

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, May 16, 2013  
1:00 – 5:00  
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris Cramer, Will Durfee, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Elaine Tyler May, Alon McCormick, James Pacala, Ned Patterson, Paul Ranelli
- Absent: Nancy Ehlke, Russell Luepker, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, George Sheets
- Guests: Provost Karen Hanson; Vice Provost Robert McMaster (Office of Undergraduate Education); Regents Linda Cohen and David Larson; Professor Fred Morrison (Benefits Advisory Committee); Dann Chapman (Employee Benefits); Professor Jean Wyman (incoming Committee member)
- Other: Joseph Schultz (Office of the Provost); Ken Savary, Brian Steeves (Office of the Board of Regents); Tina Falkner (Benefits Advisory Committee)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson [graduate education, college constitutions]; (2) report from the faculty legislative liaison; (3) academic program reviews; (4) differential treatment of students in athletics; (5) discussion with Board of Regents chair Cohen and vice chair Larson; (6) changes to the UPlan]

**1. Discussion with Provost Hanson (graduate education, college constitutions)**

Professor Kohlstedt convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Provost Hanson.

Provost Hanson began with the subject of graduate education. They are making progress in beginning a thorough review of where the University stands with respect to graduate education; she and Professor Kohlstedt have prepared a draft charge to a special committee on graduate education, to be jointly appointed by her and this Committee, and they hope to have working groups appointed by fall that will also meet together as a committee of the whole. The charge has identified the major issues they believe the group should address, although they continue to analyze the survey results and want to include the findings in the charge. She reviewed the draft charge letter.

The draft charge, as suggested by the Committee but not yet approved by the provost, read as follows (between the \* \* \*):

\* \* \*

***Charge***

---

\* 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.

The Special Committee on Graduate Education (SCGE), jointly appointed by Provost Karen Hanson and the Faculty Consultative Committee, is designed to work both collectively and in four working groups or subcommittees and is charged with analyzing the ways in which we can best address specific concerns that have emerged about graduate education. The issues on which it will focus are those raised by the 2013 survey of graduate students, faculty, and staff who work with graduate students and by the reports from Senate committee chairs. Some concerns can perhaps be addressed in the near future; others may take more time. The SCGE is asked to make a final report to the Provost and FCC by December, 2013, but interim reports and recommendations from the working groups might be forthcoming well before that deadline. The final report should not only provide recommended responses to identified problems but should also include recommendations to strengthen and re-envision the Graduate School for the future. Because there are discrete issues as well as overlapping concerns, the committee will be composed of subcommittees topically organized by the categories below.

### *Issues*

The issues to be addressed by the committee are those that have been identified by the university community as of most concern. The initial focus will be on programs' research degrees, particularly those that the National Research Council has identified as central to its assessment of graduate education in the United States. The increasingly heterogeneous nature of graduate education does not make this a simple categorization, because there are significant research degrees in professional fields and multiple career paths are pursued by those in traditional scholarly disciplines. However, the initial purpose of this committee is to focus on programs and departments where research degrees are the central concern of graduate education. The committee may at a later date consider ways in which the Graduate School can best address other issues of graduate education in the professional schools.

**A) Graduate student financing.** Funding for graduate education has been strained by a variety of pressures on the university budget and the diminution of external funding by foundations and outside agencies. We have tended to support graduate students by giving them stipends and covering their tuition and benefits in return for their efforts as Teaching Assistants and Research Assistants (appointments which are of course important components of their graduate training). Fellowship funding, however, has not kept pace with some of our competitors or with our own increased tuition and fees, and there are serious limitations on research support for graduate student professional development, including travel and publication support. What should be done to improve funding for graduate education?

**B) The role of the Graduate School as a facilitator of graduate student progress to degree.** What direct roles should the Graduate School have in working with graduate students and how can the Graduate School appropriately complement the functions of the colleges and departments? What is the most effective, efficient, and humane arrangement of responsibilities for various oversight, notification, and record-keeping functions?

**C) Graduate Enrollment Management.** How many graduate programs should we have and how should they be configured? How should colleges decide on the appropriate sizes of their various graduate programs? Is placement one of the reasonable metrics? How should the impact of graduate student numbers on faculty scholarly productivity be taken into consideration? To what extent are recruitment numbers relevant? If there are to be reductions or eliminations of programs, what processes are appropriately employed to make such decisions? What is and should be the role of the Graduate School in facilitating such discussions?

**D) Visibility and Quality of the Graduate School** In the tripartite mission of the University of Minnesota – viz., Research and Discovery, Teaching and Learning, and Outreach and Public Service – the fact that graduate education is a critical component is too often overlooked. In many disciplines, graduate education goals are split equally between missions 1 and 2, and in some areas graduate education reaches all three elements of mission. But when some of our public constituencies think about Teaching and Learning, they think mostly about undergraduate students, and when they think about Research and Discovery, they think mainly about faculty. How can we keep issues of graduate education in the foreground of thinking about higher education at a research university?

\* \* \*

Professor Kohlstedt said that the special committee could gather data over the summer and start work in the fall. The issues rose to the top in discussions the Committee had with department chairs and heads last fall as well as from the survey about graduate education. Provost Hanson said that while there are local issues, there are also national issues (such as the relationship between graduate education and the research enterprise). With respect to the timeline, she said that if there are things that need amelioration, she would like to see them addressed in fall semester, but some of the issues require longer-term solutions. She also said, in response to a query from Professor Ben-Ner, that the special committee would have the freedom to bring up issues it identifies as well. Professor May suggested the name of Jon Butler, recently retired from Yale and incoming president of the Organization of American Historians, who has long been interested in graduate education; Provost Hanson and Professor Kohlstedt said they would be glad to consider asking him.

Professor Bearinger said she was pleased at the attention being given to graduate education and recalled that the Committee has talked before about the interface between the two groups, i.e., the Graduate Education Council and the special committee being formed now; it would help the launch of the special committee if it had an historical view of discussions over the last several years and if it builds on what prior faculty groups identified and reviewed regarding the previous structure and function of the Graduate School. She emphasized that she would like to see the work of this special committee lead to change that makes the University more attractive to graduate students. The institution needs to be in a different place from where it is now, and the committee needs to look back at where it has been. It also needs to identify how it relates to the Graduate Education Council, she reiterated.

Provost Hanson said that everyone knows this is a collaboration between faculty governance and the provost's office, which includes the office of Vice Provost Schroeder. This is cast as looking back and where to go in the future, and the special committee does need to fold in the work that has been done before by faculty committees.

Professor Cloyd suggested that item C is Graduate Program Management and should include some mention of quality and how external reviews will be incorporated in program assessment. Is the MBA included in item D? Professor Patterson asked if the language "may at a later date consider ways in which the Graduate School can best address other issues of graduate education in the professional schools" mean professional degrees; Provost Hanson said that it does. Then it needs to fit with accreditation as well, Professor Patterson said. (Provost Hanson said that the MBA is not seen as a research degree, it is a professional degree.)

With respect to building on prior work, Professor Pacala said his perspective on item C is that it largely done. Much work has been done to develop metrics; has something changed so that that work needs to be done again? Provost Hanson said she is ready to be informed on that point. She has read the previous reports and it is unclear whether they have all been implemented in the colleges. Professor Pacala expressed the hope that all the work that has already been done is captured in the efforts of the group that is responsible for item C.

Professor Durfee suggested that item D should refer to the quality and visibility of graduate education, not the Graduate School. It is not clear how Ph.D. programs will be assessed; if this work will be making statements about how they will be assessed, that should be in bold. If this is about Ph.D. programs, the letter should say so. Professor Kohlstedt said the special committee would also look at research Master's degrees. Professor Durfee said that what is to be included in the scope of the special committee's work needs some thought in order to keep it focused.

Provost Hanson said that there is forward movement on the broader issue of program review and assessment; the Regents were provided a report on the topic last week and she hopes to develop a plan for more episodic reviews. Key to a review are faculty resources: there are elements of undergraduate education that have nothing to do with graduate education, and vice-versa, but the faculty are essential to both. She said she wishes to have an ongoing process that is a partnership between the colleges and departments and the Graduate School, neither completely centralized nor decentralized. Professor Lanyon said he liked the efficiency of reviewing undergraduate and graduate programs together, but it must be clear that many graduate programs do not mesh with or overlap with undergraduate programs.

Professor Cloyd said that if there are external assessments of a program (i.e., for accreditation), those reports should be used. Provost Hanson said that the program reviews would funnel in data from accreditation reports but that they are not the same as the quality reviews they have in mind. Accreditation is meeting a bar, not an assessment of whether the program makes the best use of resources or where it stands nationally, for example. But there will be a process to pull the accreditation reports into the program reviews, she said.

Professor Bearinger suggested that item A should be graduate education financing or financing of graduate education, not graduate student financing.

Professor Bearinger also said that when the Committee met with the deans, one point that came up was that databases have not kept pace with the demands for evaluation. The special committee may not have the data it needs and there is no central data repository that is consistent across schools. The special committee can address that problem, but it may be putting the cart before the horse. Professor Kohlstedt suggested that matter is part of item C. She agreed that data are important and said she has spoken with the president's chief of staff, Ms. Phenix, about appointment of someone to be a liaison with governance committees for data they need; such a person could help obtain data that committees need to do their work.

Professor Bitterman asked how many of the University's institutional training grants have a faculty that are all within one college; he suggested that it is not many. Training grants need to be addressed and doing so requires an explicit look at of the millions of dollars that do not fit within a

college but that are high-profile, peer-reviewed, and essential in the sciences to obtaining top graduate students. They are extremely challenging when as many as six deans need to sign off on an application.

Professor Hancher asked where the fine arts fit in the work of the special committee. Research degrees are highlighted, so the Ph.D. and Ed.D. are included, but the arts are a big part of CLA. Those students deserve attention and should be included unless the work of the special committee is framed so that it does not. Professor Kohlstedt said that using the National Research Council (NRC; the fields covered are found at [http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/Resdoc/PGA\\_044521](http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/Resdoc/PGA_044521)) is a way to focus on the enterprise and assessment. Eventually the effort can be expanded but that is where it should start. Are the fine arts included in the NRC evaluations? Professor Hancher said that they are not. The degree of interest would be the MFA. Apparently at this stage of the study professional education is being deferred and the focus is on research education, but it needs to be made clear whether or not that focus includes the arts.

Professor Durfee commented that item D needs to speak to expanding the visibility of graduate education to students that programs are trying to recruit and to prospective faculty, which considerations may not overlap completely with perceptions of Minnesota citizens.

Professor Ranelli asked that the special committee pay attention to graduate programs on the Duluth campus—the only other University campus that has graduate programs—and how they relate to programs on the Twin Cities campus.

Provost Hanson turned next to college constitutions and said she was grateful for the work of the ad hoc committee on constitutions in uncovering information and making recommendations. There is need for further discussion about the recommendations to the colleges, the role of this Committee, and about the extent to which there should be templates for constitutions. She said she was concerned about any provision that something would happen if no action had been taken after 90 days, for example; she said she infers that constitutions have sort of "sprung up" but that there has been no formal approval in some cases. It would help the colleges if the Committee would provide clear guidelines.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the executive summary that had been provided to the provost was preliminary; Professor Luepker, who chairs the ad hoc committee, said there would be a full report in September that would include templates. Professor Hancher added that the ad hoc committee will not be "demanding" anything but will make a report to the provost and to this Committee with recommendations; perhaps after that the provost and Committee can make recommendations to the colleges.

Professor Lanyon commented that when the Committee met with the deans, the point was made that there may be things in college constitutions that should not be, including topics that are addressed in policies. It is important to convey the point that certain things should not be in constitutions. Provost Hanson agreed and said that some constitutional provisions appear to be in conflict with University policy. Another question is whether a constitution should build in a non-binding faculty referendum on a dean; faculties can conduct such a referendum whenever they wish but it is not clear that constitutions should provide for them. She said that it is very important, however, that constitutions define faculty roles and responsibilities and how they are chosen for institutional governance committees. She said it will be useful to get colleges started on looking at their constitutions—but she would like to see an

approach that does not require the faculty to spend every week for the next two years working on the constitution.

Professor Cramer asked who the arbiter would be. Will the provost's office wish to review college constitutions over the next 15 months? The constitutions are heterogeneous and someone will have to identify where there are conflicts with University policy and ask that the conflicts be eliminated. Provost Hanson said she didn't see any way around that process. It is important to define the role and responsibilities of the faculty because they are tied in with the daily lives of the departments. She said it would be better to have these conversations than to have useless constitutions.

Does that mean everything is reset to zero and all the constitutions will need to be approved, Professor Cramer asked? Provost Hanson said that at this point she does not know. Professor Hancher said there are 15 documents, of varying status; they should not be imagined away or erased but they should be approved after people review them—and they should be published so people know about them. If a college has a functioning constitution that it follows, Provost Hanson said, it should not be zeroed out, but if it is a document that has been gathering dust and plays no role in the college, it should be dusted off and reviewed.

Professor Cloyd said he could imagine a number of reasons for colleges to have constitutions; are there legal implications or reasons for having one? Provost Hanson said that is a very good question. So who reviews and approves them, Professor Cloyd asked? If they can become the basis for litigation?

On the question of meetings with sufficient number of people present to make decisions, Professor Patterson noted that his college, Veterinary Medicine, allows electronic voting.

Professor May observed that departments also have constitutions, or are supposed to, although she said she does not know how often they are used. If college constitutions are revamped, it could be that department constitutions would not be in conformity with them. She also commented that she did not know how much it mattered at the departmental level whether there is a constitution. Professor Hancher said that is the responsibility of the deans, and they do matter. Professor May asked if department constitutions should be consulted or if they should be reviewed after the college constitutions have been reviewed. Professor Hancher said that advice to the deans could include reviewing department constitutions, but that they were not part of the present study.

As a last matter for discussion, Professor Kohlstedt asked when the Committee might see the report on gender equity in salaries. Provost Hanson said that each dean has an account of where the college stands and is required to have a salary-equity review committee.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked the provost for joining the meeting.

## **2. Report from the Faculty Legislative Liaison**

Professor Kohlstedt accepted a motion to close the meeting temporarily, which was voted, in order to hear a report from Professor Buhr, one of the faculty legislative liaisons. At the end of his report, Professor Kohlstedt thanked Professor Buhr for all the time he had put in at the legislature this year.

### **3. Academic Program Reviews**

Professor Kohlstedt now welcomed Vice Provost Robert McMaster to the meeting. She reported that he and Vice Provost Schroeder gave a major report to the Board of Regents about academic program reviews; Dr. McMaster joined the Committee today to provide a report (Vice Provost Schroeder was out of town or would also have joined the meeting.) The Committee is interested in the reviews and the effort to include undergraduate as well as graduate education. When the reviews are conducted, there is much data to be gathered; Professor Kohlstedt said she understood from the report to the Regents that the administration is offering to gather some of the required data.

Vice Provost McMaster said that Professor Kohlstedt was correct. He reported that last spring Provost Hanson decided to take a look at the program review process and asked him and Dr. Schroeder to work on it. The process they have developed (in draft) follows from the reviews previously conducted by the Graduate School (that focused only on graduate education). He and Vice Provost Schroeder concluded that if the University is going to bring in outside experts for review of a department or program, the review should go beyond graduate education and consider the faculty, resources, productivity, and so on—a more holistic and comprehensive approach. He emphasized, however, that these proposals are a draft and nothing is fixed; they are looking for feedback. He provided copies of a set of slides and walked the Committee through them.

Dr. McMaster began with the structure of program reviews. As for scope, "What do we mean by 'program'? A degree? A department? A disciplinary cluster? What aspects of the program are reviewed?" His department, for example, Geography, has three undergraduate programs and three graduate programs. He said they understand that there is not necessarily a 1:1 mapping between departments and programs and that there are also interdisciplinary programs that do not map to departments.

What about timing? "How often should reviews be conducted?" This is a wide-open question, he said. Some institutions do regular 5- or 10-year reviews. The University has no history on this issue except for accreditation reviews (e.g., ABET in engineering, which is every six years). Other institutions conduct reviews when they are triggered by some criteria. He invited the Committee's views; should they be at set intervals or as needed? Again, in the case of his own department, Geography, there had been no review for 20 years, which seemed like too long a time to let a department go without review. While chair, Dr. McMaster initiated a review in consultation with the Graduate School. Many programs have not been reviewed for a decade or more. They also know that a number of departments or programs have external reviews and a number are accredited, but it is unclear how those processes are tied to program review. He noted that there had been a moratorium on program reviews, with the changes in the Graduate School; that moratorium has been "loosely lifted" but they do not know the number of programs that have recently been reviewed.

The program views should be coordinated with other review activities, Dr. McMaster said. Those include such things as assessment of student learning, specialized accreditation, Graduate Review and Improvement Process (GRIP), (for the Twin Cities) campus curriculum committee work, and the collegiate compact process.

Professor Hancher commented on the question of conducting reviews on a set cycle, or on an ad hoc basis. His instinct is to favor the cycle, which can help prevent emergencies. In CLA, past reviews

seemed to be productive in their regularity and it is not wise to wait for emergencies to develop. Moreover, waiting for emergencies to provoke a review would stigmatize the process.

Vice Provost McMaster highlighted briefly the purpose of program reviews, which are to evaluate quality and aid planning. The primary outcomes to be expected are "an objective assessment of the health and vitality of the academic programs; recommendations that lead to programmatic improvement, from maintaining strengths to remedying weaknesses; and alignment with institutional priorities and values."

Additional potential benefits provided by program review, he said, are "opportunities for our faculty and staff to engage with and learn about programs outside their unit, leading to an increase in cross-collegiate and cross-disciplinary collaborations; [and] opportunities for outside constituents to learn about the strengths of our programs, leading to enhanced external visibility and reputation of the University of Minnesota."

Professor Durfee inquired about the meaning of "alignment with institutional priorities and values." Dr. McMaster said that one example is the University's priority for STEM degrees; is the review process aligned with that priority? Will the priority lead to the creation of more professional Master's programs? Does this University wish to focus reviews more on programs that can offer such degrees? Should a program have more regular reviews because it is new?

One question about the reviews, Professor Durfee said, is whether they will be used to drive the allocation of resources and make decisions about program closure. Reviews are so important that that question should not dominate the process. Dr. McMaster said that the process is designed to be helpful, not a punitive one that pulls resources out of a program.

Dr. McMaster noted the components of a program review, at least those that are part of a more traditional approach:

1. Program faculty prepare a self-study report.
2. Reviewers examine self-study, may conduct site visit.
3. Review initiated, review team selected.
4. Reviewers prepare report with commentary and recommendations.
5. Final review and determination of outcomes.

Dr. McMaster also outlined the criteria of program review:

**Components for undergraduate program review:**

1. Brief history of the program
2. Curriculum and Advising
  - Characteristics of current degree program(s), requirements, and sample plans
    - PCAS data
  - Curriculum, courses offered, including offerings in the liberal-education curriculum, including writing-intensive courses
    - Data and descriptions from ECAS
  - Writing in the major, Writing Enriched Curriculum, Writing Intensive courses
  - Who teaches – philosophy/narrative



- 4 years of class schedule data and instructor of record
  - Role of Student Learning Outcomes [SLOs] and specific SLOs designed for the major
  - Internship opportunities
  - Advising and career counseling
3. Students
- Retention and graduation rates for students in the major
  - Profile of students in the major
    - Freshman characteristics
    - Data from scholarship databases, student financials
    - Transfer student characteristics
    - Study abroad participation
    - Student employment
    - Experiential learning / internships
    - Awards and recognitions
    - Student organizations

**Key data sources for undergraduate programs:**

4. Resources
- Space and facilities, labs, specialized facilities
  - Budgetary information
5. Data Sources
- Student credit hours
  - # majors
  - SERU data
  - Placement
  - Graduate school
  - Grade data
  - Time to degree
  - Double majors
  - Minors accompanying this major/minor

**Future Plans / challenges**

- Who are seen as peers? Competitors?
- Points of pride
- Challenges and opportunities
- Future goals and directions

**Core Questions for All (Graduate) Programs**

- What is the *purpose* of the program?
  - What are the desired outcomes?
- What is the *rationale and educational purpose* of each element of the program?
  - Which elements of the program should be retained and affirmed?

- Which elements could usefully be changed or eliminated?
- How do you *know*?
  - What *evidence* aids in answering those questions?
  - What evidence can be collected to determine whether changes serve the desired outcomes?

**Key metrics for graduate programs:**

- time to degree, completion and attrition rate and pattern
- level of student funding support
- student research and scholarly productivity: student publications, exhibitions, presentations, and performances
- graduate profile: job placements, continued contributions to the field

Professor May said she didn't see any reference to diversity, although many issues receive attention. Dr. McMaster said she made a good point and that it can be infused in the components of the review.

Professor Kohlstedt followed up on Professor Durfee's point: If there are institutional priorities and values, they need to be articulated so that departments and programs know about them.

If STEM fields are a priority, what about non-STEM fields, Professor May asked? This is a draft, Dr. McMaster observed. Should the institution have priorities in program reviews? Professor May said that if STEM fields are a priority, that does not mean that non-STEM fields should suffer.

Professor Pacala said that the presentation sounds like these will be fairly traditional program reviews. Dr. McMaster concurred. Professor Pacala wondered if alternative methods were discussed. In medical education they are moving away from this model to one where there is a continuous review process, which eliminates the periodic burden and adds a lighter load of ongoing review. Was that considered? That gets in to the cadence question, Dr. McMaster responded. If reviews are more frequent, then it can be a smoother process, he agreed, and they have not eliminated that as a possibility. But their orientation is toward a "deep dive" into a department's health.

Professor Lanyon commented that historically reviews took place every 5-10 years because it took so long to gather data. If the review process could include a stipulation of the data that are wanted, those could be looked at every year—and external reviewers could be brought in periodically for other reasons. They can provide some of the data, Dr. McMaster said, but the "softer" metrics are more difficult. If those "soft" metrics are identified as important, Professor Lanyon said, departments and colleges can develop systems to collect them.

Professor Cramer said he was troubled by the premise that if a department is left alone, it will run off the track. Departments try to hire the best people they can and improve every year; he said he liked the voluntary look of the proposed process. A review is always going to say the same thing: if a program or department receives a lot more money and faculty, it will be a gem. But that never happens. He agreed with Professor Lanyon that providing a tool to gather and retain the needed data in order to look at

trends would be a great addition. Dr. McMaster agreed and said that the University already has a great deal of data; it is just a matter of pulling it all together.

Professor Durfee asked who the reviewers would be, in the traditional model, who review the self-study and perhaps conduct a site visit. They are typically experts in the field, Dr. McMaster said; they have not decided on a process but said he believes a combination of internal and external reviewers would be desirable, with the internal reviewers able to add context and history. So perhaps two external reviewers and two internal reviewers. For undergraduate programs, it helps to have experts in teaching and learning, Professor Durfee said. Dr. McMaster agreed and said that traditionally the outside reviewers have been experts in research; they hope to shift that approach, with more attention to the program and to teaching.

Professor Lanyon commented that of all the reviews he has participated in, the most effective ones are those with internal reviewers. Dr. McMaster agreed and said he got the idea from a review he participated in that included internal reviewers, who added a great deal to the review.

Professor Hancher asked what "role of SLOs and specific SLOs for the major" meant. The nature of the curriculum and the ability of students to get through courses offered on a regular basis, Dr. McMaster said. For that they would want to see a four-year record. And they would want to know who is teaching the courses (regular faculty, contract faculty, postdocs, TAs, etc.) and the percentage of the curriculum offered by each group. Professor Hancher commended the inclusion of these metrics.

Dr. McMaster said that they would like each college to have a set of student learning outcomes; he cited the College of Biological Sciences as an example. One of the campus SLOs is "the ability to communicate effectively"; for CBS, the coordinating outcome is "effective communication and conduct within a scientific discipline." Skills that are evaluated in CBS courses that emphasize this outcome include "communicates effectively in writing, speech, & visual presentations," "understands roles of teamwork and individual effort in scientific endeavors," and "critically and independently evaluates current theory, knowledge, & issues." This is precisely the model the Higher Learning Commissions wants to see when it visits the campus for re-accreditation in 2015, with definable metrics so there is improved learning.

Professor Lanyon returned to the "profile of students in the major" to suggest that the review should think broadly about employment. Times change and they should not just focus on employment in one or two or three specific ways; what they should seek to find out is whether students (graduates) are using their degree in a way that they are happy with. Dr. McMaster said they try to get at that with surveys, but it is not done very well. The employment datum is to be for students who graduated five years earlier.

As for the data sources he outlined, Dr. McMaster said that the administration will provide much of the data so that departments can go through continuous self-improvement. At the same time, the departments will also have to accumulate some of the data.

Professor Durfee asked how the program reviews relate to the graduate-education principles or SLOs that were discussed at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Professor Kohlstedt suggested they could be in a self-study but are independent of program reviews. Professor McCormick commented that last fall

three members of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy participated in a group that developed the document describing "intellectual principles" for graduate SLOs, and they understood at that time that eventually the SLOs would be connected to program reviews; now, however, it appears that graduate SLO's may be, but need not be, connected to program reviews. Dr. McMaster said he would argue that the undergraduate SLOs should be included in a review of a department that offers an undergraduate major and that the graduate SLOs should be included in the reviews that include graduate programs (although that view is not articulated in the materials for program reviews that have been developed thus far).

Professor Durfee asked if they had any examples of institutions that have conducted comprehensive undergraduate and graduate program reviews. Dr. McMaster said he did not know of any, although Dean Crouch (College of Science and Engineering) maintains that his college does them together now. Professor McCormick said his understanding is that it is the view in the College of Science and Engineering that the ABET accreditation reviews are distinct from this process. Dr. McMaster said he was not sure he agreed and asked why the institution should not harmonize program reviews with the reviews conducted by ABET (or any other accrediting agency).

Vice Provost McMaster turned to the future directions for academic program review on the Twin Cities campus and itemized the seven characteristics of successful such academic program reviews that they have identified; they are collaborative, comprehensive, developmental, value-added, sustainable, culturally sensitive, and adaptive. He provided more details about each of those characteristics (in the slides) but did not touch on them at the meeting. But he did emphasize "culturally sensitive": reviews will be different across colleges and even across departments within colleges. The Graduate School process was a template that all had to fit within, which made it perhaps less successful than it should have been. The process they envision will be more adaptable, because Chemistry is not the same as American Studies, for example.

This is a work in progress, Dr. McMaster concluded, and they hope to begin using it during 2013-14.

Professor Kohlstedt said the review process would be fairly labor intensive; will resources be provided or will units expected to provide them? Dr. McMaster said that is a decision the provost will make but his understanding is that the process will be a partnership between the colleges and the provost. Professor Durfee said that the process must be cost-effective and time-effective and there will have to be a compromise between those factors and comprehensiveness. They will have to figure out what they can do with the resources that will be available. Professor Lanyon said that because of resource needs, the provost's office should think about how to provide information to deans and departments regularly so that they can assess how things are going. He said he did not believe a big review would be needed frequently when a department can have data annually. Dr. McMaster said the key words are "continuous improvement."

Professor Hancher inquired how many reviews would be administered by the provost's office, given what is being sought in the components of the program reviews. If reviews were done every ten years, Dr. McMaster estimated they would need to do about 16 reviews per year, which seems like a large number. There are practical questions about money and managing so many reviews at one time, Professor Hancher said, and those questions of logistics inspire fear and awe.

Professor Cramer said he liked the "culturally sensitive" descriptor and that it seems to him the antonym of graduate student learning outcomes.

Professor Pacala asked how much of the review process would look at faculty issues, such as the composition of the faculty, its sustainability, its age profile, and assessment of the faculty. That will be an essential part of the review, Dr. McMaster said, a primary focus.

Professor Pacala said he also liked "culturally sensitive" and asked if there is a way that culturally sensitive reviews could be capitalized on to inform other departments and faculty about them. Departments have great ideas that other departments could learn from. Dr. McMaster said that Provost Hanson is asking about this at the CIC. Most of the University's peers conduct traditional reviews; the idea of changing the focus is attractive and could lead to great conversations.

Professor Bitterman asked how they would decide on cadence, annual continuous improvement versus periodic reviews. Dr. McMaster said he believed the campus should move to the regular accumulation of data in any case because they are useful for departments and the colleges. He said he did not know, at this point, how the decision for regular versus more sporadic reviews would be made. Professor Bitterman asked if it would be possible to have faculty-initiated periodicity. Even if they were only every 5-10 years, it could be that faculty believe it would be a good time but the department head might not agree; how does he envision that might work? Dr. McMaster said he imagines that the faculty members would have a conversation with the dean if the department head declined to support a program review, and he assumes the dean would make the decision. Professor Bitterman said it would be preferable not to reach the point of a vote of no confidence. Professor Cloyd said, however, that he could see that there would be disincentives to conduct a review because the program would receive no resources to do so, which would work against the performance of the department.

#### **4. Differential Treatment of Students in Athletics**

Prior to Vice Provost McMaster's departure from the meeting, Professor May said she wished to raise an entirely different subject, the fact that not all students are treated the same at the University. Student-athletes are treated very differently. Faculty members are required to report on student-athletes' mid-term performance and required to excuse them for athletic events. This means that students who are part of athletic teams are required to miss classes for athletic events. If education is the highest priority at the university, why is it that students are not routinely excused from athletic events because they have class at the same time? Students who are on athletic teams are both privileged, with tutoring and other supports not available to other students, and disadvantaged because they are not allowed to fully take advantage of their educational opportunities at the university (which is why so many students who are athletes end up in the same majors and classes, which have the least conflict with sporting events, and why they miss so many classes that are essential for their education and success at the university.) Even the term "student-athletes" sets these students apart. No other students are hyphenated. We do not talk of "student-musicians" or "student-poets" or "student-thespians," even though these students also have great demands on their time outside of class to pursue their particular talents.

Dr. McMaster said that student-athletes have extra demands on their time for practice. So do arts students, Professor May said. Dr. McMaster pointed out that there are two Senate committees that

oversee athletics, and these committees set policy for student athletes. Professor May said she served on one of them for several years and finally quit because the committee was not able to challenge any of the prevailing assumptions, educational as well as budgetary, that set the athletic department apart from the rest of the university. Dr. McMaster said he was not sure he agreed with Professor May and observed that many faculty members are supportive of athletics. Professor May said that she, too, is supportive of students who are also athletes and that is why she believes they should not be deprived of their educational opportunities simply because they are on athletic teams.

Professor Cloyd asked if these requests are only made for athletes. Professor May said she has never received a notice that she is required to excuse a student from class except for those who are on athletic teams, nor has she been required to submit mid-term performance evaluations for any students except those who are on athletic teams. There are others, Dr. McMaster said, although the majority is athletes.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Provost McMaster for joining the Committee for the report on academic program reviews.

## **5. Discussion with Board of Regents Chair Cohen and Vice Chair Larson**

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Regents Cohen and Larson to the meeting and noted that in advance of the meeting she had provided them with questions about governance. In a complicated world with great stress on higher education financing and skepticism about higher education generally, how do the members of the Board of Regents feel about governance and how do they think about it in 2013?

Following a round of introductions, Regent Cohen said she was glad to learn what each of the members of the Committee does and said their work represents what the University is truly about, the tremendous research and teaching that occurs. She said the Board appreciates what they do and how crucial faculty and students are; she thanked Committee members for serving on the Committee and said the Board recognizes the importance of shared governance. She turned to specifics.

Last month two new Board members were elected, including a new student regent, both of whom bring tremendous experience, Regent Cohen said. Crucial items at the last Board meeting included approval of new integrated care structure between Fairview and University of Minnesota Physicians, which has the possibility of being a substantial step in aligning the mission and vision of the two organizations. The Board will approve the FY14 budget, the six-year capital plan, and the capital budget, and approved a contract with the Vikings (which the University needs to do as a good citizen of the state). New Board leaders will be elected in June, and at their July retreat the Board will look more globally at issues confronting the University, the broader picture of higher education, and identify top priorities. The Board has spent a great deal of time working with President Kaler on operational excellence and the changes to be made as a result of those efforts will be important. What is crucial to the Board, Regent Cohen concluded, is the concept of shared governance; she believes it functions well and is important to the entire University.

Regent Larson recalled from his discussion earlier with the Committee that one topic was how the Regents come to understand the University. There are a number of ways; one example is that at the March meeting of the Board, they received an extensive overview of the humanities and liberal arts,

including visits with faculty members and students in CLA, a tour of the facilities, and a series of faculty mini-lectures and a graduate student poster session. Those sessions are helpful because they let the Board understand what is going on and support the needs of various colleges; they are also helpful because they include two-way interactions. He said the Board appreciates the contributions of the Committee and its collaborative approach to governance; the Board enjoys having faculty members at its meetings and at the 3x3x3 Board/administration/faculty leadership meetings they learn about faculty concerns and perspectives. The chair of this Committee also makes regular reports to the Board.

Regent Larson said that any truly great organization must have at least one thing, and that is excellent human resources processes. He related his experience at Cargill in reviewing and changing significantly the human resources system in order to improve employee engagement, which he said is key to the success of an organization. They saw an improvement in safety, turnover, customer satisfaction, product quality, and cash flow. He said he believes it is also true of the University: without world-class human resources processes, it will not be a world-class organization and maintain that status, and there are opportunities for improvement. Regents agree to serve only 12 years, in order to ensure there is new blood on the Board, and he intends to spend his last four years working with President Kaler on leading a change process to improve relationships with employees and getting them the right tools for improvement. He emphasized that he was not saying the University has poor human resources processes, only that it can get better.

Professor Kohlstedt said she had a larger question: In 2013, with all these challenges to the University, do Board members go to the legislature and interact with the media? There is great complexity in being a Regent who both governs and represents the University; what do they do in this environment?

One thing that has been helpful is the change in direction of funding for the University from the state, Regent Cohen said, and the change from cutting to increasing funding. University Relations has invited the Regents to meet with legislators, and it has been a joint effort between the Board and University Relations to explain the importance of the University. She said she was optimistic that the University would receive a significant portion of its legislative request.

Have the Board members been more involved than they were in the past, Professor Kohlstedt asked? They have, Regent Cohen said, and she observed that it is important the Board members be consistent and not go off in different directions. Regent Larson agreed that Board members have been more involved than in the past and said that some Board members have more connections than others and spend more time at the legislature. He said he believed those efforts were beneficial, as was the change in the makeup of the legislature. It is a matter of building trust; some believe the University is not that well run and Board members can tell legislators about opportunities for improvement—but that it is not poorly run.

Professor Cloyd asked if the Board is engaged in discussions about what the University will or should look like in 2023; he noted that the institutional demographics could be very different. Regent Cohen said she believes the Board needs to have more such discussions; recently it has been forced to deal with more immediate concerns and problems. The Board's July retreat will be a time to raise such questions, the vision for the University in ten years. She said she believes the president is already looking ahead in this way (e.g., with respect to e-learning and admissions policy and process). Regent Larson

said that in his eight years on the Board, the discussions at the retreats have moved in the direction of higher-level, strategic matters and away from the details. Those kinds of discussions generally do not come up at the regular public Board meetings, where they tend to have presentations about issues important to faculty, the administration, students, and so on.

Professor Kohlstedt noted that the president wants to initiate a strategic planning process in the next few months. The Board will discuss it, Regent Cohen assured her.

Professor Lanyon said that the University of Minnesota is one of the most complex institutions of higher education and said he was glad that Board members learned about the humanities in CLA. But that is only one piece of the institution; how can the Committee help the Board learn about others? They need to brainstorm on that question at their retreat, Regent Larson said: Do they do more events like their session with CLA or do they focus on issues that fall across the University, critical issues they need to address? Regent Cohen pointed out that they have lunches at the eight Board meetings each year with faculty (when they discuss research, for example), with graduate students, and with others, which provides the Board opportunities to hear about other aspects of the University.

Professor Cloyd urged the Board members to walk around the departments and see how things are done rather than only spend time with people who are invited to their meetings.

Regent Cohen said that they also make an effort to become acquainted with the system campuses by have three regents visit them, at which time they talk with faculty and students and have an intensive experience. They would like to do the same on the Twin Cities campus.

Professor McCormick expressed appreciation for the role that Regents play at the legislature and asked if there is anything the governance system can do to support regental advocacy for the University. Regent Larson said he thought it would be beneficial for faculty members such as those on this Committee to join the Board members at the legislature from time to time. They could speak for the faculty and probably dispel some misconceptions. Regent Cohen noted that four faculty members spoke in support of the MN Drive request, which was extremely helpful.

Professor Pacala said he is by nature an optimist but sometimes ruminates on whether the University is like Ford and Chrysler in the 1960s and 1970s or Kodak in the 1980s, beset by disruptive technologies (such as MOOCs) and when students do not see why they need to put on backpacks to go to school and when the private institutions are getting richer and richer. Are these universities a dinosaur that needs a fundamental change in the way they do business, or do the Regents see change as a more incremental process where the universities adapt to the times? He said he would appreciate a sounding on where the Board stands and whether it considers wild ideas at its retreat.

Regent Cohen said that was a great question and one that it is important the Board talk about. She said she believes there is something important in personal learning between faculty and students and in most research. There will be hybrid courses but she did not see the University going the way of Kodak. [At this point Regent Cohen had to excuse herself from the meeting; Professor Kohlstedt thanked her for her comments.]



Regent Larson said that he could not answer Professor Pacala's question. He said that one way the University can improve as an organization is to be more proactive and less reactive. The University can do all that it possible to look at the changes in process or that it believes will happen and view them as an opportunity to get ahead of the competition. Within the state, the University has a good reputation, perhaps not quite so great with the legislature, but it can do a better job of selling what it does really well. It should not be forced into being reactive because of its own inaction. It would also help to have a strong winning football team, Regent Larson assured the Committee; the University ranks second academically in the Big Ten (behind Northwestern) and no other institution even comes close; that has never happened before and it reflects the values in intercollegiate athletics. The University has to take advantage of opportunities—for every downside, there is an upside for someone.

Regent Larson concluded by saying that having a close collaboration between the Board and this Committee is critically important to the major questions the University faces; the Board welcomes suggestions from the Committee because it does not have all the answers.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Regent Larson for joining the meeting; he thanked Committee members for all the work they do.

## **6. Changes to the UPlan**

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Professor Morrison and Mr. Chapman to the meeting to discuss proposed changes in the UPlan.

Mr. Chapman began with a high-level overview and said that what the story boils down to is "it's the government's fault." The Affordable Care Act is having an impact on employer-provided health plans (not just at the University of Minnesota), and the effect on the University is pressure to make changes to avoid the "Cadillac tax" that starts in 2018—but for which organizations must prepare long before. The federal government decided that certain health plans are too high-value and would be taxed. "Value" is defined as the employer and employee contributions plus amounts in flexible-spending accounts. What is not included in "value" is out-of-pocket costs. The Cadillac tax is intended to be a revenue source to help pay for other parts of the Affordable Care Act. But the University must not pay that tax, which they have concluded would be about \$48 million over five years starting in 2018. The University cannot afford the tax financially or politically, Mr. Chapman said. As a public institution, the University cannot provide a plan to employees that the government judges to be a "Cadillac" plan, even though it may believe that providing a high value plan is a good idea. As a consequence, the institution is stuck in a place where it must make changes to keep the plan value below the Cadillac tax threshold.

Mr. Chapman said that some of the "value" of the plan will be reduced by shifting some administrative costs to the University, and thus outside the UPlan. In addition, however, a cost shift must occur, so there will be an increase in out-of-pocket costs to employees through increased copays and the introduction of a small deductible. After lengthy review and discussion, they have determined that employees will have the responsibility for about \$1.9 million in additional costs, beginning in 2014, but they are looking at ways to mitigate the cost shifts.

One cost shift that is neutral as far as the UPlan and the University are concerned, and as far as employees as a whole are concerned, but that advantages one set of employees and disadvantages another,

Mr. Chapman said, is the combination of the family tier (employee plus spouse/partner plus children) with the "couples" tier (employee plus spouse/partner). The cost for those in the family tier will drop (7.6%) and will increase for those in the couples tier (23.7%) in the base plan. One way they may propose to mitigate this increase is to spread it over two years. The Affordable Care Act brings direct pressure on having four tiers of coverage, Mr. Chapman explained, because the Cadillac tax calculation assumes only two tiers of coverage; employee, and family. Unfortunately, the current family tier has a projected value that will exceed the threshold for the Cadillac tax. Up until 2006, the University only had two coverage tiers, employee and family; it was advantageous then to break them into four tiers, but it is now disadvantageous to have four tiers.

Also helpful, but with a small impact, will be combining base plans across geographic areas, Mr. Chapman said. Duluth plans are more expensive than Twin Cities plans, and Greater Minnesota plans are more expensive than the Duluth plans. By combining them, the University reduces the probability of exposure to the Cadillac tax.

Professor Kohlstedt turned next to Professor Morrison for comments.

Professor Morrison introduced Dr. Falkner, chair of the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC), and reported that the BAC had discussed these matters at two meetings; the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, with members of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs invited, also devoted the large part of a meeting to the topic. These are the consequences of the Affordable Care Act, not all of which is beneficial to the University. He said he did not disagree with Mr. Chapman about the need to act well in advance of 2018 or about the need to transfer some of the costs of the UPlan to employees.

One concern that was noted as the discussions took place was that the cost shift to employees produced a windfall for the University, since the employees assumed the additional costs, thus reducing the University's contribution to UPlan significantly. The University pays more than 80% of costs covered by UPlan but will cover none of the costs that were shifted, Professor Morrison said. He also said that when all of the cost shifts are taken into account, the costs shifts all came down to a net reduction of about \$1.9 million in employee compensation.

A second concern was the merger of the two coverage tiers; if one does the calculation, the impact on employees in the couples tier will be about \$700 annually. The BAC thought that was too large a change to impose at one time, especially for lower-income employees, so has urged that it be phased in.

As a result of their discussions, the BAC adopted the following statement, Professor Morrison reported.

***RESOLVED, the Benefits Advisory Committee—***

1. *Recognizes* that the Excise Tax provisions of the Affordable Care Act make it essential that the University change some elements of the structure of UPlan by 2018;
2. *Also recognizes* that it is desirable to begin making these changes in 2014 in order to provide a gradual transition to a new structure that will be required by 2018;

3. *Regrets* that these changes, made necessary by the federal law, will require both cost shifts to individual employees and premium increases for some classes of employees;
4. *Calls upon* the University administration to ensure that any financial savings accruing to the University as a result of the costs it is shifting to employees be fully distributed on a recurring basis to members of the employee groups as an offset to those increased costs, either through the compensation plan or through reduction of premium charges, bearing in mind the differing impacts of the cost changes on various groups;
5. *Finds* that the proposed merger of the "family tier" and the "spouse/partner tier" of the plan would bring about an unacceptably high premium increase for those in the "spouse/partner tier" (over \$700) if fully implemented in 2014;
6. *Strongly recommends*, therefore, that the merger of the "family tier and the "couples tier" be phased in over the next 2 to 3 years;
7. *Thanks* the University Administration, the Office of Human Resources, and the Benefits Department for their care and attention to this matter; and
8. *Expects* that it will be consulted on further developments with respect to plan structure and cost.

Approved, May 16, 2013

Dr. Falkner commented that "no one was excited about any of this."

Professor Durfee asked Mr. Chapman if there are any red flags in items #4 and #6 in the resolution. There are not, Mr. Chapman said. There is some risk with #6 but the collection of premiums is neutral and does help the UPlan hold down value. For couples where the spouse/partner has other coverage available, the change could be an incentive to change to that coverage—and it is an advantage to the UPlan to get dependents off it. They are also seriously considering ways to mitigate the impact of the changes, such as a more focused effort to assist lower-paid employees.

Professor Pacala commended Mr. Chapman and Professor Morrison and the BAC for taking a thoughtful and comprehensive look at the problem. He asked about the possibility of tinkering with some of the changes in copays and deductibles in order to minimize their impact on low-income and sick people, which should be the goal. For chronically-ill patients who need a lot of primary and specialty care, the increase in the copay from \$15 to \$40 for specialty medical care will be significant, as opposed to the change from \$60 to \$75 for tier 3 medications. He suggested increasing the tier 3 charge more in order to hold other costs down and retaining the deductible for MRIs and CTIs, which are more optional than lab charges for the chronically ill. He said he would argue they should review the numbers once more.

Mr. Chapman thanked Professor Pacala for a very nuanced set of comments. In general, the Administrative Working Group (responsible for oversight of the UPlan) and his office, Employee Benefits, spent a great deal of time thinking about many different approaches and believe they came to an accommodation that is the least painful. They considered primary versus specialty care; the primary care copay would be \$30 if the specialty care copay is not increased to \$40. The tier 3 increase does not produce a lot of money, Mr. Chapman said, but the value is that it encourages people to move to tier 2 drugs; they discussed eliminating tier 3 but decided not to move in that direction and tried to keep more of a carrot than a stick. (Tier 3 drugs are those for which there is another drug in tier 1 or tier 2 with an

equally therapeutic effect but which costs less; there is a prior-authorization process in place so that if one tries a tier 1 or 2 drug and it does not work, coverage will be provided for a tier 3 drug, but only on an exceptions basis.)

Professor Cloyd asked how specialty drugs are treated. They are mostly tier 1 because they are unique and often no other therapy is available, Mr. Chapman explained.

Professor Ben-Ner said the purpose of the Cadillac tax is two-fold, to reduce consumption and generate revenue. What is the elasticity of demand for health care and what do they make of it? He said he would like to see the big picture, the philosophy that guides the BAC and Human Resources. Are the recommended changes aimed at medical services for which the demand is inelastic, to increase the revenue of the health plan? Or is it aimed at services, such as brand name drugs for which there are cheaper alternatives? Professor Ben-Ner said that he could not infer a strategy that deals with health care consumption and cost that also takes into account health objectives. Obviously, something has to change, and the change will be affected by how the plans are structured, what services bear a copay and how much, and a lot of other details. What is the overall thinking that guides the changes, other than wanting to make the cost of health plan cheaper so as to avoid the federal excise tax on expensive plans? Health plans like the University's are very common among universities and other organizations; what are others doing?

Mr. Chapman responded that as they thought about these changes, the goals were to maintain quality, affordability, and choice so that the UPlan is of value to employees and helps attract people to the University. But the institution must avoid the tax; unfortunately, those who wrote the legislation thought they were targeting the high-fliers in the CEO suites and didn't realize the law would hit public employees, rank-and-file employees—but they are being affected. In addition, they kept in mind that from the beginning the UPlan tried to limit the impact on people who use it more because of chronic conditions (so that it wasn't true that the sicker one is, the more it costs). They cannot readily mitigate that impact once costs are moved out the UPlan—which they must do. So they are looking for the wisest way to make the changes.

Professor Kohlstedt asked if the Committee wished to endorse or comment on the BAC resolution.

Professor Ben-Ner said he did not believe there had been enough discussion of fundamental questions. Is the goal tax avoidance? Are they trying to reduce consumption? Professor Morrison said the answer to both questions is "yes." He said that Mr. Chapman had not talked about also putting into place reductions in cost, through the Accountable Care Organizations, which are to provide more efficient care. That is where there are possibilities and they are working to move care in that direction. Efficiency is also a goal, one that is non-controversial so they did not discuss it.

Professor May asked if the Affordable Care Act is also about cutting the costs of medical care; these proposed changes assume costs will remain the same. The cost is to the country, which can lower costs by extending insurance; otherwise the country must pay for uninsured care anyway, which is more expensive, Professor Pacala said. The Affordable Care Act is building incentives for Accountable Care Organizations, a way to reduce costs. Professor Morrison said the presumptions behind the proposals are built on different rates of inflation—but the thresholds would be reached even if the inflation in health

care costs is as low as 6% or 4%. It is not reasonable to assume inflation increases of less than 4% in the next five years. Professor Cramer agreed that doing so would be Pollyannaish.

Professor Morrison said he believes that strong plans, per Parkinson's law, will be priced at about 95-98% of the Cadillac tax limit—and these changes will put the UPlan in about that place. The government has set a cap; most organizations will get to 95-98% of it.

The Committee voted 7-0 in favor of the BAC resolution; two Committee members abstained.

Professor Kohlstedt said she would inform President Kaler of the Committee's actions, thanked Professor Morrison and Mr. Chapman, and adjourned the meeting at 5:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota