

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, October 23, 2003
1:25 – 3:00
385 Mondale Hall

Present: Judith Martin (chair), Gary Balas, Susan Brorson, Charles Campbell, Arthur Erdman, Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Carol Wells

Absent: Jean Bauer, Tom Clayton, Gary Davis, Dan Feeney, John Fossum, Emily Hoover, Marc Jenkins, Martin Sampson

Guests: President Robert Bruininks, Executive Vice President and Provost Christine Maziar, Senior Vice President Frank Cerra

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) committee business (statement on USA PATRIOT Act, reviews of deans); (2) intellectual future of the University (the land-grant mission); (3) Senate docket statement on Mt. Graham telescope]

[A correction: In the October 16 minutes of the Committee, the following sentence appeared: "The Committee spoke briefly with the President about the possibility of the strike by the clerical workers and the indication by one faculty member that he would like to introduce a resolution at the Faculty Senate meeting saying that the provisions of the law saying he can be fired if he crosses a picket line as interfering with tenure." The final portion of the sentence should read (corrected language in caps): "... saying he can be fired if he DOES NOT CROSS a picket line as interfering with tenure."]

1. Business Matters

Professor Martin convened the meeting at 1:35 and noted that several members of the Committee were out of the country and consequently unable to attend. She noted several items of business:

-- As a result of email exchanges about the language of the statement on the USA PATRIOT Act, indicating questions and reservations quite correctly pointed out by the Senate Research Committee, Professors Balas and Erdman have agreed to be constituted as an ad hoc subcommittee to redraft the statement and bring it back to the Committee for an email vote.

-- The Committee will take up the Mt. Graham resolution on the Senate docket at the end of the meeting.

-- Elizabeth Wroblewski, in Executive Vice President Maziar's office, has asked for the names of Committee members, or other faculty, to participate in two administrative reviews, of Dean Tom Fisher of

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

Architecture and another dean in the spring. She said that anyone interested in serving should let her know. Professor Marshak said that he believes strongly that such reviews are important and, will, therefore agree to serve on one review. Professor Martin said she may also serve on one.

2. The Intellectual Future of the University

Professor Martin turned next to the primary item of business, discussion of the intellectual future of the University. She noted that the Committee had had a very good discussion last August. The topic today is one that has been on the Committee's list for some time--and it has also been on the President's list. As he has mentioned it repeatedly recently, she thought it appropriate to take it up. The issue is this:

The University of Minnesota and other land-grant institutions have exceeded the expectations of their founders; where do we now stand? As the only land grant institution in Minnesota, what differentiates the University of Minnesota from other higher education institutions in the state (public and private)? Is the concept of land-grant relevant to a 21st century America and world? How?

The President began by saying that he has felt for some time that whatever land-grant means or meant in Minnesota, it is appropriate to reassess the meaning in the 21st century, especially with changes in funding for higher education. The Kellogg Commission reports on public and land-grant universities (copies of which were provided to Committee members) focused on the educational mission of teaching and learning, which was an unexpected position for it to take, because he thought the Commission would focus on the statewide role of the institutions.

The President told the Committee he would be hosting a delegation of legislators the day after this meeting who are upset about the University's decision to move the Minnesota Extension Service to regional centers and who are asking that the University slow down or stop and who believe that the University is removing its shingle from local county extension offices. Part of what is happening is that people in outstate Minnesota value the University a great deal and have a deep commitment to it. There are also big changes occurring in rural Minnesota: there is massive consolidation of farming, an outflow of people, and local businesses are closing. At the same time there is a flurry of activity in the Twin Cities about biotech incubators, organizations that political leaders have observed elsewhere and want the University to invest in. He has made it clear, the President said, that biotechnology is important work for the University but that it cannot do the work without new funds.

In his view, the situation must be reframed so the University is not seen as the sole player--it must work with partners and cannot sacrifice its core mission; instead, it must leverage its intellectual base. He said he will tell those interested in the Extension Service that if they want to fund county agents within existing resources, the costs will harm University research and the University's ability to connect research with the needs of Minnesota communities. At the center of his value system and commitments is the need to keep the comparative advantage of the University strong: its research mission. It must find a way to connect with the biotechnology industry and communities. He will be meeting with the heads of the major foundations because he is finding that they all have tens of millions of dollars invested in various ways and various areas. His argument is that they should build a consortium and build on the strengths the University can offer, its expertise, and at the same time leverage other funds. But the University cannot continue to pay the capital expenses of maintaining extension offices in every county.

The University should be understood as serving as a think tank rather than an economic development agency, Dr. Maziar commented. The research suggests that using a university as a tool of economic development is a fool's errand, the President agreed.

Professor Marshak said that regionalization is occurring irrespective of what some may want. The center of gravity is shifting to larger towns and to freeway exits. Some towns are doing OK by killing off the smaller towns around them. Those struggling with these trends are asking the University to stop the flood. They are fighting for a vision of small-town America that is being eroded--but not by the University. They cannot stop fighting but the University must point out that it is not the problem and that regionalization is happening no matter what the University does.

There is general recognition of that fact, even among those making the arguments, Dr. Maziar said, and a lot of the people in those areas are steadfast friends of the University every session. Many suburban legislators have not yet established long-term strong track records with the University. As the power of rural Minnesota declines, the University needs to make sure it is developing friends with other groups.

It must also not be forgotten that the Extension Service will still deliver services in the counties, and will deliver better service by moving to extension centers with 4-6 people in each one, Professor Morrison observed. That will mean that one person does not have to be expert at everything.

The President concluded that this is tough period and the University must live through it. The real issue is the long-term vision of the public responsibilities of the University. Professor Erdman said that the original land-grant mission focused on agriculture and the mechanic arts as outreach, the University is doing even more outreach since it expanded beyond those fields, such as in medicine; the focus of the discussion needs to be shifted.

The original purpose of the land-grant act was not outreach, Dr. Maziar said, but a focus on applied fields, because most of the eastern colleges focused on training the clergy. It addressed two big needs of the country at the time: agriculture and industry, but the focus on the agricultural and mechanic arts was not to be to the exclusion of all other fields of study. People are misled when they think that land-grant means only outreach or agriculture; the point was to address the needs of the nation and open higher education to the "industrial classes." Access was a key issue, Dr. Bruininks concurred. The National Defense Education Act in the 1950s followed along the same line, Professor Marshak said: the country had certain needs in science and education and funds were provided for higher education to meet those needs. Professor Campbell added that the U.S. Department of Education's Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need plays essentially the same role at this time.

President Bruininks said he would be making 8-10 regional trips and give presentations on the role and importance of the University; he will also hold regional forums. Senior Vice President Cerra is doing the same thing. They have held one already in Alexandria. It is interesting that when they visit the small communities in decline, what those communities often see as their biggest problem is not agriculture but health care and the loss of their young people. Alexandria is thriving, seeing the growth of manufacturing and business. Among their top three priorities is addressing a shortage of engineers; they asked if the University would think about internships in the Alexandria area. They were not thinking about the University as an agency of agriculture but rather as a place to get talent. Their problem is getting people to the area; they are confident that once people are there, they can keep them.

Professor Ratliff-Crain asked if the numbers from the rural physician's program supported this view. They do, Dr. Cerra said; if the University recruits students from greater Minnesota and trains them, many stay in greater Minnesota. Professor Ratliff-Crain asked how is the pilot program in Dentistry in Hibbing was going. It is the kind of partnership the President has been talking about, Dr. Cerra replied. There was an under-served population so elected officials put money on the table. The University renovated space in a MNSCU building and the School of Dentistry put dental students and dental hygiene students there to handle 150-200 cases per week of public health dentistry. And the clinic has a viable financial model.

In terms of the role of the health sciences in the land-grant mission, Dr. Cerra continued, the state has charged the University with providing a work force for health care. It is also a partnership in that the University will provide knowledge to solve problems. The University's efforts in health care fit naturally into the regional development approach.

The University needs to leverage its research capability without draining its funds, the President said; the University needs to INCREASE its funds. He has looked at the portfolios of the major foundations; they are putting \$150 million into activities in which the University is interested. But these investments are like a picket fence, with a lot of gaps, and there is no underlying research or infrastructure to them to ensure their success. The University has developed criteria for where it will put the regional centers; they must be aligned with the presence of the University or an institution of higher education. Dr. Cerra has a major grant to develop regional education centers in health care; they, too, must be aligned with the emerging structure so they are not spinning in their own orbit. The foundation executives also recognize they cannot do things on their own, the President said, faced with declining endowments and an understanding that some of their investments have not made a difference.

The University must get the world away from talking about it as an economic engine, Professor Martin said; it can, however, be a catalyst. Foundations find projects through program officers; those officers need to be more connected to the University. There is a need to spend time identifying the areas of interest of the foundations and educating program officers about what is at the University and better ways to align the work of the foundation and the University.

One example of the partnership model is the University's relationship with the Science Museum in St. Paul, the President said. When someone writes an NSF grant proposal, he or she can write in the relationship with the Science Museum; they get points for more broadly disseminating their work with this partnership and their grants are also more competitive and productive. They must think about making the entire University more accessible and leverage relationships where they can without compromising the research mission. By the same token, in the conversations with the Mayo Clinic about the joint research venture, Mayo said it could not be a player in genomics without the technological capacity provided by high-speed internet capacity; for \$100,000, which they spent, they could have access to the technology they needed to work with the University, an expenditure that will likely generate tens of millions of dollars in new research funding, with the state support of the joint research venture.

Dr. Maziar said that people could get their knickers in a twist talking about the University as a land-grant institution. In the next 30-40 years, she said she was not certain what would make a land-grant university different from other public research universities. The label land-grant conveys both baggage and honor and it is not clear what the balance between them should be. Professor Erdman said he has

been thinking about the future land-grant role of the University in outstate Minnesota as a teaching and research institution. One approach is regional centers. Teaching over the web or by email has not panned out as predicted, although it might in the future, but the University now must either deliver its teaching and research from the hub or through the centers. It should take advantage of the circumstances to redefine the land-grant mission, not shove it aside, he said.

Professor Marshak recalled being in a meeting a number of years ago where it was said that the most effective technology transfer the University accomplishes is through the students it sends out, not its programs. The best the University can do for the state is to retain as many of the local students as it can in the state while also attracting as many students as it can from the rest of the world and retaining them in Minnesota as well. That is a much more effective approach than any programs. (Although the programs, such as the Dentistry clinic in Hibbing, undoubtedly do help.) But where people land is where most people land--in 20% of the counties in the state, and it is impossible to stop the outflow to that 20%.

When one thinks about outreach and land-grant, Professor Marshak asked, are people afraid to talk about recruiting students from far away because they will be more mobile? The University has a program to recruit students from outside the area, Dr. Maziar pointed out. It should be made part of the land-grant mission, Professor Marshak said. It serves a public purpose; what the University should do is to provide people with high quality educations to all areas of the State. The research shows that it is difficult to get people to come to Minnesota, Professor Martin commented, and then it is difficult to get them to leave once they have come here. Dr. Maziar said the University needs to use language like "talent magnet," a phrase both major political parties understand and use.

When he speaks outstate, the President said, he tells the audiences about the number of University graduates who live in the area and work in health care and other leadership positions; the number from other states or countries who stay in Minnesota after graduation is about 50%. Minnesota is a state that needs to import talent, something that will be increasingly important in a global economy. Dr. Cerra related a conversation with an individual in St. Cloud, who told him that the goal was for St. Cloud to do everything in health care that could be done in the Twin Cities--but that leader's wife was going to the Twin Cities for a medical procedure that could only be done here. The University is the repository of knowledge that one must come to to obtain it. And not just in health care.

It is wise to get away from county agents in every county, Professor Morrison told the President, and to emphasize what the University is providing in service in every county. He noted that he grew up in a rural area of another Midwestern state and knows that the University can provide a whole body of knowledge and educational opportunities to those areas. He said, however, that he would be cautious about saying there is no difference between a public university and a land-grant university. There is a different in emphasis, in practical application, and in undergraduate instruction. One needs to be careful about equating a land-grant university with a research university; to do so would be a mistake, he said. There would be a different mix of academic programs, the President agreed.

Professor Morrison said that he would not wish to diminish the agricultural mission of the University, he said that he thought Representative Justin Morrill [author of the Morrill Act, which created land-grant universities, in 1863, and unrelated to President J. L. Morrill, for whom Morrill Hall was named] was thinking about the vast underserved majority of the population, whom happened at that time to live in agricultural areas. Now large numbers are underserved in other geographic regions, some of them are nearby; one could make the case that the land-grant mission is carried out in the work of such

units as the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. The land-grant mission is to serve the people of the state.

The land-grant mission, articulated at the beginning and today, is about the development of human capital, Professor Martin said. Part of the mission is economic development, but not all of it. The University has millions of examples of human capital and the land-grant mission can be rephrased to be about human capital all over the state. Developing human capital, for example, is one of the things that the College of Education and Human Development and College of Liberal Arts (non-purveyors of economic development) do well.

At the time of the Morrill Act, the public university was a new phenomenon; there were no community colleges, Dr. Maziar observed. And this university was closed, in receivership, broke, the President added. There were no other providers, Dr. Maziar continued, to address the needs that the land-grant act wanted addressed. None could carry out the research mission. Today there are other higher education players who share the responsibility for access and for preparing the workforce. However, the University of Minnesota has the sole responsibility for many fields of professional and graduate education. The University also provides 98% of the higher-education based research capability in the state. Do the people of Minnesota or legislators understand this, Professor Kane asked? Is that because the University does not have strategies to communicate the information? There is a low sticking coefficient, Dr. Maziar commented. That is always a problem, the President concurred, but when he makes a compelling statement about the importance of the University, people get the message. He and Dr. Maziar have met a lot of important people in the Twin Cities and talked about the importance of the University; they understand. Minnesota Public Radio has made this point. It is no accident that editorial boards of newspapers understand. The problem is that people just do not naturally think about this issue, so the University has to be there to make the point in more compelling ways than it has in the past. It can make the case, and will have to work at it, and bring it to a level people can understand. It must learn to make the case in terms other than its own, the President said, but rather in terms that people find compelling in their own lives.

It must make the case over and over, Professor Martin said. She has been at the University a long time, she related, and it has struck her that the difference between when she was a student here and now is that then people took the University for granted: they could come here, take classes, drop out, and it was just "in the ether." She said she was asked a question quite a few years ago: The University is so big. Why can't we see it? The University took itself for granted, too, as did the state. It cannot do so any longer; there is a different paradigm but the University has not adjusted to it.

Professor Kane said she has had the sense that the University was losing the argument, but now it appears the President does not think so. Professor Marshak said that all of higher education is losing the argument. The anomaly in Minnesota is that there were no new taxes. Few states enacted no new taxes, even with GOP governors, but even so higher education was hit all over. The University is in the middle of the pack in terms of the tuition increases reported by The College Board.

Professor Erdman alluded to the daily summary of news articles about the University or articles that include a quote from a University faculty or staff member (provided by University Relations): The average college would be extremely envious of having that many articles. There must be a way to take better advantage of that constant appearance in the media; the University's faculty are quoted every day.

That is the "talent magnet argument," Professor Kane commented. Professor Erdman wondered if people realize the number of times faculty are quoted in the media.

There seem to be two spheres in the state, Professor Wells remarked: everybody is supportive, and then people are elected to the legislature and it is something else. She recalled seeing a lot of animosity in a legislative hearing she had attended a few years ago. In part the University serves as a lightning rod for what is going on in greater Minnesota, Dr. Cerra said. The MNSCU system would be attacked unmercifully if it tried to close five campuses. They do not because they are doing what the legislature wants. Part of the problem, the President speculated, is that Minnesota has the largest legislature in the country, which may make it more parochial. It seems, Professor Wells said, that the University wins some battles but is losing the war. How does she define "losing the war," Professor Campbell inquired? A \$200 million cut, Professor Wells replied. That cannot be turned around completely, the President said, because there are a lot of competing items the legislature must deal with, such as health care.

The President said he would like to think about developing a strategy to deal with bigger issues. First, no one is looking at or sorting out the public mission of the University and its connection with research and education. Second, there is a need to galvanize political support. He said he did not believe that a grass-roots effort alone would work last year so used additional strategies. Following a discussion of legislative strategies, Professor Martin suggested that it might be useful to bring in local legislators to talk about what the University can do to be helpful and what it does. And why the University matters, Professor Kane added.

Professor Martin said the Committee would continue to think about these issues and thanked Drs. Bruininks, Cerra, and Maziar for joining the meeting.

[Professor Clayton, who was unable to be at the meeting but who read the draft minutes, commented that "one problem is 'land-grant mission' itself, as a phrase. As a 'land-grant' university, the institution has utilitarian obligations (economic and otherwise) to its origins and to the state making the land-grant. Its 'mission' as a university retains those obligations (presumably) but has many more (research, advanced instruction, range of disciplines, and so on) that are to the idea and practices of any university, whether private, public, or land-grant.]

3. Resolution on Mt. Graham

Professor Martin turned next to the resolution that had been placed on the October 30 Senate docket by the Social Concerns Committee. The resolution requests that the University withdraw from the Large Binocular Telescope project at Mt. Graham, in Arizona (the University's participation was funded by a \$5 million gift), a project in collaboration with the University of Arizona and the University of Virginia. She reported that the Business and Rules Committee had decided not to put another Social Concerns resolution, concerning essential medicines, on the docket until the Senate Research Committee had had a chance to review it. They did, however, let the Mt. Graham resolution appear--and have since learned from Professor Kuhi, chair of the Astronomy Department, that Astronomy had never been consulted about this resolution. That process made her very uncomfortable, she said. One possibility is that the item be changed from an action item to an information item for this meeting, which would allow the astronomers to present alternative views and the mitigation strategies worked out with the tribal council.

Professor Balas said he was surprised to see the resolution presented to the Senate. It is presented, Professor Martin said, with the request that the Senate endorse it. If it does, it would be carried to the administration.

Professor Marshak said he had concerns about the resolution on several levels. First, there is the due process issue. It is not clear that the Social Concerns Committee made sufficient efforts to hear all sides of this controversy.

Second, this is a question the Regents have already decided. For the Senate to make a recommendation contrary to what the Regents have already decided, the matter ought to be really important and relevant to the University community. It is not clear that this issue rises to that standard. He said he was tired of symbolic gestures. If the Senate wants to pick a fight with the Board of Regents, it should be over something the Senate feels is central to the mission of the University.

Third, this is a land-use argument. There is a fixed amount of land and this is an argument over how to use it. Such disputes are usually settled by due process and compromise. Here, one group says that compromise is not acceptable because its claims are religious (and religious views, it is argued, supersede all others, such as scientific inquiry) and made by at least some people who view themselves as oppressed (so the claim has higher merit). The arguments seems to be that these factors legitimate raising the issue over and over again in different venues, even after it has been decided in another venue. He said he was not sympathetic to the position that one party's claims were a priori more meritorious.

Professor Marshak concluded for these reasons the resolution should not go to the Senate for a vote.

What she was most troubled by, Professor Martin said, is the information from Professor Kuhl on how the Astronomy Department has worked with the tribal council and responded positively to the requests made by that group. It is not clear the Social Concerns Committee even knew about these efforts. The Regents required those steps be taken, Professor Campbell said.

Whose beliefs should control, Professor Marshak also asked? Those who are proximate or those who are distant?

Professor Kane said the arguments pro and con should be discussed on the Senate floor; if not, she worried that the procedure would be conflated with the issues. Perhaps the Astronomy Department should meet with the Social Concerns Committee.

It was agreed that Professor Martin would contact Professor Kuchenreuther to ask if the Social Concerns Committee would agree to change the resolution from action to information for this meeting and to postpone it for action until December. Professor Wells said that the Astronomy Department should also be permitted to provide information to the Senate; there are issues of fairness and academic freedom involved.

It was also agreed that the Senate Consultative Committee and the Faculty Consultative Committee should resume a more active role in reviewing Senate dockets (as they are charged to do in the

bylaws), rather than allowing any items to appear on the docket and simply asking the Business and Rules Committee to arrange items.

Professor Martin adjourned the meeting at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota