

Minutes\*

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

**Special Meeting**

**Tuesday, February 7, 1995**

**3:00 - 5:00 p.m.**

**238 Morrill Hall**

- Present: Daniel Feeney (chair), Mary Dempsey, Kinley Larntz, Richard McGehee, Michael Sadowsky, W. Donald Spring
- Regrets: Carole Bland, Daniel Canafax, Carol Chomsky, Judith Gaston, Willard Manning, Roger Paschke, Ken Roering, George Seltzer, Bernard Selzler, James Stone
- Absent: Ann Erickson, Dianne Mulvihill, Anne Sales, Rose Brewer, Carol Carrier, Yang Wang
- Guests: V. P. Mel George, Hillel Dundar, Darwin Hendel, Jane Whiteside

[Within these minutes is a report on U2000 and a discussion of the critical measures.]

**1. REPORT ON U2000 FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS**

Dr. Mel George

Professor Feeney introduced Vice President Mel George, who presented a status report on U2000. He informed the committee that once again the Minnesota State Survey stated that the public's impression of the University as an educational institution was very good. 81% of the population gave the University a favorable or very favorable rating, as opposed to the 8% who gave the University an unfavorable rating. The unfavorable rating has been decreasing for three consecutive years. The favorable rating is the best the University has had since the 1960's. However, Vice President George said that he was surprised by the number of people who were unaware of University developments. Some of these achievements include:

- The five year graduation rate is up to 32%, rising 5% over the past four years.
- The average size of a freshman or sophomore level class is about 27 students, down 25% since the fall of 1986.
- 70% of the new freshman live in the dormitories, up from 45% four years ago.
- The University ranks fifth among all U.S. universities in patents issued to faculty members.

The meetings which Dr. George has attended to speak of U2000 have taught him that more specifics are needed to clearly communicate what the strategic plan will mean to the faculty, students, and the people of the state. Vice President George then expressed that he and Assistant Vice President Bob Kvaavik had begun a process of meeting with groups of deans in order to determine how the different colleges were developing. They discovered through these meetings that there was no structure established for presenting questions relevant to U2000.

---

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

Dr. George said that U2000 is at the heart of the budget request. He noted that the Governor recommended \$61 million to the University for the biennium. \$53 million of this is in non-recurring money, which poses a problem for the University. In comparison, the Higher Education Board (HEB) may only receive \$19 million. Their request was not well received because of the content of the request: non-programmatic matters, such as equalizing salaries, and covering administrative costs for software. The University administration believes that the gap between these figures will receive will decrease as the HEB lobbies on its own behalf. He then went on to say that considering what the Governor's recommendation to the University has been in the past, the \$61 million he is recommending is astonishing. The Governor's office and staff are being very supportive of the University's budget. Because of this fact, the strategy of the University in the legislature is to try to show that the Governor's recommendation is not a ceiling but in fact a floor. Nevertheless, Dr. George said that the University would be very surprised if it were to receive more than the Governor proposed. Also, the University would like to convert some of the \$53 million in non-reoccurring money into recurring money. The University will still take the \$53 million in non-recurring even if it can't be converting into recurring money because the difference between the two is becoming somewhat vague. As part of this fiscal plan, Dr. George said that the University may attempt to implement a bonus plan as part of the faculty compensation package. Overall, the University will not criticize the Governor's recommendation because it is a strong and good recommendation.

Institutional Relations is trying to involve different people in support of the University this year, said Vice President George. A major effort to recruit new members to the Alumni Association's Legislative Network has been made and has been very successful. There are approximately 2000 people signed up for this particular network who will contact legislators and receive regular mailings about legislative matters. This initiative includes:

- Designating "district captains" who call University volunteer lobbyists in their district. This enables the group to contact that necessary legislators when a vote on a key bill or a conference committee report arises.
- Training session for members of the network. 150 people have attended from across the state to four hour orientations
- Contacting the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association, the Trustees of the Foundation, the Board of Governors of the Medical School, the University Medical Foundation, the Academic Health Center Advisory Committee, and the Carlson School Advisory Board to ask members of those various groups to identify legislators they are comfortable speaking with who they would be willing to lobby on behalf of the University. Dr. George said that there as been a very positive response to this request. Packets have been prepared, and assignments have been given for people to speak with different legislators. They have also been briefed on the details of the University's budget request.
- Packets of materials have been prepared for Regents and the members of these various boards to help them prepare speeches on behalf of the University. These packets contain ideas and facts about the University's 140-year history, the essence of the budget request (overheads are also available).
- In addition, the Deans have been given assignments, which many have completed, for the purpose of meeting with Legislators.

Vice President George passed out the latest tool developed by his department to help the University volunteers. This brochure includes:

- A simple summary of the Partnership Proposal. (It was designed to help someone not familiar with the internal workings of the University.),
- Information on how to contact a legislator and how to coordinate a meeting,
- A description on type of information which is appropriate to present at those particular meetings.

There is also an interesting situation arising in the House of Representatives, said Dr. George. The House Education Committee has split into several subcommittees, one of which deals with the University and the Mayo. That particular subcommittee has established a working group on U2000 and is currently hearing presentations from University administrators. Dean of Education, Dr. Bob Bruininks told the subcommittee how the College of Education has reshaped itself to U2000 by directing research goals, strengthening of faculty, reaching out to other schools, and preparing students of color. The Biomedical Engineering Department is scheduled to talk about their interdisciplinary research emphasis and its involvement of undergraduate research.

Other points by Dr. George included:

- The mission of a land grant institution does not require open admission.
- The University is obligated to bring forth to the people of Minnesota results of any research being done.
- Committee members were encouraged to speak with legislators on behalf of the University.

Q What kind of effect will the proposed state funding for the University (\$20 million less than the University's request) have on the institution?

A As part of the \$143 million biennial budget for the University, the President and the Board of Regents decided to request \$87.7 million from the state allotted. No matter what the state decided, the University determined to stick with this budget even if tuition increases and/or reallocation were necessary. The Governor has stated that if the University raises tuition above 3%, it will have to give the state \$ .25 on every \$1.00 for student aid.

Q Is faculty/administration handled under Vice President George's office?

A There is no single person responsible for this particular situation. However, some people who are in part responsible for upholding communication are Vice President Infante, Dr. Mike Bognanno, and himself.

Q How much thought has actually been given to the reallocations within U2000?

A The Vice President for Academic Affairs could explain how this will work. Nevertheless, he did not believe that these decisions have not yet been made, and will not be made until the planning process has been concluded. The general thrust of U2000 assumes that the University will be somewhat smaller, more interdisciplinary, better connected to the community, and among the top research universities in the country. The actual strategies from the planning process are not yet known. The early retirement plan is an attempt to create some flexibility. This will all become clearer in May or June when the planning process is coming to a close.

One committee member said that the Early Retirement Plan will have to be decided upon before the planning process concludes in order to know specifically where money will come from. Vice President George stated that Vice President Infante was sensitive to that issue. Dr. George said that the shifts will need to be made over a long period of time so that shifts can be made in a constructive, humane, and thoughtful way.

## **2. DISCUSSION ON CRITICAL MEASURES AND PERFORMANCE GOALS**

Professor Feeney said that representatives from the Senate and Assembly committees had been chosen to form a working group to discuss the Critical Measures and Performance Goals. The representatives for SCFA are Carole Bland, Daniel Canafax, and Judith Gaston. The results of their discussions will be brought back to the committee.

Dr. Darwin Hendel explained the context of the document. He said that last year five measures were developed as part of the first phase. The second phase and the consultation and development process is being handled in a somewhat different way including allowing more time for consultation and utilizing a working group.

Dr. Hendel noted that the outlines for each of the eight measures were created to promote discussion, not propose a final product. He then turned the discussion over to the committee, and asked for questions or comments.

Q One committee member said that he had to reallocate roughly 5% of his department's budget in order to set-up the process to document the measures. He added that the additional measures outlined appeared costly, such as the periodic surveys of employers and monitoring media, etc. He wanted to know if new resources would be added to cover the expense of collecting this information.

A A definite answer could not be given at this time because it is not known what will be part of the system. The critical measures process is part of the reorganization process at the University, and in particular, the establishment in Academic Affairs of the Office for Planning and Analysis. This is currently taking on the staff that were part of MPIS (Management Planning and Information Services). A proposal will need to come forth which will allocate resources to cover these costs, such as implementing a regular survey of graduates or a periodic survey of employers of University graduates. In contrast to the first five measures, which depended almost completely on information already collected and available to the institution, the phase two measures may involve the collection of new information.

Dr. Whiteside added that the University does not want to establish measures which will diverting more money away from needy areas. One committee member expressed that if an office is not established to collect this information, the responsibility would be passed-down to departments without funding.

Dr. Hendel added the following points:

- The University really need to do this. It is not optional.
- The case needs to be made to those who will need to get this done

- The measures will enable the University to present itself entirely to those who need to hear such information such as the legislature and the Board of Regents.
- The University wants to use information that already exists on a department/collegiate level to communicate (i.e., reports of each programs, etc.)
- The University needs to determine the right things to measure because it is an expensive process.
- The measures will provide a means to use the information that sometimes is not utilized.
- The goal of collecting the measures is to communicate University's successes and improvements.
- Measures in the area of Scholarship and Research are difficult to determine.

Dr. Whiteside explained the purposes of the measures:

- a. They allow the University to tell the public what the institution is doing
- b. They help to get every part of the University headed in the same direction
- c. They assist in the process of planning and budgeting
- d. They allow the University to compare itself to peer institutions

Dr. Whiteside then asked the committee to offer some suggestions as to what are some important activities to measure especially regarding the measures on Scholarship/Research/Artistic Accomplishments, and Faculty/Staff. Dr. Hendel said that some measures will need to be implemented sooner than others based on the importance that the University community informs the document authors.

One committee member said that the measures on Scholarship/Research, Faculty/Staff, Facilities are most relevant to faculty. The chair recommended that the guests "walk-through" these measures to solicit corresponding suggestions.

1. Scholarship, Research and Artistic Accomplishments

Dr. Hendel expressed that the University wants to gather information on the accomplishments of individuals in these areas including:

- Quantity
- Scholarly influence: indicated by citation counts of an author's work
- Scholarly recognition: awards, memberships on influential groups
- Impact on professional practice, societal issues, quality of life

Dr. Hendel asked the committee what kind of quantitative and qualitative measures should be used to determine the institution's level of scholarship.

Committee suggestions:

- Qualitative measures will communicate more effectively to the public; i.e., what the numbers mean.
- Citation counts and awards do not always indicate the quality of a faculty member.
- This measure may create more public skepticism than a sense of confidence in the University.
- The measure is very focused on research and may not express the quality of the University's teaching.

- The University may have opposing goals for the measures.

Communicating with the public will take a public relations effort focusing on the type and presentation of the information. On the other hand, trying to direct the institution internally may require an entirely different process.

- The University should select the public relations effort.

The questions added:

- Specific disciplines should not be compared to peer departments at one point of time, but over a number of years
- There is a considerable amount of pressure to measure faculty workload rather than accomplishments.
- The measures will need to communicate to all the interested communities
- Examining the environment of the University is important because it influences the way employees and alumni of the University speak about the institution.

## 2. Faculty/Staff Recruitment, Development, Satisfaction, Retention

Dr. Whiteside described the proposed areas for measuring these items:

- Recruitment of top quality faculty and staff
- Satisfaction with faculty/staff experience
- Development of faculty/staff
- Retention

She quoted the document which states that "the result for this measure should be broken out for all under-represented groups, as well as for different faculty and staff groups."

Committee suggestions:

- The rate of faculty turn-over would be one "base line" item to consider. This kind of information may guide which of the items listed above should be focused. The University probably has low turnover, and therefore a focus on development may be best.
- Specific measurements could be salary compression, level of involvement in administrative decisions, and faculty values in relation to those of administrators.
- Facilities/supplies for faculty has decreased over the years
- The only way faculty usually get raises is if one enters into a retention case. This situation seems to be unique at the University of Minnesota.
- What kind of influence is the administration's handling of retention/faculty development and policies like Conflict of Commitment/Interest having on faculty morale?

Management devices are being perceived as punitive. The few problems are determining how the University sets policy and practices.

Dr. Hendel said that the committee's opinion of faculty morale would be helpful. The committee recommended evaluating the following items to access information on faculty morale:

- Faculty purchasing power
- Resources available for re-training
- Options for faculty to supplement their income
- Salary relationships to peer institutions (for internal use more than external)
- Salaries, cost of living, and other quality of life factors between peer institutions
- The influence of Conflict of Commitment/Interest Policies between peer universities

Dr. Whiteside said that measuring will provide an environment where the problems cannot be ignored.

### 3. Facilities

Dr. Hendel said that this can cover a variety of items: equipment, computer technology, communication capabilities, library resources, etc. The University has some serious challenges regarding preservation/renovation of buildings needs to be highlighted. From a faculty perspective, Dr. Hendel asked the committee, how to measure this area.

Committee comments included:

- Classroom suitability for teaching: functioning microphones, the presence of chalk, etc. (The administration of the University's fastest growing budget on campus.)
- Computer technology sufficient enough to utilize the networks that are available.
- Faculty receive no increase in their teaching budget if they offer to begin a sizable new class.
- Faculty are being required to be more productive with less support, and be excited about U2000.
- These measures appear to fall into two categories: 1) External - dealing with the customers (i.e., the students and the legislature), and 2) Internal - dealing with facilities and employee performance. The combination of these items may cloud the ability to communicate either category.
- Solutions need to be identified to deal with the financial pressures in higher education

Dr. Hendel mentioned that document could increase an emphasis on measuring the presence of support staff for teaching and research. He also said that change in higher education occurs because an institution selects a course and stays with it "for the long haul." Any additional information (SCFA minutes, faculty comments) is welcome. The chair said that an appendix on issues affecting faculty morale (prepared by Professor Spring and Professor Feeney about a year ago) would be sent to Dr. Whiteside and Dr. Hendel.

-- Nicole Boldt/Kevin Gormley