

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, September 26, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
Room 238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Will Durfee (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, James Cloyd, Eva von Dassow, Jigna Desai, Janet Ericksen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Russell Luepker, Alon McCormick, Paul Ranelli, David Satin, Jean Wyman
- Absent: Linda Bearinger, Karen Mesce, Ned Patterson, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman, Chris Uggen
- Guests: Peter Radcliffe, Daniel Jones-White (Office of Planning and Analysis), Rich Healy, Dave Ramsey (Academic Analytics); Dean Raymond Duval, Associate Deans Michel Kobialka, Gary Oehlert, Alex Rothman, Jennifer Windsor (College of Liberal Arts); President Eric Kaler
- Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents); Chief of Staff Amy Phenix, Jon Steadland (Office of the President); Lincoln Kallsen (Office of Budget and Finance);

[In these minutes: (1) Academic Analytics (faculty metrics); (2) discussion with Interim CLA Dean Duvall; (3) discussion with President Kaler; (4) bylaws interpretation]

1. Academic Analytics (faculty metrics)

Professor Durfee convened the meeting at 12:55 and welcomed Dr. Radcliffe, Mr. Jones-White, and Messrs. Healy and Ramsey from Academic Analytics. [<http://www.academicanalytics.com/>]

Dr. Radcliffe began by observing that the University purchased services from Academic Analytics as part of a larger strategic-planning effort to develop metrics. The Faculty Consultative Committee Subcommittee on Metrics and Measures, chaired by Professor Jennifer Windsor, highlighted the need to capture what it is that faculty members do. [<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/fcc/metricsreport.pdf>] Traditionally there have been "easy" measures used, such as student-credit hours, research grant funding, and so on. Academic Analytics provides comparative data about the scholarly activity faculty members not currently captured by University. The data provided by Academic Analytics does not capture everything a faculty member does but it does capture a number of elements of faculty work and is used by many of the University's peers. Academic Analytics staff engage with institutional research staff across institutions on how to structure their data; their tools try to fill the gap between the "easy" measures and a holistic understanding of what faculty do, including strengths and comparisons with peers, data that are difficult for a single institutional research office to assemble. The data can also be used in program reviews. There has not been any institutional effort to collect data before this and the need to do so has not spread around the University.

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

Mr. Healy noted that both he and Mr. Ramsey come out of working in higher education (Ohio State and Virginia Tech) so are familiar with the goals of institutions of higher education. What makes Academic Analytics unique is that it starts with a faculty list from the institutions and builds from there in looking for publications, citations, books, federal research grants, scholarly awards, and conference proceedings—those are the primary data they collect.

Mr. Ramsey said they put heavy emphasis on the quality of the data. Of the 80 employees at Academic Analytics, 40 are devoted to matching individuals to data. They have about 270,000 faculty members in their database and recognize that it is important to identify faculty work accurately and completely. They have a complete unit record on each faculty member, which helps their data managers make informed decisions. They have an analysis group that looks at outliers in order to identify errors as well as a product-quality team consisting of subject-matter experts who audit the work of the others and do a random sampling of the data. They also rely on external reviewers, to whom they provide all the information they have on the faculty at an institution, who can check locally on the information. They are 98-99% accurate in matching faculty members to data, meaning that approximately 98-99% of unit records (faculty members) are complete and accurate within the scope of data coverage specified by Academic Analytics. Their biggest problem is common names, and in those cases they work with institutions to confirm the data.

Mr. Healy said that the 2011 database for the University of Minnesota contains articles, citations, grants, and awards for the period 2007-11. But they do not re-create CVs; they are seeking to see what has happened in the recent past in departments and programs.

Professor Konstan said he was willing to assume they achieve the accuracy they claim, but asks what the data is actually going to be used for. On the one hand, it could be another way to gather data on faculty activities. But the University already has an effort in this direction, and this product doesn't seem better for that—it doesn't have the historical data and is limited in the types of data it gathers. On the other hand, this could be used for decision-making—but is there any evidence that decisions in the University require this granularity of data? Everyone already knows that Chemical Engineering is a great program or that Economics is a nurturing ground for Nobel Prize Winners. Are there really decisions that the president, provost, or deans want to make that they don't have enough quality data to make? Indeed, they seem to be making decisions anyway—MnDRIVE, for example, is grounded in areas of faculty excellence—but it didn't seem to need this data to happen. Is this an answer in search of a problem? Or a covert effort to effect culture change to make us more data-driven? Dr. Radcliffe said that the data could have informed the sort of strategic decisions Professor Konstan mentioned, but has not yet been used for them. There are many elements in their database that can help even a great program improve performance, Mr. Healy said.

Professor Gini inquired how one knows that the data captured reflect the quality of the institution? At the end of the day, these are numbers. What does one do with them? Mr. Healy agreed that these are only one aspect of considering whether a Ph.D. program is high quality. There are other metrics that must be used. Academic Analytics only captures some of the measures of scholarly productivity. But they also provide what is otherwise a blind spot for the University, Dr. Radcliffe added, because the University cannot simply query its databases to obtain this information.

Professor Satin said that in his department there are reviews of faculty members every year; why is someone looking for something when he does it every year? Professor Durfee commented that this

could be a connection between Faculty Activity Reports and Academic Analytics data. Dr. Radcliffe said faculty activity reports are internal, and not for people at other institutions, so they cannot be used to make comparisons. "Why not ask me?" Professor Satin asked. He has the data. Are they saying they have a more efficient mechanism to gather data? Is not the gold standard what he must provide to the promotion-and-tenure committee? Professor Gardner said that the University has a merit system for faculty and every department has the CV of every faculty member; the question is whether the Academic Analytics data correspond with the departmental data. Dr. Radcliffe said the tools serve different purposes; Academic Analytics is not aimed at faculty reviews. The question is how to compare, for example, Art History at Minnesota with its peers. That is based on the evaluation of each individual in a department, Professor Gardner said. Dr. Radcliffe said that Academic Analytics uses standardized measures across the country and cannot use CVs.

Mr. Ramsey said the question is the scope of what is captured, not recapturing CVs, and Academic Analytics' focus is on benchmarking with 382 Ph.D.-granting institutions. They use a common set of metrics, not self-reports. Institutions can select the peer group for comparison and can use whatever metrics they choose, whichever are important to a program. He emphasized again that Academic Analytics data are only part of a program review.

Professor Durfee asked if colleges and departments at the University have expressed interest in using the Academic Analytics data. Dr. Radcliffe said that a few of the colleges are interested, and they will talk with departments to learn what would be useful. But not a lot has been done in this direction yet.

Professor Ranelli asked several questions. (1) What about non-traditional scholarship: how will these data work, for example, in theater or art? (2) This is all about comparisons, but some data are also needed for accreditation and meeting national standards; what does it mean if Minnesota is #3 and some other institution is #1? (3) In his experience with large databases for research, what is being provided now doesn't match well with his experience with merging or mining large data bases into one.

Mr. Healy said, with respect to the fine arts, that Academic Analytics may not be the correct tool to use for some departments. Theirs is not especially useful for performing arts. They have tried to work with arts departments and find that it is difficult to capture information—but they are open to suggestions on how to do so.

In terms of Professor Ranelli's second and third questions, Mr. Ramsey said that they do not try to rank programs, they try to show where a program might be strong or not and how it measures up to its goals. In terms of accreditation, it is possible these data could be useful, depending on the accreditor's criteria, but that is not the primary purpose of the tool.

Professor von Dassow remarked that they are marketing a tool they sell to other institutions to enable them to compete against each other for the same goods—money, prestige, rankings; as Professor Konstan asked, why should the University buy this? Their method of analysis assumes that the more a person or department churns out, the better. But the example of the arts illustrates the flaw in such thinking: a painter may paint as many paintings as he or she can and they won't add up to one Mona Lisa. Moreover, inasmuch as Academic Analytics takes the individual as its unit of analysis, it promotes an atomistic view of faculty and their work that is antithetical to collaboration. Mr. Ramsey said this is not about more grants or money; the power of the data is in the user's hands because they decide what to measure. One can focus on a chosen set of journals, for example, or areas to be weighted more heavily.

Professor Luepker, following on Professor Satin's point, said that faculty members must submit a great deal of data every year about grants, publications, and so on, but many of the things that are valued, such as teaching and students graduating, are not included in the Academic Analytics package. Dr. Radcliffe can obtain departmental data; are there some that do not collect this information? And how is the system going to pick up information about things the institution values that don't happen to be on the web?

Dr. Radcliffe responded by repeating the point that Academic Analytics is not the only tool that the University will use and there needs to be conversation about other data that his office obtains. They want to use SERU student survey data, for example; each source is only one part of a holistic picture of programs and the different ways each contributes to the University's mission.

Professor Durfee thanked Dr. Radcliffe and Messrs. Healy and Ramsey for their report.

2. Discussion with Interim CLA Dean Duvall

Professor Durfee next welcomed Dean Duvall and Associate Deans Kobialka, Oehlert, Rothman, and Windsor from the College of Liberal Arts. As background, Professor Durfee noted that Dean Duvall is interim dean and one might ask why the CLA dean is visiting the Committee inasmuch as it is not usual for it to visit with individual deans. He said that Dean Duvall has a useful perspective on the situation, and while there has been much focus recently on the STEM disciplines, and while CLA has some of those within in, it also has the humanities and fine arts. Moreover, CLA teaches all of the undergraduate students and is core to the institution. He thanked Dean Duvall for providing a copy of his State of the College address.

Dean Duvall thanked the Committee for meeting with them. He commented that he was accompanied by CLA's four associate deans to signify that leadership in the college is a team effort, and as such, is not governed or led by one individual. The associate deans also know a great deal more than he does because he has only been in office for three months. He said he was pleased to have the opportunity to sing the praises of CLA and appreciated that the invitation was couched in terms of CLA's mission being at the core of the University. That is the case not only because CLA teaches a significant portion of students but also because of what the liberal arts are. What would a university be in the absence of strong liberal arts programs?

CLA is a large, diverse college, Dean Duvall said, with programs that range from the fine arts and humanities to a set of STEM fields. It is not as diverse as some because at a number of peer institutions it is an arts and sciences college, but it is large and intellectually diverse nonetheless. The centrality to the University is not a function of its size, however; instead, it is the centrality of the mission, because of the nature of what CLA does: namely, teach and do research in the liberal arts. CLA is also central to the mission of the University because of the high quality of what its faculty and students do. CLA has many great strengths, some of which may not always be recognized.

Professor Durfee inquired if the budget model or the manner in which revenues are allocated are driving academic decisions in CLA—if the way the budget works is getting in the way of what needs to be done in CLA. Dean Duvall said they have a number of joint programs but, like any college, they would like more revenue. More than most colleges, CLA is dependent on tuition (about 75% of its

revenue comes from tuition), so it is sensitive to changes in the registration of students. He said he feels good about the steps that have been taken to move the dial forward; preliminary projections this semester suggest the college will reach its tuition targets. That will happen primarily due to the work of the associate deans, in particular Dean Windsor, as well as work with the central administration. In recent years CLA did have shortfalls in tuition revenues compared to costs; tuition revenue is more volatile than the cost side. He said he is confident the college is closing the gap between cost and revenues.

Professor Konstan noted that he is in Computer Science and Engineering and teaches undergraduates in both the B.S. degree program in the College of Science and Engineering and the B.A. degree program in the College of Liberal Arts. It has always seemed to him that the charges were not right to the two colleges—not right to CSE because it is delivering all the instruction and CLA is getting 25% of the revenue; now he hears CLA claim it is not right to CLA because they get only that 25% but pay all the student-related cost pool charges. So perhaps the right balance exists because both colleges are unhappy—or do the arrangements in place discourage intercollegiate collaboration because the colleges do not believe they come out whole?

Dean Duvall observed that institutional rules always create incentives and disincentives, and he is the first to acknowledge that any University rules for allocating resources will have unintended consequences. Allocation of tuition has unintended consequences. CLA, however, has moved forward in collaborating with other colleges; the question is what is done within the context of University mechanisms and rules. He could design a set of allocation principles that he might like better, but CLA is part of the larger University and they assume there are good reasons for the rules as they are.

Dean Windsor noted one successful undergraduate cross-collegiate minor between CLA and the School of Public Health. They reached agreement on what would be expected and had strong faculty support; the minor has taken off and serves students in several colleges. If people take the time to do the hard work upfront, colleges can do a lot of good things, she said, and if there is high student demand, they can do good things. In this case, they embraced a different curriculum rather than a new set of courses, so they grew the pie rather than dividing up what already existed. As for cross-college degrees, students can take degrees in chemistry, math, and physics in both CSE and CLA because neither is an arts-and-sciences college.

Dean Duvall reported that CLA and CSE are at an earlier stage in discussions about a joint program across the two colleges. It will be worked out so neither loses out on the agreement. He agreed that these arrangements are hard work, but well worth doing.

Professor Ben-Ner commented that there has been a great deal of discussion about interdisciplinary research and teaching interdisciplinary research and teaching. He wondered if there is any discussion in CLA about developing new ways to encourage innovation and possibly new fields by creating new institutional settings, including new departments. Dean Duvall said that creating new departments or reconfiguring departments in CLA is not on the horizon right now. One would miss what CLA is, however, if one did not see the incredibly array of interdisciplinary work taking place. Almost all of the intellectual life of the college is across boundaries. Professor Ben-Ner said he was glad to see that of the new hires in CLA, almost all had a second affiliation, which is why he asked about new disciplines emerging. The work happens in terms of relationships among faculty members, Dean Duvall said, the college intervening to create the formal apparatus of departments. (For example, there is work

between political science, journalism/mass communication, and psychology on political psychology—but there is no plan to create a department of political psychology.)

Dean Kobialka said that CLA is positioned uniquely and historically to do cross- and interdisciplinary work, allowing the strengths and interests of faculty to coalesce in creative and trans-departmental ways. It should be noted here that of the 29 new hires last year, many of these new faculty were interested in coming to Minnesota precisely because of CLA's faculty's commitment to interdisciplinarity and openness to new ways of thinking about disciplinary formations. The college has been responding to changes in disciplines for three or four decades (e.g., Women's Studies, one of the earliest departments, has evolved into Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies, Cultural Studies, and American Studies). CLA continues to respond to changes in the social science disciplines, and in the humanities/fine arts as evidenced by the initiatives such as the program in human rights and social justice or the Humanistic Commons, envisioned as a mode of inquiry into the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences, a critical space that underscores the double sense of critical—as both crucial and contested; embracing a history of critique.

Professor von Dassow observed that the centrality Dean Duvall emphasizes is a property of the relations among disciplines, not of any individual discipline, in the liberal arts. Thus interdisciplinary work need not entail hiving off new disciplines or departments from existing ones. Departments are useful structures but they can have inhibiting effects inasmuch as they constitute units for resource allocation and for assessment (in terms of enrollment figures, number of degrees, faculty productivity, etc.). Is it possible to conceive of structures or mechanisms—perhaps the Humanistic Commons initiative is an example—that may be superimposed on the organization of disciplines into departments, so as to transcend these inhibiting factors? Also, Professor von Dassow remarked, while developing a new course proposal she sought but failed to find a definition of the liberal arts on the CLA web site, which ought to provide one.

Dean Duvall expressed surprise at Professor von Dassow's inability to find the language and said it needs to be made accessible. He agreed with her that any institutional structure can block creativity, something they must always be alert to; he is taking it as one of his guiding principles during the year he serves as interim dean to think about whether there are barriers that have been unintentionally erected. He said he did not know if he could say more than that there will be heightened awareness across the college and campus that more can be done to foster an environment in which interdisciplinary collaboration and curricular innovation can flourish.

Professor Luepker said he teaches a course that is part of the undergraduate Public Health minor in CLA and agreed that the program is a great success. He asked about the graduate-student experience. The president has talked about the many graduate degrees the University' gives and has asked whether graduates are getting jobs and if there is enough money to support them. With the reorganization of the Graduate School, there have been stresses. He asked Dean Duvall about the balance between undergraduate and graduate education and the changes in the latter.

Dean Duvall said the balance requires a deep and enduring commitment to the highest quality undergraduate and graduate education. This is the state's research university, its Ph.D.-granting university, and it must be sure it is participating at the cutting edge in the production of the next generation of scholars. It must also deliver state-of-the-art undergraduate education. The balance is that the college must do both well, which is a challenge with limited resources. He said he is not ready to say

that any part of CLA should get out of the business of educating graduate students; he noted that of the 19 University programs that were relatively highly ranked in the NRC rankings, 11 are in CLA. It has strong graduate programs and placed 93% of its graduate students over the past five years. The History department placed 100% of its graduate students for the last two years. There are a lot of stories about graduate education in the liberal arts, many of them wrong.

Professor McCormick asked Dean Duvall to comment on the current liberal-education requirements on the Twin Cities campus and support for the excellence in teaching expected in CLA. Are there things that concern him?

Dean Duvall asked Dean Windsor to respond. She said that universities make decisions about general distribution requirements, and it is a struggle as to how best to frame them here because there is no college of arts and sciences on this campus. So the requirements are spread across colleges in a fashion approved by faculty governance. She said she believes that the fundamental distinction between a liberal arts education and liberal education requirements may be confusing for undergraduates and that the liberal education/arts story is complicated, one that the University does not tell well. It is helpful to look at where students take courses: is it where the courses are fabulous or where the students must take them? Did the faculty mean to achieve what it did with the way it established the liberal-education requirements?

Professor Gardner noted that he will be at the legislature starting in January, as faculty legislative liaison, and legislators will ask what the difference is between CLA and the MnSCU colleges. How would he reply, he asked Dean Duvall? Dean Duvall said he has not visited a MnSCU campus in order to learn the differences. What he can say is that students at the University receive a state-of-the-art education with the leading scholars in the field.

Professor Gardner said that some members of the legislature will ask why they should care if this is a research university. They should care if they want knowledge to look different 20 years in the future and if they care about whether we know more than we do now, Dean Duvall said. If they do care, they need to support the research mission. Professor Gardner said that is the answer he would give as well but most do not understand the role of a research university in solving problems, especially for CLA, where it is more difficult to see how problems are solved than it is in some of the colleges with more applied programs.

Professor Durfee said that Dean Duvall's State of the College address and the planning document CLA 2015 lay out ways to respond to some of the challenges facing the university, which is to make courses and programs so exciting that students want to take them; how that is going is something the University will want to learn about. Dean Windsor said it is easier to deliver outstanding interdisciplinary teaching when it fits in with existing structures and there is sustained faculty and student interest over time. It is harder when you are trying to create something new and/or the interest is more ephemeral. In part to address this, CLA asked its faculty to provide "crazy good ideas" for a competitive course incubator program. The goal was not necessarily for the course content to be sustained over time but for novel teaching and learning ideas and formats to generalize. It worked out; three faculty members from different departments taught a course on the Renaissance together and separately, so taught the same number of students overall as they would have individually but leveraged the unique perspectives of each faculty member. It is possible to find ways to do things differently without doing more, she concluded.

Professor Durfee said he hoped that ideas originating in CLA could spread to other colleges and he thanked Dean Duvall and Associate Deans Kobialka, Oehlert, Rothman, and Windsor for joining the meeting.

3. Discussion with President Kaler

Professor Durfee welcomed the president to the meeting and said the Committee would be interested in hearing about the planned \$90-million in administrative cost reductions over the next six years.

President Kaler said the University will move \$90 million over six years from administrative spending to mission and mission-support. The strategic-planning process that is just beginning will identify exciting things the University wants to do; one source of funds for those activities will be philanthropy and another will be to redirect current institutional funds—especially by reducing administrative costs—to those higher priority areas. He said the administration will be as transparent as possible in making the reductions and he emphasized that the goal is not to lay people off (although he cannot guarantee there will be no layoffs). The University has a robust turnover rate and it can take advantage of natural attrition by realigning positions with needs as people leave or retire.

Students and faculty will see a noticeable benefit from the reductions, the president said. He said he hopes to reduce the cost of attendance for students through increased scholarships, to renovate classrooms and labs, to provide additional graduate stipends and fellowships, and maintain a robust compensation plan for faculty and staff—because the University will be competing around the world for them. The administration works continuously on reducing expenditures and they have already taken \$37 million out of administrative costs. That process will continue.

Professor Satin said that he understood the consultants' studies to mean the University is in the middle in terms of administrative spending. Although the University can always do better and get leaner, what are the opportunity costs of cutting administrative spending when the real data show it is not an outlier here? President Kaler said he could not tell with certainty right now. Reducing expenditures includes improving processes which will allow us to do some tasks with fewer people (e.g., reducing the hoops units must pass through in hiring people, which should mean fewer people will be required to process appointment documents). With 25,000 employees, the University can accomplish much.

Professor Konstan said that a big part of becoming more efficient in administrative operations is making sure that the University doesn't become less efficient overall (by shifting burdens onto faculty, for instance). One of the reasons departments have staff handling payroll or purchasing is because faculty have not been able to count on central staff to respond to urgent requests to hire a student or purchase an urgently needed piece of equipment—local staff know the faculty and respond to their needs. Has the president thought about what might be done to instill a culture of service to centralized staff in areas where it is seen as more efficient to centralize first-line administrative support?

The president said he is not talking only about centralization versus decentralization, he is looking for the best way to get something done. The Enterprise Systems Upgrade Program, for example, will make it easier to get someone on the payroll—a transaction that happens thousands of times of year at the University; right now the process is exceedingly complex. The University needs to be "best in class" in these kinds of transactions. A department may still have a finance staff member—but that

person will have access to the best tools available. The new U Market store will be like Amazon.com: one touch of a button to order something, there will be no paper, and the produce should arrive the next day.

Professor Ben-Ner said he has read that universities are moving to centralize services. There are good places to do so and others where it is not a good idea. What is the president's thinking about reorganizing and centralization versus decentralization? President Kaler said that the University now has both consulting reports [spans and layers provided by Sibson and the cost benchmarking report provided by Huron] and they have been provided to the legislature. Decentralization and centralization represent the two extremes in ways to get things done; he agreed that it will be smart to do some things centrally and that some functions are best left at the unit level. The goal is to find the best way to carry out transactions. Part of this is level of trust and engagement on both sides (e.g., if there is agreement with the Office of Information Technology that it will take care of computing equipment, and if departments can rely on the service, they do not need their own IT person).

Professor Gini commented that the federal government is adding more and more regulations and requirements on grants and other things that use federal money. Will the savings from restructuring end up being used to cover the additional costs of compliance? President Kaler said he hoped not and that Professor Gini makes a significant point. NIH has layers and layers of regulations governing animal and human research, and while individual rules may make sense, the accretion creates substantial burdens. The University does not receive adequate compensation from the federal government for the costs of adhering to all these regulations.

Professor Durfee invited the president to touch on other topics on his plate. President Kaler mentioned several.

-- He said that the recommendations on the Twin Cities campus no-tobacco/no-smoking policy are before him and he will make a decision.

-- There have recently been two accidents on campus, one resulting in death and the other in serious injury; the president said it might be helpful if faculty and instructors who teach undergraduates say something in their classes about students being careful and taking care of themselves.

-- One may read in the media that MnSCU is facing an enrollment decline; the University had 43,000 applications for about 5,500 spaces on the Twin Cities campus and enrollment on all campuses is up.

-- The legislative session will be about bonding and the University will campaign actively for HEAPR funds and capital projects.

-- The candidates for Dean of the Medical School and Vice President for the Health Sciences will be on campus in October; the president said it is a very strong pool and he urged Committee members and the faculty to take part in the forums and listening sessions.

Professor Konstan asked whether requiring finalists to be public has hurt the Medical School search process. The president said he is worried because he believes the current law is flawed and damaging to the ability to recruit high-quality candidates, perhaps uniquely for University hiring. That

said, he does think the current pool is strong and he does not believe that any candidates have withdrawn due to the public nature of the search.

-- Professor Desai asked if there is any consideration to increasing the number of undergraduates admitted, given the number of applicants. The president said that will be an important question for the strategic-planning process to address and there will be a working group on enrollment management. How big should the campus get? It is restricted in classroom space, although presumably the hours taught could be expanded and opportunities could be increased through the use of technology. Residence-hall space is critical; retention is now 91% and much of that depends on programming in residence halls. If the campus is to increase the size of the freshman class, it probably would need new residence halls (which could be built). It would also need additional faculty to handle growth in the number of students. There is worry about the declining number of high-school graduates in the Midwest, but with 43,000 applications, the University has turned away students in a number of fields who could very likely have succeeded here.

-- Professor Luepker said there has been discussion for years about the University's antiquated job classification system; what is happening on that front? President Kaler said that Vice President Brown assures him that that progress is being made. There are some concerns on the part of employees, but he likes to believe he is fair—and the current job classification system is not fair to employees in terms of career progression and equity.

-- Professor von Dassow expressed concern about increasing public demands for accountability in higher education (as evident in the recent White House proposal to impose new regulations that could increase costs while potentially introducing perverse incentives), and about how these demands collide with the issue of accreditation. Institutions respond by developing things like student learning outcomes, which entail increased labor for faculty, but this labor is never accounted for in institutional budgets. She could write a scholarly article in the time it takes to propose a course to meet a liberal education requirement and a student learning outcome. These tasks cost a lot of faculty time but cost the institution nothing. How would President Kaler respond to this concern?

Part of responding to this problem is the effort to pare down to minimum the requirements that are imposed, the president said. In terms of student-learning outcomes, he initially disliked them when he had to deal with them in the 1980s, but he is now a fan because they helped him improve his courses and improve him as an instructor. They take some work "but they are not the spawn of the devil." Accreditation demands have been reduced as accrediting agencies realized the burdens of their requirements. With respect to federal requirements, institutions are stuck; elected representatives seem not to understand the costs and consequences of regulations. The challenge at the end of the day is to tee up the tasks and draw a line: do the ones that are important and find ways to get rid of the rest.

Professor von Dassow said she did not know what student-learning outcomes look like in engineering, but she does know what the University's look like. They are very broad and vague. She certainly wishes she could count on students having learned something in courses previous to hers, but she can neither count on that nor guarantee their attainment of something like "understanding diverse philosophies and cultures"—that is a process, not an endpoint. If learning outcomes are to be used, they ought to mean something; the set of undergraduate learning outcomes that the faculty approved several years ago needs to be revisited. Professor Durfee commented that the faculty establish the learning outcomes, they have been around for awhile, and they probably need another look.

Professor Konstan commented that while the federal government does a lot to create burdens, the University does a lot of that itself as well. For example, instead of requiring numerous statements in every instructor's syllabus, why not send a document to all students that contain the various statements that provide students' rights and responsibilities, and let the syllabus deal with the course. The University made huge strides in moving to per-diem payments for travel rather than requiring receipts for every meal; it needs to think about next steps because there is much it could do to reduce burdens but still stay within federal rules.

President Kaler recalled that he has talked about risk recalibration since he arrived at the University and agreed with Professor Konstan.

It was said the culture is difficult to change because there is a fear of getting a qualified audit. President Kaler said he talks regularly with the University's auditor; part of the problem is that it can be difficult to do things the right way, so units develop work-arounds. For example, in the case of the IPEDS list that was provided to the *Wall Street Journal*, a large number of faculty were wrongly classified into administrative positions because it was not easy to classify them correctly. But the University is getting the WSJ article behind it; the consultants' reports addressed the issues. Professor Durfee agreed that at the September Regents' meetings, the sense was that thinking is now more positive and forward-looking.

Professor Durfee thanked the president for his comments.

4. Bylaws Interpretation

Professor Durfee asked Committee members to review a proposed interpretation of a Faculty Senate bylaw. The bylaws require that members of this Committee, FCC, have no administrative appointments above the level of department chair or head, but there is no such requirement for members of the Nominating Subcommittee, the subset of this Committee that nominates candidates for election to FCC. For this fall, both Professors Cramer and Kohlstedt would be members of the Nominating Subcommittee—but both are now in administrative positions (and have expressed reluctance to serve on the Nominating Subcommittee). The interpretation is that members of the Nominating Subcommittee are subject to the same membership requirements as FCC members.

The Committee approved the interpretation unanimously. Professor Durfee thereupon adjourned the meeting at 2:55.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota