

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 3, 2011
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Kate VandenBosch (chair), Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Shawn Curley, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Caroline Hayes, Jeff Kahn, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch, George Sheets

Absent: Melissa Anderson, Michael Oakes

Guests: L. Steven Goldstein, Kathleen Pickard (University of Minnesota Foundation); Professor Tom Clayton, Professor Barbara Elliott (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee); Vice Provost and Dean Henning Schroeder

Other: Jill Christenson (President's Office)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Mr. Goldstein, President and CEO of the University of Minnesota Foundation; (2) amendments to the tenure policy; (3) committee business; (4) update on graduate education; (5) resolution on faculty support for recognition of staff participation in governance]

1. Discussion with Mr. Goldstein

Professor VandenBosch convened the meeting at 11:00 and welcomed Mr. Goldstein to provide a report from the University of Minnesota Foundation (UMF).

Mr. Goldstein said he would talk about what has happened with private giving to the University and about what they expect in the future. UMF and the Minnesota Medical Foundation (MMF) jointly provide a report to the Board of Regents every year about the state of giving at the University. He noted that UMF represents 26 units including all campuses and colleges. He said he tries to share the impact giving has and focuses on student achievement, faculty excellence, ground-breaking research, and life-changing programs. He starts with "Driven to Discover" and why it is important, and said he is proud to be at the University because of its mission to attend to some of the biggest problems society faces.

The theme this year with donors was "Because of You," an effort to speak directly to donors and the effects they have, and tell them that their contributions are more and more important to the advancement of the University.

Last year there were about 84,000 donors, a group about the size of the City of Duluth. They gave \$186 million in gifts, pledges, and commitments. That number is up from the previous year and includes 49,000 alumni, 30,000 other individuals, and 5,000 foundations, corporations, and non-profits. Those donors provided \$ 95 million for academic program support, \$41million for student support, \$17

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

million for research and outreach, \$15 million for capital improvements, \$14 million for faculty support, and \$4 million for strategic initiatives.

Mr. Goldstein then told the stories of four major donors: (1) William and Nadine McGuire, who have been giving for 21 years and have donated to biodiversity, medical research facilities, student access and support, and athletics. They have created funding for McGuire scholars, for students who otherwise never would have been able to attend the University, and have also supported translational research in the health sciences. (2) The Hubbard family, which has been giving for over 30 years and supports journalism, medical research, astronomy, the veterans tribute at TCF Bank Stadium, and the Carlson School. (3) 3M, the University's largest corporate partner, has been giving for over 40 years and has supported building programs, funding leading-edge research, and supporting students; the 3M donations have touched almost every corner of the University. (4) Nancy and John Lindahl, who have been giving to the University for 30 years, to the Carlson School, the College of Education and Human Development, athletics, and the Amplatz Children's Hospital. These are real people giving time and money to help real people at the University, Mr. Goldstein concluded.

Mr. Goldstein noted that he has been in his job for two years; shortly after he took it, the economy crashed. In spite of that, the number of donors continued to grow, although the amount of money raised varied with the economy. Now there is an uptick, and they are focusing on three areas for private giving: (1) excellence, in gifts that fund research and build the faculty; (2) support for students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional); and (3) building the campus community (e.g., Weisman, the stadium, Northrop). With waning state support, tuition is the most fungible revenue source the University has, Mr. Goldstein said, and there is universal institutional passion is to be sure that students continue to have access—he observed that he could not have afforded to attend the University had tuition been as relatively high then as it is now.

The Board of Regents has asked him how the Foundation can be sure that private gifts fund University priorities, Mr. Goldstein related, rather than donor priorities that could be different or even conflict with the University's. Both UMF and MMF work on gift plans with the colleges and then frame the case for donors around those priorities.

Mr. Goldstein then turned to the gifts as of December 31, 2010, and compared the results thus far this year with the same point last year (in millions of dollars). The results, he said, have been stellar.

	FY10	FY11	Increase
UMF	60.1	77.6	29%
MMF	20.4	40.8	100%
Total	80.5	118.4	47%

These are reassuring numbers and things are picking up. The same pace has continued for UMF into January (\$13 million this year compared to \$6.4 million last year).

Asked about the two foundations, Mr. Goldstein explained that MMF was actually established first, and then UMF was created in the 1960s. The two foundations are complementary, and UMF does work with units in the Academic Health Center.

The plans for the future include guiding donors in ways that the deans have directed. They are trying to be strategic in gift development and identify goals for the units. Student support is the most universal need and they are working as hard as they can to raise funds for it. Mr. Goldstein said that he obviously cannot predict the economy but he remains optimistic that the second half of the year will be as good as the first half.

In terms of long-term trends, Professor VandenBosch asked if giving has returned to the level before the economic downturn. Mr. Goldstein said the world has changed markedly and there is turmoil that no one can predict; they try to create relationships with donors that transcend the peaks and valleys. They need to be disciplined and focused, and are trying to capitalize on this positive moment and keep donors engaged.

Professor VandenBosch asked how giving compares to 2008, before the downturn. They raised \$280 million that year, Ms. Pickard reported. Mr. Goldstein pointed out that 2008-2009 were great years in that the University received three of the largest gifts in its history: \$65 million from the Masons, \$40 million from the Schultz family, and \$50 million for the Amplatz Children's Hospital. They have to look over longer horizons, because it takes a long time to develop those kinds of gifts and they do not happen every year. They are working on some that could be breath-taking, but the timelines are the donors.'

Professor Boyle asked about the ratio between small and large donors. Almost always a few major donors drive the total, Mr. Goldstein said; it is more than the 80/20 rule. That is why they focus on the number, 84,000, because only a small minority of donors drives the revenue. They have learned, however, that people who give routinely in life, even in small amounts, will be there for the University in their estates and at the time of a major project, so they emphasize breadth and seek to create a culture of giving—that needs to start with student orientation and informing them that even \$25 matters. They want to create a pipeline, so they do spend energy on small donors as well as build relationships with major donors.

Professor Ehlke asked if they are developing a strategy to replace the matching funds the University had—that was a great strategy, she said. Mr. Goldstein said that he has told President Bruininks that the matching funds were the secret to the Foundation's ability to raise \$350 million for student support. The deadline in that campaign was December, and they received 12,000 gifts that month. They are working on the next scholarship campaign and there will be incentives; there are no Permanent University Fund (PUF) dollars left, but there are other funds they can seek for matches. It will be more difficult, but they hope to be able to offer some matching funds.

Professor Chomsky said that one question this Committee has talked about, which was part of the reason for the invitation to join the meeting, is the impact of branding and "Driven to Discover." This Committee was part of the discussions that led to the creation of Driven to Discover, and the faculty members on the Committee understand it, but that is probably different from the view of faculty members around the University, who ask why the University is spending money on something like that. How does Driven to Discover play in his work in reaching out to alumni and potential donors?

Mr. Goldstein said it is black and white for him. Driven to Discover has had a huge impact on their work. Driven to Discover and the aspiration to be among the top three public research universities have constantly been mentioned in their conversations and have created confidence that the University is in control of itself, is growing, and aspiring to be better. Those efforts have been spectacular from their

perspective. They did not know about the impact until they began meeting with people, who would refer to the TV campaign. People are confident in President Bruininks and the future as it was captured in the "top three" aspiration. He said he knows that the goal was controversial, and people wanted to know who the top two are, but the donors and alumni did not focus on that, they focused on the University wanting to become better.

There have been campaign messages in the past, Mr. Goldstein recalled, but they have been transient and were all about money. The "Driven to Discover" messages are about the institution, research, differentiation, and aspirations. They have laid the groundwork for creating a positive disposition to the University. They at the Foundation know that the messages made people feel good about and confident in the University. So they very much want a creative, credible, clear, and visible branding effort because it is extremely important for raising private gift funds.

Professor Cramer noted that he serves as the Committee's representative on the Alumni Association National Board, and was at a meeting when the "top three" message came up. He offered his somewhat skeptical faculty opinion about it—and the 40 other people in the room all pushed back and said they loved it and used it. He said he was overwhelmed and convinced and said he believes it really has played well with the external community.

Professor Cramer went on to inquire about the role of the Alumni Association. It is a service organization for alumni; does it have any fund-raising goal? People who give money to it don't know if it goes to the Alumni Association, the University, the Foundation, or where. What is the relationship in terms of strategies and fund-raising?

Mr. Goldstein said it is an important question. They were very glad that Mr. Esten was selected as the Director of the Alumni Association and that he is wrestling with that very question. There are multiple elements to it. The private institutions have done a great job of creating life-long relationships with the alumni; those relationships are important to giving. If the Alumni Association is successful in building better relationships with alumni, giving will increase, so they want to help him any way they can. The University has 40,000 alumni who have given nothing, a fact they do not like, and that group is considered a potential source of gifts. Active engagement is a precursor to gifts; the question is how they can engage current and future alumni so they feel connected to and good about the University.

Professor Kahn recalled that Mr. Goldstein had mentioned the Minnesota Medical Foundation and noted that he—Professor Kahn—is from the Academic Health Center and works with MMF. There has been some confusion and tension about the roles of the two foundations in the past, but that seems to be less true now, and he said that Mr. Goldstein and Ms. Malkerson (the CEO of MMF) deserve kudos for working together well. Donors can be confused by the two foundations, as can those who work with them.

Within the University there are so many people and engagement points that it is tough not to duplicate efforts, Mr. Goldstein said. He said they are working effectively to maximize the relationship between the foundations and to minimize the conflict. He noted that he has known Ms. Malkerson for 25 years, they present together to the Board of Regents, have weekly reviews, and share strategies. They each appeal to donors and do not care which one receives any donation. The system is not perfect but it does not create conflict. Do the two foundation boards work together, Professor Kahn asked? The point of engagement is really the staff as opposed to the boards, Mr. Goldstein said. At the end of the day,

Professor Kahn observed, there are still two separate staffs and offices; have they done as much as they can to increase efficiencies? They make sure they work together, Mr. Goldstein said, and they prepare joint reports and work together on University-wide initiatives. They are doing all they can to maximize relationships with donors.

Professor Bitterman said he was impressed by the 84,000 donor number. How does that compare with the University's peers, such as Michigan or Wisconsin? It is comparable in terms of the gross number of gifts, Mr. Goldstein said, but the University is low in its penetration of alumni in comparison with peers—the University has not done a fabulous job in developing alumni from a great student experience to lifelong engagement. Are they communicating with students at orientation, or is that just a plan, Professor Bitterman inquired. He added that he knows for sure that contact is made early at Penn State. Mr. Goldstein said that there is room for improvement.

The Alumni Association is looking carefully at how they get alumni engaged, Professor Cramer reported, and have retained a firm to look at the issue. Minnesota is very low in comparison with peers. Mr. Goldstein recalled attending his first national meeting of the Alumni Association, perhaps 30 years ago, and found there were about 50 people with an average age of about 80 in attendance. That was clear evidence that the University was not paying attention to alumni engagement; as tuition becomes the University's prime revenue source, student relations are mission-critical. It is a cultural matter; the institution must believe it important.

Professor Luepker returned to the question of two foundations. The Committee and Mr. Goldstein discussed the issue.

Professor Chomsky said that another perennial question is the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and the rest of the University in terms of giving. President Bruininks made it a point that giving to athletics for the stadium had to be accompanied by donations to the academic mission. Does he have a global sense that athletics helps fund-raising? Athletics is important to many people, Mr. Goldstein said, and they believe that if one is to have a winning institution, one must have winning athletic teams. When the most-visible sports win, that creates momentum for giving, like it or not. Just as with the need for branding, athletics helps.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Mr. Goldstein for joining the meeting.

2. Amendments to the Tenure Policy

Professor VandenBosch welcomed Professors Clayton and Elliott to discuss further the proposed amendments to the tenure policy.

Professor Chomsky reported that the points raised in the discussions this Committee held last week were brought back to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) the following day, and she and Professor Elliott have brought back to this meeting the current proposals for amendments to the tenure policy. She reviewed the changes that had been made since the last discussion.

AF&T discussed the three-year limit imposed on extending the probationary period proposed for section 5.5. Professor Curley had asked a question about it because the limit is a change. AF&T's clear choice was to retain the limit, Professor Chomsky said. Vice Provost Carney maintained that there were

unintentional changes that crept in because of amendments to the policy over the years; there is at present a two-year limit on caregiving, so an odd situation results because there is a limit on one reason for extending the probationary period (caregiving) but not in other areas (child birth/adoption and medical disability). AF&T voted to retain the three-year limit and noted that the recommendation does raise the limit from two to three years, so it is not cutting back.

Questions also arose about section 5.5 when someone has less than the usual probationary period. A probationary Instructor may have a one-year or two-year appointment; can the person have an extension under the provisions of section 5.5? What about the Associate Professor or Professor hired on a three-year probationary appointment? There is now a paragraph that proposes a one-year limit on extending the probationary period for probationary Instructors and for probationary Associate Professors and Professors on three-year appointments. To allow a one-year extension seemed to AF&T to be proportionate to the length of the probationary appointment for these individuals.

A number of other questions about section 5.5 have been raised, Professor Chomsky reported. If the Provost denies the extension (in the case of caregiving and medical disability), the language now provides that the denial may be taken to the Senate Judicial Committee. That probably needs more discussion. Typically the Senate Judicial Committee examines process questions in tenure-denial cases, not whether the person should have received tenure. The denial of an extension of the probationary period would not involve very much process; the question would be whether the Provost's discretion is being applied reasonably. She said she did not know what the Senate Judicial Committee would think about taking such cases; the attorney for the Senate Judicial Committee has raised the question and it needs more vetting.

Professor Bitterman described a case with which he was familiar and asked if it would go to the Senate Judicial Committee. It would, Professor Chomsky said; the Provost makes the call, and if he does not grant the extension, what is the role of the Senate Judicial Committee? If one were to file a grievance with the Office for Conflict Resolution, the matter would take a different path. The question of where an appeal goes needs to be resolved. [It was clarified later that the Office of Conflict Resolution has no jurisdiction over an issue related to promotion and tenure under the tenure policy.]

One easy fix to section 5.5 is the definition of family member, Professor Chomsky said. It will be made more explicit that it includes foster and adopted children and the child of a domestic partner.

Section 6.21 deals with probationary appointments for Associate Professors and Professors and allows a three-year probationary appointment which is also a three-year minimum appointment. The language has been cleared up; the probationary period is three years and the person cannot be terminated before the end of the third year and notice must be given the second year. If units do not give notice until the third year (e.g., because they decide at the end of the probationary period), the person is given a fourth (terminal) year.

Professor Curley asked if there is an upper limit on the probationary period under section 6.21. Typically it would be six years, Professor Chomsky said, or longer where colleges have adopted longer probationary periods (i.e., the Carlson School, the Medical School). The shorter probationary period is used with Associate Professors and Professors who have significant experience but who may lack teaching experience, for example. A probationary appointment at that level is a special contract.

Section 6.22, dealing with Instructors on probationary appointments, was not clear, Professor Chomsky said. A probationary Instructor on a one-year appointment may be terminated at the end of that year if notice is given by March 1. A probationary Instructor on a two-year appointment may not be terminated during the first year but may be terminated at the end of the second year (that is, without a terminal third year) if notice is given by December 1 of the second year of the contract. If notice is not given by December 1, the person must either be given an Assistant Professor probationary appointment or must be given a terminal (third) year. They have tried to make that clearer.

In Section 6.3, on the relationship between tenure and promotion, the language now includes a sentence that reads "A single vote is taken on whether to grant tenure and promote." The Procedures will make that requirement even clearer, Professor Chomsky said. There were additional minor clerical changes in section 6.3.

There were some changes in the policy that they wished to make but decided against recommending them. Professor VandenBosch asked what they were. Professor Chomsky mentioned section 3.2, which defines regular appointments, and says a probationary faculty member has a right to be considered for tenure and a right to a notice of termination; it seems odd to say one has a "right" to termination. The provision is really about having a right to notice if termination is to occur, as well as the right to the process and procedures in section 7 on consideration for tenure. Vice Provost Carney maintained it would take far too many changes in language to deal with that issue, and there is no problem with the language as it stand; people understand it. The members of AF&T agreed.

A tacit question, Professor Clayton said, is how literate can a tenure policy afford to be? The three of them (he, Professor Chomsky, and Vice Provost Carney) represented somewhat different points of view. Dr. Carney was concerned about how the policy is to be administered and wanted to address problems she has had to deal with for years. Professor Chomsky brought a sound legal approach and a penchant for reorganization. He himself served as a "public nuisance" who contended that when they understood what was intended, they should say it as clearly and economically as possible. He used the term "felicity" to describe the *optional* changes he suggested, which expressed more accurately what was understandable by customary use and the familiarity of terms used. A document like this is looked at by few, but it expresses the will and expression of the University. Ideally, it would be a model of its kind as well as an unequivocal guide to responsible practice. In any event, Professor Clayton said, he, Professor Chomsky, and Vice Provost Carney were fully agreed on having as their primary responsibility serving the best interests of the faculty, of tenure and academic freedom, and of the University as a whole. Professor Elliott commented that AF&T was very grateful to the three of them for the attention and work they had put in, especially because much of it came over the holiday period.

Professor Chomsky said that there will also need to be language added in section 15 of the policy to make clear what an appeal to the Senate Judicial Committee would mean under the terms of section 5.5.

Comments taken from the question-and-answer session scheduled following this meeting will be taken back to AF&T next week and brought back to this Committee on February 17.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Professors Chomsky, Clayton, and Elliott for all the work they had done on the tenure policy.

3. Committee Business

Professor VandenBosch raised several questions that the Committee dealt with.

- Professors Boyle and Hayes will ask to have a meeting with MnSCU Chancellor-designate Steven Rosenstone to discuss the transition and relationships between MnSCU and the University.
- Committee schedules and senate dockets for spring are very full; Professor VandenBosch said she would try to keep appropriate time limits on the discussions.
- There will be brownbag lunches with newly-tenured faculty members in 238A Morrill Hall before two of the upcoming Committee meetings.
- At the February 17 meeting, the Committee will need to provide the names of four faculty members to fill two slots on the Benefits Advisory Committee.
- There may be additional Senate meetings on April 14, depending on what items must be scheduled for this spring.

4. Update on Graduate Education

Professor VandenBosch welcomed Vice Provost and Dean Schroeder to provide a report on graduate education. She observed that there continues to be change in the administration of graduate education and that Dean Schroeder, now in office for a year, continues to see changes. She said she thought this a good time for an update on how the changes are being implemented.

Dean Schroeder said he would start with governance structures. The Policy and Review Councils have been replaced by the Graduate Education Council (GEC), and there is a provisional Council in place at present (Professors Curley, Hayes, and Kahn are members of it). There will be an elected body by the end of the year, and the Committee on Committees is helping to identify candidates.

The provisional Council is composed of 14 faculty members and 3 students. Many institutions include students, but not with voting rights; the students on the Council at the University of Minnesota have a vote. The size of the permanent GEC will be between 14 and 17 faculty members, depending on the sense of the Committee on Committees about the breadth of representation needed. The GEC deals only with the governance of Ph.D. programs, Dr. Schroeder said, and only with major changes or new programs; less substantial changes are made by the colleges. The process is going well and there have been a lot of discussions.

Professor Luepker asked if there is a written charge to the GEC. There is, Dean Schroeder said. Does the GEC have the power to vote on things, Professor Luepker inquired? It has an advisory function, Dean Schroeder said, but it also takes over the Policy and Review Council functions, so there are votes on new programs or major changes that go to the Provost and the Board of Regents. The GEC makes decisions on Ph.D. programs. The GEC will have also an ex officio representative from the deans, Professor Kahn added.

Professor VandenBosch asked if the charge to the GEC is available. Dean Schroeder said it is available in the recommendations approved on April 30, 2010, but there is no separate formal charge letter. Professor Curley said the provisional Council is taking on the responsibility of drafting a charge for the permanent body.

Professor Cramer asked what a "major change" in a Ph.D. program is. Colleges might not think something is major that the GEC would. Dean Schroeder said that minor changes are things like name changes to a course title, but he agreed that "major change" is not defined in the recommendations approved on April 30. There is a transition memo on the Provost's website (http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/newpoliciesandprocedures5-27-10_000.pdf) that describes the current requirements for new and changed doctoral and Master's program. Changing the name of a program or a track, for example, constitutes a "major change." He is not seeing the colleges use the changes as an opportunity to do things they should not; they are receiving many questions from the colleges about how to do things.

There are two other groups involved in governance and the graduate education reform process in addition to the GEC, Dean Schroeder said. One is a group of college representatives for graduate education (not every college is represented on the GEC); the deans appoint the representative and every technical step in the reform process is talked about in this group. There is another group of college representatives for interdisciplinary programs. They deal with jointly-owned graduate programs. Then there is the Graduate and Professional Education Assembly, a forum open to everyone interested in graduate education. It has met once and there will be another meeting in April; the April meeting will be focused on program review and evaluation and will have national experts as keynote speakers. It will also provide an opportunity to talk with colleagues about program review.

Professor Bitterman asked how many intercollegiate graduate programs there are at the University. Dean Schroeder said that there are about 15 that are jointly-owned by more than one college, which means they have an agreement on sharing tuition. Some of those programs pick a "home" college because that works for them. They do not propose to change any arrangements that are now working well, but where they believe students would be disadvantaged if they have a home college on their transcript, the Graduate School will remain as the degree-clearing unit (which does not mean that the Graduate School will administer the program). As finances become more challenging, Professor Bitterman said, if other programs wanted to consolidate and become intercollegiate, would that be a problem? Is there a process in place that would allow them to do so? Dean Schroeder said he had not thought about that possibility. Most new programs will be between disciplines; if existing programs want to merge and become intercollegiate, they would need to remove barriers that now exist. He has also spoken to graduate deans from around the country about how they allocate funds to programs; all of them have said that they pay special attention to intercollegiate programs. There are different models how these programs are funded. Professor Bitterman said he could envision such mergers as one outcome of budgetary changes, consolidation to preserve strength and conserve resources. That assumes the faculty and the college are interested in sharing a program (including tuition) and coming up with a Memorandum of Understanding, Dean Schroeder said, but it might be a way to go in order to obtain better support. They are developing a template for a Memorandum of Understanding.

Dean Schroeder turned next to matters of finance. The biggest change, the one that has taken the most time, is the change of the Graduate School relationship with programs. The Graduate School does not allocate funding to programs any longer, it allocates it to deans (although that does not mean the

Graduate School is completely out of the picture in the decisions about allocations to programs). They have come up with a model for FY12 that has a mix of metrics about where money should go, but it is an interim year. The metrics are (1) student headcount, (2) a five-year history of funding (30% of the measure), and (3) a transition grant for programs that will receive less money than they have in the past because of the use of the first two metrics; (3) is to buffer losses in FY12. They are working on a plan for FY13 and beyond that will focus on metrics related to program quality and want to provide predictable planning opportunities for colleges and graduate programs.

The doctoral dissertation fellowships will stay in the Graduate School and the application guidelines for them have been changed, with a stronger focus on student achievement (research, scholarly, creative activities). The funds that were used for block grants in the past have been proposed to be allocated on the basis of a set of quality metrics for graduate programs. They will develop these metrics with the programs so they embrace them. Nothing is decided for FY13 at this point, Dean Schroeder said.

Professor VandenBosch inquired who "they" is. What role will the GEC and others play? And how will the groups come together? Dean Schroeder said that he put these issues on the table for the deans on January 27 and talked earlier today with the President and the Provost. The GEC and Graduate Education Financing Task Force will also advise on it. The Graduate Education Finance Task Force has two charges: address the NIH cap on graduate-student funding and propose solutions to the shortfall in funding for students on federal grants resulting from this cap. In addition, the Task Force has been charged to look at the current model of charging and paying for tuition and whether it is in line with educational goals in graduate education.

Professor VandenBosch asked what will come from the Enrollment Management Committee. It has three subcommittees, on graduate education, professional education, and undergraduate education, Dean Schroeder said, and all three have come up with ideas about how to address enrollment management. In the case of graduate education, the subcommittee has thought about considering whether there are too many Ph.D. students in the field, if the program must adapt to market conditions, and a set of academic quality measures that would be used to decide whether to support or downsize a program. He has talked with the University's deans about the best way to measure graduate programs and he has heard from other graduate deans that data are important. But there is agreement that they all want to be data-informed but not data-obsessed. For example, they may need to identify mechanisms to deal with the market disadvantage of humanities programs that do not have access to federal or other grants to the extent that engineering or the sciences do, based on transparent criteria.

Professor Hancher inquired about the three measures that Dean Schroeder had mentioned and asked if departments should think about the first two (but not the transition funding to buffer cuts). Dean Schroeder said they should not; they had no quality measures available for FY12, therefore scale, history, and need-based metrics were in the mix for the funding decisions in FY12. Those will not be the criteria used in the future.

These data are used to provide money to all graduate programs, Professor Cramer asked? The money for FY12 is sent to the colleges, Dean Schroeder said, based, at least in part, on what the programs in the college used to receive.

A question she is encountering from faculty is a concern about the loss of support for the best programs, Professor VandenBosch reported, and how to prevent the erosion of those programs. Based on what they are doing in FY12, decisions about what signature programs should be supported are internal to the college, Dean Schroeder said, but the Graduate School is at the table in the discussions. They hear concerns from programs as well and are in touch with them. There may be feelings that have not percolated up, Professor VandenBosch said; what is the recommendation if programs do not believe the colleges have treated them appropriately—should they contact him? Dean Schroeder said he is encouraged by the models at Ohio State and Florida, where the college deans must be engaged in the process, get their priorities right, and communicate with the programs. There are different views on this across the country; some say the deans are so busy with undergraduate education and have so much on the table that the decision for funding should be in the Graduate School—and there is the completely opposite view as well. The Graduate School will be in the process here, Dean Schroeder said, but the deans will take more charge of graduate education and come to the Graduate School with questions. Whatever is done with dollars in any fiscal year, the deans will be held accountable in the compact discussions and will be asked how and why they made decisions. These changes are to align resources with accountability, Dean Schroeder explained; the deans were not accountable for graduate education in the past and graduate education was never a substantial part of the compact discussions; now it is. It is not that programs will now be at the sole mercy of the deans, and he emphasized that from discussions he has had with the deans and their representatives, he is certain there will be no lack of sensitivity about how to deal with graduate education.

Professor Curley inquired about FY13 and thereafter. There was a cost pool for the Graduate School that included money given out for block grants, etc. Most of that money has been decentralized to the colleges, except for dissertation fellowships and administration of the Graduate School, so the cost pool should go down. Evaluation of programs is at the college level; will the Graduate School ensure that there is evaluation but not be involved in its development?

The cost pool is going down, Dean Schroeder said; they have saved about \$1 million in Graduate School operations and have reduced the staff from 36 to 27 people. In addition, items have been moved out of the cost pool. One proposal to be taken up in April is that block grants would stay in the Graduate School as a fund to be given to colleges on quality and performance metrics. First-year fellowships are considered to be permanently moved to the colleges and are only for graduate-student support. But this is a completely open discussion.

Professor Curley said he thought that would not happen; what changed? There could be another proposal, Dean Schroeder said. If all the dollars the colleges paid into the cost pools were simply given to, or left in, the colleges, that would create a new set of winners and losers, but not necessarily based on quality metrics or market needs for graduate programs. They are modeling a proposal that would leave only some of the cost-pool dollars in the colleges as a base adjustment and that would leave about half the funds in the cost pool—but with transparent metrics so that perhaps all could support the decisions.

Professor Luepker said, apropos of fellowships from NIH and NSF, that as they look for solutions, they should recognize if tuition is lowered, less money comes back to the units that teach. In terms of splitting up the graduate scholarship money, quality and performance measures are important, but success in the job market needs to be factored in. It is not just whether a department is high quality; if the graduates are not getting appropriate jobs, the program is not a good investment. Dean Schroeder agreed with the second point. The GEC and financing task force have both indicated that the placement

record and market need should be highly-rated metrics. The CLA 2015 report addressed this issue. As much as the University is here to provide an education for those who are interested, they must look at the market. Professor Luepker said that one reads a lot about people who leave school with large loans and who never get a job that pays enough to repay the loans.

Professor Gonzales said that given the intersection between graduate training and undergraduate instruction, she hoped that the discussion will take into account undergraduate education.

Professor VandenBosch said, about the restructuring, the decrease in staff numbers, and the \$1 million in recurring funds that has been saved, her understanding from the work of the earlier task forces and from the President and the Provost is that that money would be put into student support. There has been no decision about the \$600,000 saved this year, Dean Schroeder responded. It has not been decided if the \$600,000 reductions would be used to absorb state cuts or to increase the investment in student aid. Future allocations of funds to colleges will be tracked to see how they are used for student support.

Professor Bitterman commented on the deans making decisions: In a number of professional schools with a substantial number of graduate students, the dean has no experience in graduate education; will assistance be available for them? Dean Schroeder reported that in one of the AHC schools, the dean has appointed an associate dean for graduate education. Does that count as savings, Professor Bitterman asked? Maybe the person hired brings in a large number of grants, Dean Schroeder commented. Some of the tasks that are decentralized will actually be resolved by transforming them into electronic processes, but certainly not all of them; the colleges will have to rely on human beings. There must be expertise in every college, Professor VandenBosch said.

Professor Luepker said he is aware that the cost-pool charges went down, but he is not aware of any money trickling down to the colleges. He surmised that it is being used to offset budget cutbacks.

Professor Cramer asked about the exam policy; he said that every time they give an oral exam, they wonder what they are supposed to do. At what level have rules been established, if any? Are we running on status quo ante? The policy-review committee that Professor Krevans is chairing is doing a great job of reviewing all the policies, Dean Schroeder said, and the policy on graduate examining committees has been fast-tracked. There is another one on Directors of Graduate Study that is coming and it will address what should be regulated at the central level. The draft policy will go to the college representatives and then be distributed for comments. Eventually it will go to the Provost and the Board of Regents.

Professor Cramer asked about the location of the Spring Graduate and Professional Education Assembly on academic program evaluation. Dean Schroeder said that it will be on April 18 from 11:00 – 2:30 in Coffman Union.

Professor VandenBosch thanked Dean Schroeder for taking on the responsibility of shepherding through the many changes that are required.

5. Resolution on Faculty Support for Recognition of Staff Participation in Governance

Professor Sheets next reported on a resolution adopted unanimously by the Committee on Faculty Affairs calling for faculty support for inclusion of governance activities in annual reviews for P&A and

Civil Service staff. The Committee discussed the resolution last year and this year, he recalled; it was initially formulated by CAPA and then the Civil Service Committee also became involved. The thrust of the resolution is to express encouragement and appreciation to P&A and Civil Service colleagues in governance, to note that President Bruininks has strongly supported such participation, and to agree that it is important that all University employees are involved in University policy-making. Why the resolution? Because apparently some units discourage staff participation in governance; CAPA asked for a declaration by the Faculty Senate that participation is good for employees and for the institution.

One concern they had was the budget implications for employees paid on sponsored funds. Those who are paid 100% on sponsored funds are required to spend all their time on the grant. Professor Sheets said the Faculty Affairs committee acknowledged that problem in the comment on the resolution and are exploring whether the "de minimis" exception allowed for faculty members would also be allowed for staff or if departments might buy out a small part of the employee's time to permit governance activity. The "de minimis" exception is a standard term in sponsored contracts allowing a small amount of discretionary time to be spent on non-sponsored activities even when a faculty member is being paid 100% time on a grant.

Professor Chomsky said she believed the resolution a very good idea. She has talked with P&A staff members who report they have a difficult time being recognized for participation in governance. She said this is the right thing to say.

Professor Bitterman said that in many cases, it is the staff who have expertise in regulatory areas, and it is acceptable to NIH if such people are engaged in activities related to their expertise on the grant. This resolution would encourage such participation.

Professor Curley said that administrative buy-in would make the statement more effective; is it being sent to the Council of Deans? It is not, Professor Sheets said; it is going directly to the Faculty Senate. This statement is from the governance system, Professor VandenBosch noted.

Professor Cramer said he was concerned more about the maximum than the de minimis rule. What about a staff member who serves on several committees and points to this resolution to argue for recognizing that much governance activity? It is up to the department head and a PI to decide on participation, Professor Sheets said. De minimis does not mean the maximum; units have the authority to say that participation is excessive. Professor Luepker said he is in a unit where there are hundreds of staff members who are 100%-time on grant funding; he said he worried that maximum participation could be a problem.

The Committee approved a minor amendment to the resolution so it endorses support for reasonable levels of participation in governance and then approved the resolution unanimously.

Professor VandenBosch adjourned the meeting at 2:15.

-- Gary Engstrand