

TO: AHC-PFCC Members
DATE: 2/20/97
FROM: Sheila Corcoran-Perry
RE: SON Student Records and Data Practices Policy (12/23/97 Draft)

Before getting into the major item, I thought I'd share a quote that just happened to be stuck in the elevator when I returned from the PFCC meeting today:

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world.
Indeed, it's the only thing ever has.

Margaret Mead

Now to the major topic of this memo.:

You have all received copies of the three page SON Student Records and Data Practices Policy (12/23/97 Draft), with the related Regents' Policy and Procedure attached. From a faculty perspective, I have grave concerns about six areas in this document. These six areas are listed below. With most concerns, I have a brief statement about my view (in italics), along with excerpts from the Regents' Policy and Procedure that I believe are relevant to the concern.

CONCERNS:

1. Policy: Location of Student Records, particularly the three following statements:

a) p. 1: "the record will remain within the Office of Student Services at all times"...

My view; This is far too restrictive. It interferes with faculty's ability to carry out their educational, research, and service responsibilities in relation to students. The Regents' Policy does not include such restriction. Administrators have said there have not been problems regarding misuse of students' educational records

b) p. 1: "Should a faculty member need copies of information to take away from the office for interview or correspondence purposes, copies of the relevant data will be made"

My view: Why only copies? Having both the original record and copies (in total or in part) is problematic in many ways. In addition, using SON staff and paper resources to copy such records seems unwise and unnecessary. Faculty need access to the original data at the time and place that they need it. (No mention of this in Regents' documents)

- c) p. 1: “The Dir of SS, DGS, Assoc Dean, or Dean will be granted permission to remove student files from the Office of Student Services for the purpose of accomplishing administrative, legal and judicial work after completing a sign-out procedure.”

My view: If U personnel in these positions can remove files via sign-out procedure, why not faculty?

2. **Policy: Release of Information**, particularly the following statement:

- a) p. 2: “Private data from a students’ record will be **released to a faculty member only** after the student has signed a release of information form”

My view: This is inconsistent with Regents’ Policy and inhibits faculty from carrying out their responsibilities

Regents’ Procedure: “University officials are those members of the U whose designated responsibilities reasonable require access to student records for education, administrative, or research functions and may include faculty...” (p. 4)

“Persons and institutions that may receive information without student permission. 1. Persons within the U who have a legitimate educational interest, defined as having responsibility for... providing academic or personal advice and counsel to students” (p. 6)

3. **Policy: Faculty Access to SON Student Records**, particularly the following statement

- a) p. 2: “Faculty members whose **only** relationship is that of teacher of a course or reference are **normally not given access** to the official record without a signed release form from the student”

My view: This negates many teaching responsibilities that faculty have in relation to helping students learn and progress.

Regents’ Policy: “Within the U, student education records will be

used only for appropriate research, educational, and U administrative functions. Access to those records is allowed only to those members of the U community whose designated responsibilities reasonably require access..." (p. 2)

"Student (private) education records...are not disclosed to anyone except:... b) persons within the U who have a legitimate interest in the information for educational, administrative, or research purposes" (p. 3)

Regents' Procedure: "University officials are those members of the U whose designated responsibilities reasonable require access to student records for education, administrative, or research functions and may include faculty..." (p. 4)

"Persons and institutions that may receive information without student permission. 1. Persons within the U who have a legitimate educational interest, defined as having responsibility for one or more of the following functions: providing academic or personal advice and counsel to students" (p. 6)

4. **Procedure: Access to Official Student Records, particularly the following stat:**

- a) p. 2: "Faculty who require access to a student file for reference letters or graduate school applications should secure a release of information form or a comparable statement ..."

Regents' Policy & Procedure: (same as for item # 3)

5. **Procedure: Return of Student Papers, particularly the following statement:**

- a) p. 3 "materials should be returned according to the following schedule: (4 listed)

My view: Far too prescriptive; Regents' procedure below is adequate.

Regents' Procedure: "examinations, term papers...any other graded materials that are personally identifiable should be distributed directly to the student or made available for pick up in departmental offices in a manner that ensures the privacy of each student's grade" (p. 5)

6. **Responsibilities of Office of Student Affairs, particularly the following statement:**

a) p. 1: "responsibility to design systems that ensure the integrity of all student records"

My view; I expect that the system must be approved by administration and faculty. This should be made explicit.

Regents' Policy: "custodians of student education records have the responsibility to educate and inform ..." (p. 2)

"Appropriate U officials held directly responsible and accountable for the careful protection of student education records against possible misuse.

Regents' Procedure: "It is the responsibility of custodians of education records to bring the regents' policy to the attention of all persons having access to student records." (p. 4)

document.s\cc.son\datapr2.pts
2/20/97

Received: from mhub1.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Fri, 21 Feb 97 09:59:57
Return-Path: <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub1.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 21 Feb 97 09:57:22 -0
Received: from x108-40.cvm.openpn.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Fri, 21 Feb 97 0
From: "Daniel A. Feeney" <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
To: bebea001@maroon.tc.umn.edu, Daniel A Feeney <feene001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, fhaffert@d.umn.edu, Peter B Bitterman <bitte001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, Judith M Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, dwh@med.umn.edu, Sheila A Corcoran-Perry <corco001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, Cynthia R Gross <gross002@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, Andrea D Grehan <barsn001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>, courtney
Subject: FYI, SCFA Letter...
Message-Id: <330dc5e23c3b838@mhub1.tc.umn.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 97 09:57:25 -0600

Hello AHC-PFCC,

As a follow-up to our meeting yesterday, I said I would send you a copy of the letter that Faculty Affairs Committee sent to the outgoing and incoming administration. The central theme was the importance of "faculty consultation in advance" vs. "you'll be the first to know on a need to know basis". This letter is NOT FOR WIDE DISTRIBUTION!!!! However, because of the topics on which we ended our meeting yesterday, you should know what has been said to Yudof in advance of the AHC/Yudof Forum on Monday.

Pete mentioned my framing a question on one of the included issues. My concern is that I've already posed the scenario. Therefore, it would be better if someone else could draft a relevant question that would read different from the (convoluted) writing style I use. The last thing we need is to have it appear that somebody is planting the questions.

My questions (with any modifications welcomed) would be:

"Do you plan to use the current U-wide and the evolving provostary faculty governance structures in your policy making and planning efforts?"

"If so, how would you propose to do this?"

"When do you think it appropriate to use outside consultants?"

"Do you have a plan for balancing pressures from outside constituents vs. faculty expectations?"

I will be able to make the meeting with Provost Cerra, but because of clinic commitments, I will be unable to attend the forum.

Have a good week end!

Feeney

*****NOT FOR FURTHER DISTRIBUTION*****

Professor Nils Hasselmo, President
Professor Mark Yudof, U-MN President-Elect
Professor Marvin Marshak, Senior Vice President For Academic Affairs
Morrill Hall
East Bank Campus

Gentlemen,

As higher education adjusts to the ever-changing public philosophies and priorities, the need for a strong bond of trust as well as a collegial working relationship between administration and faculty become increasingly important. During its February 6, 1997 meeting, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) discussed recent events that influenced where our institution is today and what could/should have been done differently. In the interest of improving OUR institution and learning from past experiences, it seems wise to share the points that emerged.

One issue is the balancing of constituent priorities. Those of us in faculty governance have some understanding of the numerous pressures facing academic administrators. We are aware of the seemingly ill-fated intrusion by the Board of Regents into the general operations of the University. We realize that the political motives and educational paradigms of our elected representatives in State government (and where germane, the Federal Government) may not match the institution's collective vision of its future or its perceived place in the regional funding hierarchy. We understand the need for institutional efficiency, accountability, and evolution as perceived by the public. We also understand the need for institutional responsiveness to students' needs, to regional industry priorities, to legislative whims, and to local/regional competition. However, the needs, perceptions, and priorities of the faculty must not be lost in the shuffle.

As you know, faculty morale is low. In part, this is due to the ever-tightening fiscal environment. It is in part the result of the real or perceived shifting of priorities within the institution. The Faculty feel that a growing number of concerns and constituencies are drawing administrative attention at the expense of the faculty whose perspectives are addressed, if at all, as an afterthought. This feeling was fostered when the delayed biweekly payroll policy was implemented. Despite what was probably little, if any, real savings for the institution (the numbers given varied so as to erode confidence in them), this was pushed through over the objections raised by the members of SCFA and some members of the Faculty Consultative Committee. It was apparently what the entrenched administrative staff felt was right (or convenient), and it was deemed politically advantageous for outside consumption, regardless of how it affected the faculty's morale or fiscal situation. Similarly, the fallout from the tenure deliberations, coupled with the draconian approach taken by the Board of Regents, have left the faculty feeling that they have no advocates. This became quite obvious with the support given to the recent collective bargaining endeavors and its narrow defeat in the Arts, Sciences, Engineering, Agriculture, and Professional Education segments of the institution.

There is one indisputable fact here; the reputation for scholarly and educational excellence as well as the very credibility of this institution are a direct result of faculty effort! The faculty need to be acknowledged for what they are, the cornerstones and foundation of the institution. Current faculty concerns relate to the apparent corporatization of the University and the view that faculty are expendable commodities (or even liabilities) who stand in the way of any hypothetical need for increased institutional flexibility. Instead, because of their importance to the institution, the faculty (through the governance system) should play a major role in determining institutional priorities and setting institutional policy. This currently occurs on some fronts, but not on others. How effective the faculty's role can be will be determined by the working consultative model and the ready use of interested faculty as sounding boards, strategists and analysts in advance of final decisions.

Major faculty governance concern centers on the definition of

consultations as used at our institution. In the collegial model, consultation is interpreted as advise and consent, whereas it would appear that the corporate definition implies only the need to inform when deemed necessary. Universities have traditionally and continuously evolved at the unit level through faculty in their classrooms, in their research, and in their scholarly endeavors. While this change is not always evident to the general public (or even to some administrators), it is through this form of evolution that universities have exerted enormous influence on the societies in which they are embedded. Faculty have protected this form of evolution through the device of collegial governance. That it has been effective is evident from the following quote from the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education:

"TAKING, AS A STARTING POINT, 1530, WHEN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH WAS FOUNDED, SOME 66 INSTITUTIONS THAT EXISTED THEN STILL EXIST TODAY IN THE WESTERN WORLD IN RECOGNIZABLE FORMS: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, THE LUTHERAN CHURCH, THE PARLIAMENTS OF ICELAND AND THE ISLE OF MAN, AND 62 UNIVERSITIES. UNIVERSITIES IN THE PAST HAVE BEEN REMARKABLE FOR THEIR HISTORIC CONTINUITY, AND WE MAY EXPECT THIS SAME CHARACTERISTIC IN THE FUTURE. THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED WARS, REVOLUTIONS, DEPRESSIONS, AND INDUSTRIAL TRANSFORMATIONS, AND HAVE COME OUT LESS CHANGED THAN ALMOST ANY OTHER SEGMENT OF THEIR SOCIETIES."

Quoting the above is not to say that the faculty are totally resistant to change. However, if the faculty perceive that their input is not taken seriously, or if the consultative process occurs after decisions are made (or implementation is initiated), two problems arise. First, faculty lose their investments in the institution. One should not discount faculty loyalty in our highly rated university that has among the lowest senior faculty salaries in its peer group. Second, the benefit and insight captured from the collective wisdom of the faculty are lost (and probably their support, as well). Timely and effective consultation can provide perspective on issues and can potentially head-off trouble before it starts. In addition, broad support for potentially controversial policies having effects on the faculty may be facilitated through prior, candid discussion and modification before disclosure to the faculty at large. Concerns about hidden agendas or undue influence from other constituents should then be minimized. The periodic criticism of Senate's Committee minutes may be viewed differently, if used as a mode to assure faculty that adequate advance consultation was solicited and that controversial issues were discussed from the faculty perspective. Reflecting on the more contentious issues of the past couple of years, it seems to us that early and in-depth discussion (not just transfer of information) may have prevented some of the problems observed.

Over the past year or so, there were several issues that were of particular concern to the faculty. It is our feeling that had the timing and relative weight of faculty input been different, a number of recent controversies may have been averted. The timing of discussions with faculty about specific issues must be early in the life of an issue. For example, had the issue of one in four vacated faculty lines reverting centrally been discussed with the faculty governance representatives, the ire and suspicion that spread across the institution recently could have been minimized. The need for institutional flexibility in our competitive and ever-changing environment is a concept faculty can understand, and possibly even embrace, if their viewpoint is solicited early and taken seriously. Similarly, the Summer Session Cancellation Policy implementation without faculty input has had a serious negative influence on faculty perception of their relative importance in the institution. Worse yet, the long term effects of such a policy could influence the quality of the summer sessions. Faculty in such a prestigious institution will have other options with more predictability. They will move to opportunities that are not

affected by a 6-day cancellation notice. The consultant-driven, re-engineering debate in the Health Sciences is yet another example of what happens when the faculty are perceived as liabilities whose sole goal is to maintain the status quo and save their jobs. Such consultants necessarily have a stake in producing striking, short-term results which are often based on corporate models. By contrast, the faculty have a long-term commitment to the goals and ideas of OUR institution and its well-being. It is becoming increasingly obvious, at least to us, that outside consultants are expensive, potentially counterproductive, and cannot replace the collective wisdom of the faculty!

Our point here is straightforward. Faculty input must be solicited early and often on most issues. Information sharing is not consultation. The interaction between administration and faculty governance must be in depth, even on issues that seem like the prerogative of administrative operations staff (e.g. biweekly payroll). Issues and the effects must be analyzed from both the faculty and administrative perspectives in advance. Outside influences must continually be viewed in light of their relative importance to the views and needs of the faculty. Despite how we were treated during the recent Regents deliberations on the tenure issue, we believe the faculty can and will look beyond self-interest toward the good of the institution. The University of Minnesota has assembled a large number of loyal faculty who, despite being comparatively underpaid, continue diligently working for the institution's reputation and the improved student experience. This communication is not a ploy for faculty governance to usurp administrative authority. It is, however, submitted as food for thought. In our estimation, there would be fewer contentious issues if faculty reaction to proposed administrative actions were analyzed with faculty governance in advance of implementation. We believe that actions taken may be different, and even possibly more effective, in the long-run thus improving internal rapport.

We cordially invite you to a discussion of these issues. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs stands ready to provide input and render analyses on issues affecting faculty well-being and the qualities of the institution that can be influenced by how faculty may view proposed actions. We are not attempting to assume the role of the Faculty Consultative Committee. However, we may be able to assist in deliberations that have effects on faculty morale consistent with our charge. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Daniel A. Feeney, 1996-97 Chair
Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

cc: Professor Virginia Gray, 1996-97 Chair
Faculty Consultative Committee
Professor Laura Koch, 1996-97 Chair
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Professor Fred Morrison, 1996-97 Chair
Senate Committee on Finance and Planning
Members, Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Daniel A. Feeney
C-350 Veterinary Hospitals
University of Minnesota, St. Paul Campus
1352 Boyd Ave
St. Paul, MN 55108

Received: from mhub2.tc.umn.edu by mailbox.mail.umn.edu; Thu, 30 Jan 97 10:35:42
Return-Path: <corco001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Received: from maroon.tc.umn.edu by mhub2.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 30 Jan 97 10:34:11 -0
Received: from x14-18.ejack.umn.edu by maroon.tc.umn.edu; Thu, 30 Jan 97 10:34:1
To: ahcfcc96-97@maroon.tc.umn.edu
From: "sheila corcoran-perry" <corco001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>
Subject: Deans' Council Meeting
Date: Thu, 30 Jan 1997 12:34:19
X-Tick-Nemesis: The Idea Men
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Message-Id: <32f0cd830fed661@mhub2.tc.umn.edu>
Status: U

I attended the Deans' Council meeting, 1/28/97. Although the meeting was scheduled from 2-5, I was asked to come at 3:30 and to give an update on PFCC activities.

When I got there, Frank told me that he used the beginning of the session to discuss with the deans the idea of having a PFCC representative regularly attend the council meetings. He indicated that he would contact Judy Garrard about the deans' reactions, suggestions, etc.

The following topics were addressed with some discussion at this meeting while I was present:

1. "AHC Strategies for Revitalization"

A handout has familiar background "slide-type" information on challenges, crisis, and chronological development of the AHC Strategic Plan.

It also included the "Interscholastic Strategic Plan for the Academic Health Center, 1996-99"

I will share this handout with Judy for distribution to all AHCPFCC members

2. Focused Grants Management Process (FGMP)

A four-page document identified the FGMP goals, objectives, accountability metrics, and required commitments. I will share this with Judy, too, for distribution.

3. 1998-99 Biennial Budget Initial Draft

A three-page document describing the U of MN Budget Brief. It includes short descriptions of the University's plan and the Governor's recommendation. This document identifies the 30 research universities that have been identified as the peer group for the U of MN; it is the Change magazine list of the nation's top 30 research universities.

This document will be distributed.

4. Summary of University Central Administration Executive Retreat in January, 1997

5. AHC Programs of Excellence, 1998-99 Legislative Request

This is in draft form and Provost Cerra does not it circulated yet. There are many issues to be resolved.

One issue related to this request is "position control", an attrition model. We will want to keep in touch with progress on this issue. A two-page handout will be distributed.

Another item in the budget that is of interest to us all, I am sure, is faculty compensation. There are budget items for "salary inflation: "fringe inflation", and "compensation strategy pool"; the plan is to bring the mean U of MN faculty salaries up to the mean of the salaries within the 30 comparable universities. This goal is to be achieved in 2 or 3 years.

6. Development of School/College Strategic Plans and 1997098 Performance and Quality Metrics

Provost Cerra shared a memo that he just distributed to deans about the development of such plans and metrics. A copy of this memo will be distributed.

7. At the end of the meeting, one dean raised the issue of the Deans' Council having a "party line" to share with President-elect Yudof regarding having a provost/chancellor for AHC, regardless of the organization for the rest of the University or Twin Cities campus. This will be a future agenda item.

In summary, there were many topics that I think AHCPFCC wants to keep an eye on, including:

1. Focused Grants Management Process
2. A "party line" on AHC provost/chancellor structure
3. Faculty compensation
4. Position control (an attrition model)
5. Central Administration accountability fo University-wide services
 - Who decides about services
 - On what basis
 - Overall vision?
 - Accountability?

I think we need to clarify what status we want/request for a PFCC member at the Deans' Council. This should be on the agenda for our next meeting. Do we want/need ex officio status or a regular presence? After yesterday's meeting, I felt that it would be difficult to serve in an ex officio role if we have different members attending successive meetings. It will be difficult to be "on top of issues" if the same person isn't there consistently, and it could be disruptive for the deans.

I do feel that it is important for us to be at the Deans' Council in some fashion. We could be observers as described in the "Open Meeting" rules, where the deans do their work, can request input from observers, or can give permission to an observer to speak. We have written rules of this type for all of our School of Nursing meetings. I could share them if others don't have them.

That's all for now.

Sheila Corcoran-Perry

Sheila A. Corcoran-Perry, PhD, RN, FAAN
Professor

To: Judith M Garrard <jgarrard@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,
dick@neuro.med.umn.edu,
stan@lenti.med.umn.edu

From: "bland001" <bland001@maroon.tc.umn.edu>

Subject: AHC faculty governance

Date: Wed, 22 Jan 1997 09:59:44

Hi Judy, This is a note to provide a nudge to the AHCPFCC to take action on the Faculty Governance document forwarded to you from the Faculty governance task force. Week before last, I attended a meeting of the FCC with AHC department chairs and faculty. David Hamilton was there from the AHCPFCC, perhaps someone else, I can not remember. (Been to Belize since then and by brain's a bit in jet lag.) It was striking how uninformed they were about AHC major decisions. They were talking particularly about upcoming retrenchments in the AHC and that they had had no mechanism for input on information about this. In addition to this being a problem, there is clearly beginning to be established a climate of distrust of the AHC administration. This reminded me that a standing faculty committee that worked with major administrators, in this case, the finance officer and an infrastructure that communicated the conversations of these standing committees, including the PFCC, is greatly needed. These were recommended in the proposed AHC Faculty governance document forwarded to you.

Thus, I am requesting that the chairs of that task force, and others involved in the development of that document be put on the agenda of the AHCPFCC to move forward discussion and action on that report. Please let me know you have already taken action on the report, when it would be appropriate for us to meet with your committee, or if you would suggest another strategy. Thank you. Carole