

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee Fall Retreat Thursday-Friday September 1-2, 2005 Humanities Education Center, St. Paul

- Present: Jean Bauer (chair), Gary Balas, Nancy Carpenter, Barbara Elliott, Dan Feeney, Megan Gunnar, Morris Kleiner, Kathleen Krichbaum, Scott Lanyon, Judith Martin, Richard McCormick, Terry Roe, Steven Ruggles, Martin Sampson, John Sullivan, Jennifer Windsor
- Absent: Mary Jo Kane, Marvin Marshak, Fred Morrison
- Guests: Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter, Julie Tonneson (Office of Budget and Finance); Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Sharon Reich Paulsen (Office of the Provost); Professors Kenneth Keller and Lori Abrams; Vice Presidents Kathleen O'Brien and Linda Thrane; Professors Mark Davison and Darwin Hendel, Dr. Richard Howard (Institutional Research and Reporting), Mr. John Ziegenhagen (Office of the Provost)
- Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the Chief of Staff)

[In these minutes: (1) the budget model; (2) strategic planning; (3) strategic planning and institutional change; (4) issues for the year for the Committee; (5) administrative strategic planning; (6) a 4-hour seminar on ranking universities]

September 1

1. Budget Model

Professor Bauer convened the first day of the FCC retreat at 8:30 and welcomed Vice President Pfutzenreuter and Ms. Tonneson to discuss the budget model. The proposed model is entitled "earned income and full cost." The Committee discussed a number of issues related to the model:

- the need for further analysis of the impact of the model on interdisciplinary research and teaching
- the need for further discussion of the 75/25% tuition attribution scheme
- the extent to which deans will figure out ways to optimize their college's revenue
- the possibility that the model will lead to increased college/department administrative costs
- the need to inform colleges and faculty about the comparative performance of the college
- where are the incentives for quality? (which mostly costs more money; the point was made by several Committee members that there must be incentives to increase quality)
- how to design the institution so bad leadership does not permanently "screw up" the institution—does the new budget model put a check on bad leadership or does it increase the power of bad

* 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.

leadership? (It was suggested there must be budget model transparency at the faculty level, which will serve as one check on bad leadership.)

Other points were also made in the discussion.

- This Committee should play a role in highlighting, and mitigating, the possible disconnect between making the University better and the imperatives that may emerge from the new budget model. The Committee can push toward improvement of the University and it can continue to emphasize quality.
- There is need to analyze the distribution of power with the new system.
- Transparency can give faculty a lever to affect a dean and help address concerns about leadership; the model needs to create incentives for deans that push as strongly toward quality as they do in the direction of "bean counting."

Professor Bauer thanked Vice President Pfutzenreuter and Ms. Tonneson for joining the retreat. It was agreed that the Committee on Finance and Planning should take up the budget model very soon and that the subject should then return to this Committee.

2. Strategic Planning

Professor Bauer next welcomed Provost Sullivan and Ms. Paulsen to the meeting. The Provost discussed the strategic positioning timeline, task forces, and charges. Committee members made several points and raised several questions:

- Public engagement of the University should be in the work of the task forces
- The budget model could create incentives that run contrary to the strategic positioning goals (and the task forces should all be made familiar with the proposed new budget model)
- The appropriate task forces must focus in part on interdisciplinary teaching and research and there should be mechanisms in the budget process to set aside funds for interdisciplinary activities
- What will be the mechanism for deciding among sets of very good recommendations from the various task forces?
- What will the process look like after this year?
- Whence the resources to implement recommendations and what will be the task forces be told about resources?
- There needs to be a faculty feedback mechanism for deans
- Faculty who spend time in the strategic positioning process should not be penalized when salary decisions are made next year.

Provost Sullivan emphasized that the process will align academic priorities with the budget and the allocation of resources. He also reported that there will be about 500 people involved in the task forces and recommendations, including a number of representatives from this Committee.

Professor Bauer thanked Provost Sullivan and Ms. Paulsen for joining the meeting.

3. Strategic Planning and Institutional Change

Professor Bauer next welcomed Professors Abram and Keller to the meeting to discuss barriers to institutional change and strategic positioning. The guests and Committee members made a number of points during the discussion.

- People change because it is good for them, not because it is good for the organization.
- For internal success, there needs to be a strategy to obtain external support.
- Strategic planning at some point is the culmination of efforts that gets attention. The process must establish a vision that makes sense to people, that builds on previous efforts, and that represents change—but in a direction already identified.
- There is difficulty in using communication links and getting the message out; the University must also deal with the "vision" issue: what does it mean to be a land-grant university? Has that meaning changed in the 150 years since the land-grant act was adopted?
- The state can set goals for the University, but it must leave the University alone to carry them out.
- Just as doctors are the most important people in the health care system—but the health care system does not exist to support doctors, the most important people in the institution are the faculty—but the institution does not exist to support faculty.
- The University must report its steps toward achieving the goal of being among the top 3 public research universities—or people will say "see, they are making no progress." It is important that the slope of the line be in the right direction.
- It is important that the process not become disconnected from the criteria and that task forces not be set loose with no responsibility for the outcomes—they have to remain linked to the process and the goal.
- The University might consider hiring a professional firm to do the public relations for the strategic positioning process.
- The administration must be in a position to make some of the decisions; it can take the heat, but it must be accountable and the decisions must be consistent with the announced criteria.
- The process needs to address the question of the student as customer.
- The process must also address how important it is to undergraduates that the University is in the top three.
- A "high tuition, high aid" model distorts the purpose of the University. If students are paying a high percentage of the costs, there is incentive to offer only low-cost courses. Students are not the only "customers" of the University; so are the state and the nation.
- But there are no "national" universities, only a confederation of institutions. In some cases departments serve the nation, even though the focus of its activities may not be as important in the state of Minnesota; by the same token, other departments in other institutions serve Minnesota. In addition, a lot of students come to the state to attend the University and stay, people who would not come here to take their first job.
- There is a need to talk about what families want for their children: good jobs as well as a good education. The University plays a critical role even for students who do not go to the University in ensuring that there will be good jobs in the state.
- The criterion of demand is the most complex of those in the process. It is not clear what is meant—but it should not be just what freshmen students want.
- Undergraduate education at a research university offers different things—and the University must live up to its obligation to deliver those things. Students obtain a different kind of education at

- Carleton—which is very good at what it does—so the University must build its curriculum on its comparative advantage.
- The strategic positioning process can't be one with all losers (i.e., when the budget is shrinking). The University should be able to move around 2-3% of its budget each year, with the right incentives and criteria in place. It must be able to reward outstanding performance.
 - One of the dangers in the current process is the number of task forces and the possibility that they will not be tied to the overall goals. But it is a good idea to involve a lot of people. If the University rewards "Lone Ranger" behavior, it will get "Lone Ranger" behavior.
 - Is there a mechanism to move around the 2-3% without incurring large opportunity costs? It is possible by working closely with this Committee and the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning; the administration must make decisions but must justify them with the criteria (and there must be room for disagreements). The more diffuse the process the more likely problems will be dealt with remote from where they are; consultation with the committees would bring credibility and understanding across the University. The more committees that are involved, however, the more diffuse the process will be. The committees have to be sufficiently knowledgeable to have a dialogue with the administration, but the decision must be delegated to the administration.
 - It will be important to identify critical points of reassurance with various communities in the state, and the University must not try to pull the wool over people's eyes but demonstrate that it is working toward what they want. The University will also need allies.
 - With respect to transparency, people sometimes have short memories; if they do not like the outcome, they will forget they knew what was going on. Transparency is important, but people still don't remember.
 - The Committee should think about how to keep contact with the process without dictating to it. It should discuss ideas and proposals before they emerge. The discussions will evolve and it will be necessary to have many informal discussions. With more time, it is also possible to convey the message/sensitize people about what is going on with the other task forces—and to political realities.
 - One way to manage change is to point out what is NOT changing.
 - The Committee should think about how to bring the deans into the process—and not just in a hierarchical/following orders way.
 - High quality means supporting faculty effectively, but that is not cheap. It is possible to have programs that bring in more money but that are low quality.

Professor Bauer thanked Professors Abram and Keller for joining the retreat.

4. Issues for the Year for the Committee

Professor Bauer next asked Committee members to identify the major issues for the year.

- High on the list is the budget model and its interplay with strategic planning, and the need for a simulation of the budget model (one can learn "what ifs" from simulations as well as about weaknesses in the model); strategic planning/budget model issues include:
 - Crafting the message about strategic planning: as task forces do their work, how can the mission of the University be communicated to the state?
 - Brainstorming about the downsides and unintended consequences of the budget model and what policies will be needed to deal with them

- The funding of graduate education
- The need for transparency
- The need to have the deans invested in the strategic planning process; they have not been involved but they must carry it out
- Ensure that there is no negative fallout from the process as a result of having maximum faculty participation
- The Committee MUST champion interdisciplinary education and research; it will be the only constant force in the strategic positioning process other than the administration and the Committee must brainstorm ideas so that interdisciplinary activities are really included (and there must be financial incentives for deans and department heads to advance interdisciplinary activities); the Senate Research Committee is to look at interdisciplinary research incentives
- The implementation costs of the budget model and strategic positioning and trying to ensure that they do not lead to increased administrative costs for colleges and departments.
- The disposition of three resolutions from the Faculty Senate last year (tuition remission for dependents of University employees, elimination of the waiting period for the Faculty Retirement Plan, and conducting exit interviews of faculty who go to another academic institution)
- The hiring of a new chancellor with no consultation
- Academic freedom versus the market-driven institution (not all research and teaching must be market-driven)
- The future of tenured faculty at the University
- The relationship of the Committee with the Twin Cities Deans Council
- Post-tenure review: Is there pressure on department heads and units to increase the number of faculty subject to post-tenure review? (And the Committee on Faculty Affairs might re-emphasize the objective of post-tenure review, which, in the first instance, is intended to be formative and helpful, not summative leading to dismissal)
- The proportion of tenured faculty at Minnesota compared to other institutions, and the proportion of probationary faculty at Minnesota who achieve tenure compared to the proportion at other institutions
- Track how well the new process for reviewing deans works (Professor Bauer announced that she has been asked to serve on the review committee, which will consist of four faculty and one dean).
- The stipend for Regents Professors
- The status of the Subcommittee on the Faculty Retirement Plan
- Post-retirement health care should be on the Committee's agenda

5. Discussion with Vice Presidents O'Brien and Thrane

Professor Bauer next welcomed Vice Presidents Kathleen O'Brien and Linda Thrane to discuss the administrative strategic planning report and turned the chair over to Professor Sullivan to preside at this portion of the meeting.

Vice President O'Brien reported that there will be seven administrative task forces, which corresponds to the number of major recommendations in the administrative strategic planning task force report. There were, she said, seven recommendations and many strategies and projects. Among the topics of conversation were these:

- how the administrative task forces would be coordinated and the consultation process for their work;
- branding and marketing and promoting the University's reputation as well as protecting the University's symbols and logos;
- the administrative savings that can be achieved, and how, and avoiding cost increases elsewhere in the institution because of savings in one place;
- the principles of centralization and decentralization (and associated costs) and the appropriate distribution of administrative costs in the University to achieve effectiveness and efficiency;
- the need for auxiliary units to value the mission of the University; and
- the timeline for accomplishment of the goals of the administrative strategic planning effort (probably 3-5 years).

Professor Sullivan thanked Vice Presidents O'Brien and Thrane for attending the meeting and recessed it at 5:00 until the following morning.

September 2

6. Ranking Universities

Professor Bauer convened the meeting at 8:00 and noted that the session this morning would be devoted to a discussion of the ranking of universities. Materials on various rankings systems had been distributed to FCC members, groups of whom had been assigned specific systems to report on. She turned first to Professor Martin to review the rankings of the National Research Council.

Professor Martin noted that the report she examined was an assessment of the National Research Council rankings, which were last issued in 1995. Because the NRC rankings look at graduate programs, the recommendations in the article were actually directed to Ph.D. education. Those recommendations/comments were: it takes too long to get a Ph.D., Ph.D. programs need to be expanded, Ph.D. students need greater exposure to information technology, Ph.D. programs need a more varied and flexible curriculum, interdisciplinary research must be emphasized, and graduate students should be exposed to broader information on the economy and global environment. These are things that can be done in graduate programs to improve the quality of graduate education—and which, if done, would (one hopes) improve the rankings of programs. There was also a recommendation that NRC rankings in the future include agricultural programs.

In terms of rankings, the report raised several questions. Is scholarly reputation worth measuring? (Yes, but there is not a good way to do so.) Why should there be rankings? (Because students pay attention to them.) The article dissected the ranking methodology (but the University of Minnesota's rank would not change if there were changes in the methodology).

Comments on the NRC rankings:

- They are the ones that most academics pay attention to, Professor Sullivan observed. The numbers are probably still being used, but at this point they are quite old and alternative measures should be considered, especially since it is not clear when the next NRC rankings will be developed (if ever).

-- The strategic planning goals include looking at the University's rankings vis-à-vis other institutions, Professor Gunnar observed. The University needs to look at ranking methods and decide what it wants to track, and then link those item back to the rankings. It must also decide what slice(s) of the University it wants to track and at what level (e.g., for graduate programs, it must be the department).

Professors Feeney and Ruggles next reported on the U.S. News & World Report rankings (USNWR). Professor Ruggles said they tried to figure out how the system works and how it changes over time. He distributed a handout listing the criteria used for undergraduate programs, for graduate programs, and for the various professional programs; they also indicated the relevance of the criterion for the University of Minnesota and the possible unintended consequences of using or emphasizing the criterion in institutional planning and decision-making. For graduate programs in the fine arts, sciences, social sciences, and humanities, the rankings are simple: they are 100% reputational, based on responses of deans and department heads. For professional and undergraduate programs, several measures are used. For the professional fields, each has its own measures and they are assigned completely different weights (with no rationale for the weightings provided). Their conclusions are that the USNWR is probably the weakest of all the rankings systems and that the best policy would be for University to take the best elements of the publicly-available data and decide what is most valuable for it. The USNWR rankings penalize institutions for being large and the reputational measures have a significant disadvantage: if one tracks changes over time, they have a lag—and one must trust that deans and department heads know what they are talking about. Objective measures would be more useful.

The weaknesses of the USNWR rankings, Professor Feeney summarized, are inconsistency across time and across fields, changing criteria, and possibly irrelevant criteria. If the University is to be among the top three public institutions in the world, it will have to pay attention to what it wants; it is not clear what the University is aiming for. It may end up chasing ratings by spending money where it should not. The quest for higher rankings can foster bad judgments by boards of regents and administrations—some might feel the University should go after them, but rankings are developed by the uninformed and the University would be trying to measure itself by criteria set by those uninformed others.

-- Professor Gunnar said she tried to identify which institutions it would be reasonable for the University to compare itself with and selected Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa. No matter what ranking system is used, they all seem to place the four institutions in roughly the same relationship with each other. Other ranking systems do correlate with the USNWR rankings.

-- One person at a university may receive more than one of the three forms sent to institutions, Professor Windsor observed, and people often will be tempted to rank their own department as the best. She also noted that the strongest correlate with high rankings is faculty size, so smaller departments (of which the University has a lot, in comparison with peers) will be ranked lower.

-- The criticisms of the USNWR rankings are well-founded, Professor Sullivan said, but even so, there have been serious declines in the social sciences at the University—the University's rankings have declined faster than any other Big Ten school except Northwestern, on average by three ranks. Over time, the University does not look as good as it once did.

Professor Sampson next reviewed the world university rankings released by the Institute of Higher Education of the Shanghai Jiao Tong University. These rankings first appeared in 2003 and were the first attempt to rank universities around the world. The rankings were a sensation when they appeared

and they were unwelcome in Europe because they suggested the dominance of American universities. These rankings are in one way the opposite of the USNWR rankings: there is no reputational component at all. The Shanghai study uses only data that are weighted (e.g., alumni of the institution who have won a Nobel or Field prize (10%), faculty who have won such prizes (20%), articles published in Nature and Science (20%), articles in the science citation index and social science citation index (20%), and so on). The University of Minnesota, which ranks 32nd in the 2005 rankings, is one of only three institutions at that level or higher that has a zero in the Nobel or Field Prize category (Michigan and Duke, with which Minnesota is tied, are the others). The University is at the leading edge of a bulge, a group of institutions that are tightly clustered (after which there is a steep increase in change necessary to increase ranking significantly). The number of points that would get the University from 32nd to 19th if it gained them, would cause a drop from 32nd to 75th if it lost those same points.

They are in the process of fine-tuning the rankings, Professor Sampson concluded, and will divide the rankings by fields in 2006.

-- Among public universities on the list, Berkeley is first, San Diego is second, Michigan is 7th, and Minnesota is 9th, Professor Ruggles commented; the publics are penalized for their size, and the lack of award-winners has a huge impact.

-- Minnesota is on the leading edge of a mass of institutions in a number of the rankings, Professor Lanyon observed; the University could move forward, with difficulty, but could slip very easily.

-- The University loses in these rankings by not having superstars, Professor Kleiner pointed out; the University has never had a Nobel Prize winner who won the prize while at the University, although it has a number of people who did much of their major work here and then moved, so were somewhere else when they won the prize. Are these people not at the University, or does it not put forward names (e.g., for the national academies), or do they leave just about when they are ready to win a prize?

-- Since the goal is to be among the top three public institutions in the world, will the assessment include European universities, Professor McCormick asked? Most are public institutions, but including them in the pool makes achieving the goal even more difficult.

-- It is striking that this study, which includes a large piece of the University, has nothing to do with undergraduate education—where the University has spent a lot of money, increased its reputation considerably—and thus the University could spend much and have no effect on its ranking. The University is 66th in the US in the USNWR rankings of undergraduate education at national universities, Professor Sullivan noted.

-- Apropos those who have left the University and then earned major awards elsewhere, Professor Gunnar said she hoped there are plans for qualitative discussions about people who have left the University and what must be done to retain them. Professor Kleiner pointed out that the Senate adopted a resolution last year, at the recommendation of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, requesting that there be exit interviews of every faculty member who leaves the University to go to another academic institution. Professor Gunnar speculated that if one asked members of the national academies why they left, one would find that resources to do their job was a bigger factor than salary.

-- The Committee had a discussion about the usefulness of seeking more members of the national academies for the faculty. Professor Balas suggested that in many cases those are individuals whose influence has waned and that they should not be sought as a way to increase the University's rankings. It would be more important to see more mid-level awards as a metric of a growing/improving university. Other Committee members disagreed; Professor Gunnar maintained that many of the members of the national academies are not "dead wood"; Professor Sullivan said that age and productivity vary by field: while in engineering, math, and science, people may make their biggest contributions by the time they are 30, major contributions tend to come later for social scientists and even later for those in the humanities. Moreover, Professor Ruggles pointed out, the University does not do dismally with respect to national academies membership; it is 11th, and it is 8th in the criterion of most-highly-cited researchers and 6th in total publications.

Professor Windsor next reviewed the rankings of the top 200 world universities published by the Times of London. These rankings are based on peer review (1300 academics in 88 countries), international faculty score, international study score, citations, and so on. The University of Minnesota ranked 82nd on the Times table (compared to 32nd on the Shanghai study).

-- The Committee did not discuss the Times rankings at length, but Professor Sullivan noted that the University of Minnesota is 6th in the Big Ten in the Times rankings. Professor Bauer noted that the Times rankings were, like the USNWR rankings, based in significant part on reputational data.

Professor Balas next reported on the University of Florida study, The Top American Research Universities. The study uses nine metrics, all of which are quantitative (total research expenditures, federal research expenditures, endowment assets, annual giving, national academies memberships, etc.). The study explicitly uses data that everyone can see.

Federal research expenditures are a good measure because those are peer-reviewed proposals, Professor Balas commented; total research expenditures is less directly related to quality (and the study authors agree) because some funding is not peer-reviewed, and this measure is oriented to medicine, engineering, and high-energy physics. He cautioned that the University must decide which of these metrics to use to drive academic investments, and he again suggested that it should not "buy old Nobel Prize winners" and instead hire three new junior faculty. The University of Minnesota does very poorly on one of the nine measures in the Florida study: SAT scores, where it ranks 159th in the country. (That is not a metric that relates directly to education, he said, but it comes up often.)

-- In terms of undergraduate measures, it was noted that most students at Minnesota have taken the ACT, not the SAT (although those who do have SAT scores were probably better students because they were most likely thinking about applying to universities on either coast, rather than a Midwestern university, because it is the coasts that use the SAT while the Midwest institutions use the ACT, so it is plausible to think that the SAT scores for students at Minnesota may be above the average for students applying to Minnesota—and in any event, SAT and ACT scores are highly correlated). Moreover, many students graduating from Minnesota are transfer students, so are not counted.

-- This study is one measure where the University did (earlier) rank in the top three, although the Florida study looked only at American research universities. Minnesota is now at 7th in the Florida study. This methodology, he noted, rewards institutions for size.

-- Professor Gunnar contended that tiers are more important than specific numbers; it would be important to move up one tier.

-- Professor Ruggles observed that the variables are not weighted in the Florida study and that the University does reasonably well on most of them.

-- Professor Elliott commented that the Florida study included a very insightful introductory essay that included the point that to evaluate the effect of a research university is about human capital and how institutions measure it and invest in it. That essay offers insight into how the University could grow as a research university. Faculty and students are expensive; acquiring a dynamic future with award-winning faculty will not require increased salaries as much as start-up funds. If the University is to attract high-quality students, it will need funds to attract them. The community of scholars is important, as is amount of resources available to it, in attracting and retaining outstanding faculty.

-- Graduate education is overlooked at the University but it is key, Professor Windsor said. And it is very expensive. There are pragmatic things that can be done; for example, it is cheaper to fund a postdoc or a clerical position than a Ph.D. student because of the fringe benefit rate. She said she would prefer to hire a Ph.D. student but often cannot because of the difference in cost. Some Ph.D. students can be very expensive for their college or department, she added, such as when they do not obtain or are not supported by external funding—which leads, in those units, to decrease the number of graduate students. That high cost, however, is a result of the effort to make budgets more transparent, Professor Lanyon said; the University KNOWS how much graduate students cost while other institutions may not.

Listening to all of the discussion, Professor Martin said she was led to inquire, given the available evidence, what makes anyone think the goal of being in the top three public institutions in the world within ten years is realistic? Professor Gunnar said that if the University could figure out why Wisconsin (which seems to be in a very similar kind of state meeting similar kinds of demands) is ahead of Minnesota (at this time), and then move up in the rankings to the level that Wisconsin is now at, it would certainly be on the right track. Professor Lanyon said he believed achieving the top three is possible, but not on the indices used in many of the studies that the Committee has considered. The University needs to think about what Minnesota and the country need and stick to measures oriented to those needs—and they must be real measures, he said. What does the UNIVERSITY define as important? It should not invest a lot of money to chase a particular index.

The prospects for the University achieving its goal in the regular rankings MAY depend to some extent on the University of California system imploding and Michigan becoming private, Professor Sampson observed. He said he agreed with Professor Lanyon, however, that the University can become one of the top examples of how to unlock creativity in support of excellence in an institution with a very large undergraduate mission, a very diverse set of graduate programs, and a distinguished research program. It has a chance to be regarded as having done remarkable things, given what the University wants to do.

Following a short break, Professor Bauer turned next to Professor Hendel to provide an overview and analysis of rankings of universities. Professor Hendel presented a series of slides.

Professor Hendel began with a quotation from the University of Florida rankings of the best American research universities: "Who's number one? The quintessential American question. We all want to stand first in line, first in the hearts of our country, first in the polls, first in the standings. The pursuit of Number One is surely an important thing in sports, but for universities, being first is not as important as being among the best." He noted that there have been many rankings recently published. From the Star-Tribune: "Did you know that Macalester College in St. Paul is one of AMERICA'S HOTTEST COLLEGES? That the University of Minnesota's Twin Cities campus is ninth on Rolling Stone's list of schools that rock? Or that St. Olaf College in Northfield is ranked 24th on *Golf Digest's* list of best schools for academically inclined female golfers?" As higher education becomes an increasingly international enterprise, Professor Hendel said, the University needs to consider not only an institution's standing in the context of American research universities, but also the context of research universities across the world. The key question is "What is the peer group?" The University has come far from past decades in which most comparisons were based on the Big Ten institutions.

The challenge for the University is this, Professor Hendel said: "Given the tripartite mission of the University of Minnesota, how do we conceptualize an institutional ranking schematic that takes into account and appropriately weights the three inter-related mission components of an urban, research, and land-grant institution?" The University does not particularly want to rank highly on every scale, such as the Princeton Review's list of party schools (on which three of the Big Ten schools are among the top 10).

There are two kinds of ranking systems, Professor Hendel reported. One is single-variable ranking systems (that use such measures as Federal Research-and-Development Expenditures, Doctorates Awarded, Number of Volumes in Library, Competitive Success in Athletics (Directors' Cup, and so on. The other is multiple-variable ranking systems (such as *U.S. News & World Report*, NRC Ranking of Doctoral Programs, *The Top American Research Universities*, *Washington Monthly* Rankings of service to society, and Internationalization of Research Universities). There are also stand-alone ranking systems for departments and disciplines and for professional schools (e.g., American Studies, Philosophy, Economics, *Forbes* Survey of Business Schools, and for law schools).

There are various criteria by which to judge ranking systems, which include reliability, validity, usefulness, and consequences. In the case of the last, one consequence of relying on one or more ranking systems might cause institutions to do things they should not do. One could also ask about how institutional rankings relate to the needs of the state. Who uses rankings? Students and their parents, and faculty (*U.S. News & World Report*, NRC Ranking of Doctoral Programs); so also do funding agencies and institutions. In terms of student usage, there are limited data how they use ranking systems making decisions about institutional choice. There have, however, been surveys of entering freshmen on the Twin Cities campus about the role rankings played in choosing the University of Minnesota.

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
1995	51.8%	36.3%	11.9%
1997	45.6%	39.0%	15.4%
1999	49.1%	39.9%	11.0%
2001	51.6%	35.4%	13.0%
2003	43.6%	39.1%	17.3%

Publicity follows changes in rankings; Professor Hendel noted recent coverage in the St. Paul Pioneer Press: "The undergraduate program at the University of Minnesota's Carlson School of Management is ranked 12th nationally on the annual U.S. News & World Report list of America's Best Colleges, which will be released today. For the past two years, the Carlson School's undergraduate program was ranked 14th by the magazine. Carlson is ranked seventh among public universities. Also today, *Forbes* magazine is releasing its survey of top business schools, rating them according to return on a student's tuition investment five years after graduation. It places Carlson's part-time MBA program sixth and its full-time MBA program 35th, down from 31st last year." And there is a competitive preoccupation with the rankings, he said, and noted an observation from a recent outstanding book on American universities. "It is hard to overestimate just how important the rankings game and U.S. News' annual reciting of America's Best Colleges has become. No matter how the results are pooh-poohed, everyone pays attention. Everyone's strategic goal is to move up in the rankings; from tier two to tier one, or from there into the top 100 and ultimately the "nifty-fifty" (*Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission driven*).

Professor Hendel also noted a recent comment in one of the higher education newsletters; "University administrators have a love-hate relationship with the annual rankings released this time of year by *U.S. News & World Report*, *Peterson's*, *Newsweek* and others. In speeches and op-eds, they complain that the ratings use flawed methodology and prompt institutions to skew their priorities to perform better in them. Yet some among them, at least, are the institutions that skew their priorities to perform better in the rankings, and they are often quick to trumpet the news when they fare well."

Professor Hendel recalled that there are a large number of single-variable measures of institutions, which include institutional size, seating capacity of the football stadium, endowments, tuition and fees, enrollment of foreign students, faculty salaries, fund-raising, research and development expenditures, faculty salaries, library holdings, doctorates awarded, and on and on. The reason it is important to understand them, he explained, is because some of the single variables are included in the set of variables used in multidimensional ranking schema, because knowing where the University of Minnesota ranks on certain key variables helps understand ranking for the more complex ranking systems, and because those individual variables provide the basis for discussions within institutions about appropriate institutional strategies to affect changes in a particular variable (e.g., undergraduate retention and graduation rates). If size were a measure of quality, the Twin Cities campus ranks 4th. If winning across athletic programs, the Twin Cities would rank 17th among public universities and 22nd among all. If endowments were the measure of quality, the University would rank 6th among public institutions and 26th among all. In the tally of all the variables Professor Hendel provided, the University stands as follows:

	Public	Overall
Intercollegiate Athletics	17th	22nd
Athlete Six Year Graduation Rate	49th	68th
College and University Endowments	6th	26th
Tuition and Fees	7th	56th
Most Enrolled Foreign Students	13th	21st
Faculty Salaries	23rd	76th
Top Fund Raisers	8th	16th
Research Libraries	11th	19th
Federal Research-and-Development Expenditures	9th	22nd

Doctoral Degrees Awarded

8th

8th

Professor Hendel next revisited the University of Florida study on the top American research universities. He noted the nine variables (total research expenditures, federal research expenditures, endowments, annual giving, national academy members, faculty awards, doctorates awarded, postdoctoral appointees, and SAT/ACT range) and how the study used them (first it was determined whether an institution ranked in the top 25; if so, it was given a "1" if in the top 15 and a "0" if not; the zeros and ones are summed). Here are the numbers for the 2004 results (number of the nine measures in the top 25):

Harvard	9
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	9
Stanford University	9
Columbia University	8
Cornell University	8
Johns Hopkins University	8
University of Pennsylvania	8
Duke University	8
University of California-Berkeley	8
University of Michigan	8
Yale University	7
University of Southern California	7
University of Washington	7
University of Wisconsin	7
Washington University	7
University of California-Los Angeles	7
University of Minnesota	6
University of Texas	6

The 2004 ranking (tied for 6th) represents slippage for the University. In 2003 it was tied for second with UCLA, University of Michigan, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin; in 2002 it was tied for first with the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan; in 2001 Minnesota was tied for first with the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan, and in 2000 it was tied for second with Penn State, University of Florida, University of Illinois, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin (but there were four institutions above them as well).

There are criticisms of the Florida study, Professor Hendel noted, related to reliability (i.e., stability) of rankings over short period of time), to the fact that ranks are based on the number of indicators in top 25 institutions nationally, and that institutions have little direct impact on certain composite variables.

Professor Hendel turned to a brief review of the U.S. News & World Report rankings. The rankings include "America's Best Colleges," which includes rankings of institutions in several categories: national universities, national liberal arts colleges, regional institutions. It also includes "America's Best Graduate Schools," rankings in business, education, law, medicine and others. The daily news update from the Chronicle of Higher Education summed up the results of this year's rankings as follows:

- Harvard and Princeton Universities tied for the top spot in the annual college rankings compiled by *U.S. News & World Report*. Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania followed, taking third and fourth place, respectively.
- The rest of the top 10 changed little from last year. Two universities tied for fifth place: Duke and Stanford Universities. The California and Massachusetts Institutes of Technology tied for seventh place, followed by Columbia University and Dartmouth College, which tied for ninth.
- In other rankings compiled by *U.S. News*, the University of California at Berkeley again claimed the No. 1 spot on the list of top public universities. The University of Virginia was second, followed by the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, which tied for third.

Among public institutions, this is how the University of Minnesota fared:

Public rank	Overall rank	Graduation rate
1. University of California-Berkeley	20th	87 %
2. University of Virginia	23rd	92 %
3. University of California-Los Angeles	25th	87 %
4. University of Michigan	25th	87 %
5. University of North Carolina	27th	81 %
6. College William and Mary	31st	90 %
7. University of California-San Diego	32nd	83 %
8. University of Wisconsin	34th	79 %
9. Georgia Institute of Technology	37th	72 %
10. University of California- Irvine	40th	80%
11. University of Illinois	42nd	80 %
17. University of Texas	52nd	74 %
30. University of Minnesota	74th	56 %
Indiana University		71 %
SUNY-Binghamton		80 %
Michigan State University		71 %

Professor Hendel mentioned that the single biggest predictor of an institution's graduation rate is the academic ability of incoming students. And on that measure, the University of Minnesota underperforms: it has a lower graduation rate than predicted by the academic ability of its students.

In 2006 ranks of professional schools, the University stood as follows:

	Overall	Public Rank
Business	23rd	9th
Education	12th	5th
Engineering	26th	16 th
Medicine	38th	16th
Law	19th	6th
Public Affairs	21st	10th

In 2006 ranks of graduate programs, the University ranked as follows:

Biological Science	29th	13th
Chemistry	22nd	10th
Computer Science	35th	10th
Mathematics	16th	6th
Physics	24th	12th
Economics	15th	6th
English	Not in Top 25	
Political Science	18th	8th
Psychology	12th	6th
Sociology	22nd	12th

Professor Sullivan said that in order for the University to achieve its goal of top three publics, some departments have to be ranked first or second. Professor Hendel noted the criticisms of the USNWR rankings and observed that there are other rankings systems available--but sometimes the data they use are not publicly available. One new ranking that just appeared was developed by the Washington Monthly magazine.

'Washington Monthly' Produces Its Own College Rankings, Based on Service to Society

- Each year *U.S. News & World Report* releases its annual ranking of colleges, and each year critics complain that the magazine's ranking methods ignore many of the colleges' crucial characteristics. This year, the editors of *The Washington Monthly* not only joined in the criticism of the *U.S. News* rankings, released last week, but also published their own college guide, which ranks institutions using entirely different criteria.
- "While other guides ask what colleges can do for students, we ask what colleges are doing for the country," write the editors in the September issue of the publication, a political magazine based in the nation's capital. "Universities should be engines of social mobility; they should produce the academic minds and scientific research that advance knowledge and drive economic growth; and they should inculcate and encourage an ethic of service."
- Rather than asking institutions to complete a survey form, as *U.S. News* does, *The Washington Monthly* relied on publicly available data. The monthly calculated each college's score for community service, based on the percentage of federal work-study funds used for community-service projects. It also calculated scores for social mobility, which it figured by calculating the graduation rate of low-income students on Pell Grants, and scores for research, which it measured based both on the amount of research spending and the number of doctorates awarded in the hard sciences.
- The Massachusetts Institute of Technology earned the top spot in the monthly's rankings, based largely on its performance in the community-service category. Harvard University and Princeton University, which shared the top spot in the *U.S. News* rankings, were 16th and 44th, respectively. The monthly ranked Wellesley College first among liberal-arts colleges.

The University of Minnesota did not rank in the top 25 of the Washington Monthly rankings, although three of the Big Ten schools (Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois) did.

Professor Hendel touched briefly on the NRC rankings. He noted they had been issued in 1982 and 1995, and the 1995 study rated 41 doctoral fields (the University of Minnesota has 98 doctoral degrees). Some of the University's high-quality doctoral programs were not included, such as American

Studies and Agricultural Economics. The next iteration of the NRC study is not yet funded (it was supposed to be completed in 2005); the process is very expensive and there is a long time lag to publication. It is not clear at this point that there will be another NRC ranking, or not very soon.

Another study that drew on the institutions in the University of Florida study looked at the internationalization of a university. Professor Hendel reported that the study used 19 variables and relied on international experts to assign weights to the variables. The variables included such things as percentage of international undergraduate students on campus, percentage of international graduate students on campus, number of Marshall and Rhodes scholars, number of Fulbright Fellows, number of Peace Corps volunteers, number of campus centers focused on international research, number of least-commonly-taught languages, and so on. On this study the University ranked fairly high:

Rank	Institution	Public Rank
1.	COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	
2.	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY	1
3.	GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	
4.	UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	
5.	HARVARD UNIVERSITY	
6.	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	2
7.	YALE UNIVERSITY	
8.	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES	3
9.	UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON	4
10.	UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES	5
10.	UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON-SEATTLE	5

Yet another way to rank institutions is on outreach/public service. Professor Hendel provided a table of data with expenditures on outreach, which, according to the source (IPEDS), is "the sum of all operating expenses associated with activities established primarily to provide noninstructional services beneficial to individuals and groups external to the institution. Examples are conferences, institutes, general advisory services, reference bureaus, and similar services provided to particular sectors of the community. This function includes expenses for community services, cooperative extension services, and public broadcasting services."

Rank	Institution Name	2003 Expenditures
1.	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH	\$291,066,000
2.	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY	\$163,473,641
3.	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	\$157,929,129
4.	UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA-TWIN CITIES	\$154,294,058
5.	UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO	\$144,570,326
6.	UNIVERSITY OF ILL AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	\$142,426,752
7.	UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	\$140,658,248
8.	UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON	\$106,797,234
9.	UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	\$105,047,000
10.	NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV AT RALEIGH	\$95,236,999
11.	UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-ANN ARBOR	\$78,090,000
12.	UNIVERSITY OF NO CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL	\$75,409,910
13.	COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	\$70,553,437

14.	IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY	\$64,557,779
15.	AUBURN UNIVERSITY MAIN CAMPUS	\$64,102,553
16.	UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA NORMAN CAMPUS	\$63,265,000
17.	MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY	\$58,987,575
18.	CLEMSON UNIVERSITY	\$57,501,753
19.	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-DAVIS	\$55,470,000
20.	KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	\$54,837,137

Professor Hendel turned to the issue of the University's announced strategic positioning goal, to become one of the top three public research universities in the world within the next 10 years. This could be an aspirational goal. Achieving it will require identification of competing countries and understanding of the distinction between private and public in other nations. There is a very rapid expansion of higher education going on in other countries (e.g., China and India), he noted. Finally, outreach and public service distinguishes American universities from those elsewhere in the world. Professor Hendel noted the observation of one of the leading scholars of higher education: "Everyone wants a world-class university. No country feels it can do without one. The problem is that no one knows what a world-class university is, and no one has figured out how to get one."

Professor Hendel quickly reviewed the Times of London and Shanghai studies, which Committee members had already discussed. He noted that the University ranked 9th among public institutions in the Shanghai study. He also reported that there are ranking systems in other countries as well, each of which uses a different set of criteria.

In summary, the University (primarily Twin Cities campus) stands as follows:

	Overall	Publics
<i>U.S. News & World Report Best Colleges</i>	74th	31st
<i>U.S. News Best Graduate Schools</i>	NA	NA
NRC Survey of Doctoral Programs		9th
<i>Washington Monthly</i>	?	?
International Emphasis	10th	4th
World Universities (Times)	82nd	NA

One of the criteria by which one can judge ranking systems, Professor Hendel recalled, is their consequential validity, which is an extension of standard notions of validity by Samuel Messick at Educational Testing Services. What are the consequences/effects of ranking systems? What are the desirable and undesirable effects? Do the rankings influence institutional and individual behavior? He noted the observation by Professor Altbach: "Putting too much stress on attaining world-class status may harm an individual university or an "academic system. It may divert energy from more important and perhaps more realistic goals. It may focus too much attention on building a research-oriented and elite university at the expense of expanding access or serving national needs. It may set up unrealistic expectations that harm faculty morale and performance." Professor Hendel also reported the caution issued by an economist, reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education: "Many research universities are responding to fiscal, political, and competitive pressures with a rankings-driven "arms race" that creates management problems and can erode institutions' core strengths. . . . 'mission creep' at research universities is making 'all institutions look like each other.'" Another scholar has pointed out that "while

some of the actions an institution might take to improve its rankings may also make sense educationally, others may not and, more importantly, may not be in the best interest of American higher education as a whole."

There are also disconnects between institutional rankings and state priorities. There have been three national reports grading the states on higher education. Higher education institutions such as Minnesota compete in a national and international arena. There is also the distinction between the different roles of public and private higher education in the United States. And finally, Professor Hendel asked, to what extent do legislatures consider institutional rankings? In the three national studies ("Measuring Up"), the State of Minnesota was given these grades:

	2000	2002	2004
Preparation	C+	B-	B+
Participation	B-	C+	A
Affordability	A	B	C-
Completion	B+	B+	B+
Benefits	A	A-	A
Learning	I	I	I

Committee members discussed this information at length. Professor Martin began by reflecting that in order to move up quickly in its standing on the US News and other rankings, the University could increase the SAT scores of incoming students. To improve quickly on the NRC and similar rankings, it must go hire Nobel laureates. There is a disconnect in what the University must do between these two varieties of studies. Professor Hendel agreed that they do lead to different strategies. In the case of the NRC, it is essential for the University to hire and retain high-quality faculty. It also needs to invest in undergraduate education—where it has made immense progress.

The way to improve the undergraduate graduation rate is to improve the quality of incoming students, Professor Gunnar observed (following the same observation by Professor Hendel). Doing that will mean that more and more students do not get in, which will change the character of undergraduate education on the campus, she said. Putting the two together (changes suggested to improve NRC rankings plus changes in undergraduate education) would mean bright faculty members with a more exciting undergraduate student body. But to do that the University would have to work with the state to figure out where the other students would go; if that is not addressed, there could be many students who would not have a place to obtain a four-year college degree. The key is students in the metropolitan area, Professor Hendel said, and he hypothesized that St. Thomas has become like what the University used to be, albeit more expensive.

The number of high-quality students attending the University has increased, Professor Hendel said, but this is a low-population state. Where are the rest of those high-quality students to come from?

Professor McCormick said it is interesting that two criteria on which the University does very well is outreach and internationalization. Internationalization is a market issue, he said; European universities are reorganizing themselves to match American universities so they can be competitive for the best students coming from Asia. Professor Sampson reported that the Citizens League has projected a shortfall of students unless more Minnesotans from minority and immigrant communities enroll in post-

secondary education; that suggests that the University could do better in the social mobility aspect of The Washington Monthly rankings.

Professor Bauer now invited Professor Davison to provide observations and commentary on the rankings discussion.

Why rankings, Professor Davison first asked? Progress (or lack thereof) toward becoming one of the top three research universities in the country needs documentation from credible evaluations that are both external to the University and consist of comparisons to other research universities. He commented that the K-12 education system has learned the danger of aspirational goals (if that is what the University's goal is): They will not be understood as such by the public and organizations will be expected to meet them. Being among the top three public research universities in the United States would be tough; to expect to be among the top three publics in the world may be unrealistic.

In adopting a realistic goal and rejecting an unrealistic one, the University may need to explain not only what it is doing well but also what makes the goal unrealistic why it cannot or should not strive for that goal. It needs to be open with the public on what it can and cannot do, and why. If it intends to make a claim about its standing, it must use an external system and must "buy into" that system. The difficulty is that the external agency picks the measures. But an internal system will not substitute for an external measure. An external measure also requires comparisons: are other places doing it better? Once the need for comparisons is accepted, certain limitations necessarily follow: for example, the comparison will involve a large number of institutions and one must rely on pieces of data that are efficiently collected from a large number of institutions.

Professor Davison advised the Committee there are a number of criteria one could use to select a ranking system. He suggested the University consider these: the rankings are updated regularly, they are based on research criteria and comparison to other research universities, they are evaluations of universities as a whole rather than specific programs within universities, and they are consistent with the breadth and land grant nature of the University's mission. An existing study that meets those criteria reasonably well is the University of Florida evaluation of research universities. The University of Minnesota, he observed, has one of the broadest missions of any university in the world, with good reason. The use of Nobel laureates, one indicator in the Shanghai system, is a rather narrow way to measure research accomplishments or stature, since few fields have Nobel prizes.

If one dissects the evaluations, Professor Davison said, the rankings turn into a feedback mechanism; dissection also provides the basis for explaining strengths and weaknesses to the public. In the University of Florida study, for example, with its nine metrics in which the highest score is given to universities in the top 25 (and in which the University is already in the top 25 in six criteria), to improve in those six categories would not improve the University's overall ranking. There are, however, other areas where the University could improve or where it is in danger of falling out of the top 25. It is 26th in endowment—just barely out of the top 25. It is 25th in national academy memberships, so could easily fall out of the top 25. It is 43rd in major faculty awards. And it is 159th in undergraduate selectivity (30th among publics)—to get to the top 25 or 50 in selectivity would make a difference but would be difficult. However, Professor Davison cautioned, Washington ranks 229th in selectivity and Wisconsin ranks 49th, and both of them stand higher in the Florida rankings than Minnesota.

With respect to major faculty awards, Professor Gunnar commented, part of the problem or solution is rewarding departments for putting up people for awards and providing assistance in preparing nominations. She asked Professor Davison if the University were moving into a top tier if one were to pull measures from a number of the ranking systems. He said that the University would have to combine the separate measures itself--and it would be accused of cherry-picking measures. It would not be using a recognized standard, but a standard of its own making.

Professor Windsor said she thought it has not always been clear if the goal is to be among the top three public universities or among the top three public RESEARCH universities. If the latter, that suggests a small elite undergraduate education and large, well-funded graduate programs. Professor Gunnar said that if the University is not among the top RESEARCH universities, all the rest of the institution will suffer. She surmised that there will be fewer research universities in the future because there will be insufficient resources to support them all. Professor Davison pointed out that the University is the only research university in the state.

Professor Davison reviewed the nine criteria used in the Florida rankings and offered comments on its advantages and disadvantages. Its disadvantages are that it uses a limited number of indicators, it is limited to relatively simple, easily collected measures, and it takes little account of local conditions. Its advantages are that it is external and satisfies the need for comparative data. That suggests, he said, that the University needs a statement of which evaluation system it considers most appropriate along with statement of its strengths and limitations as well as a statement other indicators/targets by which the University judges itself. Professor Sampson agreed; drawing on the observations by Professors Davison and Gunnar, suggested that the University use the Florida ranking of research universities—but that it also supplement those rankings with additional measures because the University has other missions as well.

Professor Bauer inquired how the Committee wished to proceed. Professor Martin commented that the University appears to have established the goal (being among the top three public research universities in the world) without a clear sense of how to measure achievement. The Committee should convey its concerns about measuring, about whether the University can realistically be expected to reach the goal, given the potential difficulties.

Professor Lanyon said he assumed that the task force on metrics, being chaired by Executive Associate Vice President Sullivan, would be charged to identify measures the University would use. Mr. Ziegenhagen said that he believed the task force charge would speak to the issues that have been discussed at this meeting. The University's annual accountability report does some of what Professor Davison recommends, he said, and it will be critical to pick measures that one can evaluate over time and NOT manage or make decisions based on rankings. Mr. Ziegenhagen agreed with Professor Davison, however, that there is value to dissecting the rankings—doing so can raise red flags (such as the University's precarious standing on the faculty awards measure in the Florida study)—but there is no universal standard for measuring research universities.

Professor Windsor said that if the goal is to be among the top three public research universities, it is not clear how the strategic planning process will help the University achieve it. There is no task force on graduate education, or on the endowment, and the faculty culture task force is far too broad. The task forces may recommend good things, and things the University wants to do, but they are not likely to get it into the ranks of the top three public research universities. And, per Professor Davison, one worries if this is purely an aspirational goal.

Professor Kleiner said his question, as chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, is how the goal will affect faculty members as they show up to work each day. How will they be expected to behave differently in five years? That will depend on the metrics that are chosen, Professor Lanyon said. The University, for example, must have more interdisciplinary research if it is to be among the top three, and faculty must be assessed on the extent and nature of their interdisciplinary research. Professor McCormick said that interdisciplinarity has been mentioned repeatedly during these discussions but it is not something that is measured in any of the ranking systems. Grant agencies are moving in the direction of supporting more interdisciplinary work, Professor Gunnar said, and grant funding will become a proxy for interdisciplinary work.

Professor Feeney said he agreed with Professor Windsor. If the University has a metric it will use, he did not know how the task forces can do much without the target and the metric. The Committee should advise the President that it is essential the metrics for measuring progress toward the goal be developed as quickly as possible so they can be consulted on. He agreed with Professor Davison that the University should adopt a Florida-plus system—and that it should be given to the task forces. The selection of the "plus" part must be wisely done, Professor Sampson added. Professor Hendel reported that the Council of Graduate Schools has done work on interdisciplinary research and graduate education; he promised to provide the Committee information about that work.

It would be useful if someone would write a critique of the Florida study in terms of what it leaves out, such as measures of interdisciplinary teaching and research and public service/engagement, Professor Martin commented. It would be helpful to begin a national discussion on that subject, she said. Professor Hendel reported that while there has been considerable scholarly commentary on a number of the ranking systems, there has not been on the Florida study, in part because it is fairly new. Professor Balas pointed out that the Florida rankings are of U.S. universities; the goal is to be among the top three in the world. There is a need for metrics on what it means to be among the top three in the world.

Professor Bauer again inquired what the Committee should do first, and second, and so on. Professor Lanyon said that Professor Windsor's concern cannot be answered yet—because the goal does not say where the University should go. It must say what it wishes to improve on in order to identify the metrics, which will in turn will allow the task forces to be effective.

Professor Sampson, in response to Professor Balas's comment, said that in the United States institutions are public by the nature of the public funding they receive. Things are fundamentally different for Cambridge and Oxford, for example. The University must be clear that the comparison group is not just state-funded institutions; it should also include a research and a land-grant mission. Professor Gunnar suggested the University say it want to be one of the top three publics in the United States as well as being highly attractive to foreign students. But it cannot "define out" the other institutions with whom it would normally be seen to compete with, Professor Balas said. The University should adjust its goal to a comparison with the public research universities in the United States, Professor Hendel suggested, but at the same time should indicate what it will do to increase its importance and impact around the world.

Professor Bauer, noting general agreement that there should be an early meeting with the President, the Provost, and Dr. (Al) Sullivan, said the Committee should inform them of the issues it believes require attention as strategic positioning moves forward. The measures and metrics task force

will be one of the most important because there is now a sense of disconnection between the goal, the measurement, and the process.

Professor Martin suggested that Professor Bauer write a letter to the President on behalf of the Committee informing him of the time spent in this retreat talking about concerns about the goal and metrics to be used. The Committee would like to have an early discussion about these concerns because it wants the strategic positioning process to go forward in the most constructive way possible. Professor Gunnar said it is important that what it means to be among the top three research universities is mapped out for the task forces so they can identify steps that will help move the University toward the goal. Professor Sampson said he was also concerned that leaks of unformed ideas from the task forces could have explosive implications; the University should explain the process to the state to mitigate the impact of the possible premature surfacing of ideas that are only preliminary or partial. Professor Gunnar said the task forces should treat their deliberations carefully.

Professor Bauer thanked everyone for attending the retreat and adjourned it at 12:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota