upper Midwest.

But the great budget years are gone, there are no big building projects; the University must find a way to address the problem of keeping its momentum, Professor Bernlohr said. He has the sense that people are proud of sending their children to the University. "I like that," he said; how will the University foster that attitude?

Professor Bernlohr said he worried about the branding issue and what the brand will portray to people in the Twin Cities. He said he did not know the latest version but that he was in a focus group a few months earlier and the emphasis appeared to be on "big." It is "big time," Professor Martin told him. Contrast that with the Hamline University billboard, Professor Bernlohr commented, which makes the point that their faculty know the names of all their students. He wondered about the message that the University would be sending with the "big time" theme. It would be better to have people think of the University as a place where one can realize his or her potential, not that it is just bigger.

Professor Martin said that the Committee members were uneasy about the campaign. Professor Bernlohr said he is in a big department; they spend a lot of time trying to make it smaller in various ways so that it is connected to people.

Do the Distinguished McKnight Professors talk about issues, Professor Martin asked? They have an annual lunch, Professor Bernlohr said, but they do not have any overwhelming or "hot button" issues. Most want to find out what they are supposed to do so they can do it better tomorrow. The Distinguished McKnight professorship program is thought very highly of by his faculty, he said; they know who the DM professors are and wonder who will be nominated. There is interest in being chosen and pride in it, but the group does not advocate for particular positions.

Professor Sampson said he was fascinated by the good news that Professor Bernlohr brought. If he had to distill his insights into wisdom for branding, or for the legislature, what guidance would he offer, Professor Sampson asked? Are there particular themes the University should reinforce? What might the University be saying that would resonate with the average citizen? The University needs to promote recognition/realization of the quality of the academic programs here--they are top programs--and that it has places where students will learn from faculty who are world-class. The emphasis should not be that the University has everything. It has top programs, people, facilities, pride in what it does, and that it is a better place to realize opportunities. He said he recoils against the "big" concept, which goes exactly the wrong way.

Did the other members of his focus group agree, Professor Campbell asked? They did, Professor Bernlohr responded, and he is surprised that the idea keeps coming up. The Committee was told that it is not the audience, Professor Campbell pointed out. They were told, Professor Wells added, that the concept is overwhelmingly supported, whoever the audience is. Professor Bernlohr cautioned that his

focus group was only about a half-dozen faculty who had the idea bounced off them. Professor Campbell said he was surprised the group was asked, since it is not aimed at faculty. But it is cheesy and dangerous, meaning the tag line could backfire on us (e.g., Big Time scandal), Professor Kane said.

Professor Bernlohr said he liked the idea of branding in general; it has value he said, but this concept does not convey the image the University wants. It is the wrong direction, away from the issues of quality, students, potential, and is more "the big top." A brand or slogan must appeal to external constituencies but also the internal constituents, Professor Fossum said; it must make people at the organization proud to be part of it. One of the best examples was the Ford campaign, "Quality is Job 1." Those in the auto industry know that "job 1" is the first car off the assembly line, and everything was oriented to getting "job 1" done--even if it meant sacrificing quality. That campaign by Ford had two intended effects: consumers were to see a Ford as a quality product and employees were to see quality as of highest importance. A brand must have an effect on INTERNAL attitudes as well as external, he concluded.

That seems not to be part of the program, Professor Martin said. Nor does the "big time" concept echo the positive perceptions people like Professor Bernlohr are hearing in the community, Professor Sampson said. This Committee told Vice President Gardebring that it would acquiesce to the campaign, Professor Campbell recalled; perhaps that was a mistake and the Committee should discuss the matter at the next highest level in the University.

Small things have a large effect on how the University is perceived, Professor Bernlohr commented, such as words, buildings, the position an institution takes. The University a few years ago tried to avoid use of the block "M" because it was associated with the athletic program. That was a mistake, because that block "M" is probably the most-recognized symbol of the University. He said he worries that the image created by "big time" will defeat the progress of the last five-seven years.

Some of the good things that Professor Bernlohr heard about the University had nothing to do with its academic programs, Professor Fossum observed; some were related to the physical plant, for example. That has made a huge difference. Professor Campbell recalled the campaign based on Garrison Keillor's comment that the University "is one of the glories of the state"; "that made me feel good," he said. That speaks well to the state but not outside it, Professor Bernlohr observed, and even if the campaign is aimed primarily at Minnesotans, it will appear on every televised basketball and football game.

It was agreed that the Committee would revisit the branding issue with the President or Provost, and that Professor Martin should notify Vice President Gardebring about the Committee's change of mind. Professor Martin thanked Professor Bernlohr for joining the meeting.

4. Meeting of Faculty Leaders of the Big Ten

Professor Martin next reported on the meeting of the faculty leaders of the CIC schools the previous week (the Big Ten plus the University of Chicago, except that Chicago never attends so it is in effect a meeting of Big Ten faculty leaders). Last year the discussion was focused heavily on athletics and launched the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. This year the discussions focused on a number of governance issues.

-- There was considerable discussion about the kinds of issues the governance systems at the various campuses are involved in. She learned that there is an enormous difference across the campuses in terms of what is defined as an appropriate activity for faculty governance and an equally enormous difference in the access faculty have to administrators and regents. Many were surprised at how often the faculty at Minnesota are consulted by administrators and regents. Consultation and governance seems to be more deeply embedded in the organization here than at some of the other schools. One of the representatives commented in a side conversation that if he had to start over and use a template for a governance system at his university, he would pick Minnesota as the model.

-- The composition of the faculty is an issue around the CIC. The Bales committee tried to deal with the issue when it proposed the academic appointments policy. The general concern is that more and more people who are not regular faculty are being brought in: They are cheap labor, do the work and are not the pesky faculty members who call administrators to account. There did not appear to be any resolution to the problem; there was instead considerable hand-wringing about the apparent disappearance of the tenured faculty as a class.

-- There was a discussion of student academic integrity; they heard from Ohio State's equivalent of the University's Student Judicial Affairs officer. As with Minnesota, most cases at Ohio State are resolved before they reach the formal process.

-- There was a lively discussion of whether and in what setting faculty should be more engaged in articulating the value of the university to legislators and the kinds of things that faculty can do.

As a summary, she said she was surprised to learn what the faculty at Minnesota take for granted is not taken for granted elsewhere.

Professor Martin adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota