

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 23, 2012
1:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Chris Cramer (chair), Linda Bearinger, Avner Ben-Ner, Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Carol Chomsky, Nancy Ehlke, Janet Ericksen, Caroline Hayes, Walt Jacobs, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler May, Jan McCulloch, George Sheets, Richard Ziegler
- Absent: James Pacala, Kathryn VandenBosch
- Guests: Provost Karen Hanson; OIT Faculty Fellows (Professors John Bryson, Humphrey School; Christina Clarkson, Veterinary Medicine; Sehoia Cotner, Biological Science; Michelle Driessen, Director of General Chemistry), Dr. Lauren Marsh (Manager, Faculty Development and Consultation Services, OIT's Collaborative for Academic Technology Consultation), Dr. Kimerly Wilcox (Senior Academic Technology Consultant, OIT's Collaborative), and Dr. D. Christopher Brooks (Research Fellow, OIT's Collaborative); President Eric Kaler; Board of Regents Chair Linda Cohen and Vice Chair David Larson
- Other: Ken Savary, Brian Steeves (Office of the Board of Regents); Amy Phenix, Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Provost Hanson; (2) discussion with the OIT Faculty Fellows; (3) discussion with President Kaler; (4) discussion with Board of Regents Chair Linda Cohen and Vice Chair David Larson]

1. Discussion with Provost Hanson

Professor Cramer convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed Provost Hanson to her first discussion with the Committee. He called for a round of introductions and then turned to the Provost.

Provost Hanson thanked the Committee for inviting her to its meeting and said she looked forward to becoming better acquainted with it and with faculty governance at the University. She said she has been impressed by what she has seen in terms of governance: how robust it is, the number of people who participate, and she asked how the system gets younger faculty members to become involved. She said she also needs to know more about how decisions are made on policy matters and about how the system stays so healthy at Minnesota.

She is now in the middle of the compact process, the Provost related, and would like to get out more to departments in order to get to know them better. She said she will do so as she can work visits into her schedule.

* 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.

The University has had a long transition, Provost Hanson observed, between the end of the last President's term of office and her appointment as provost. If there are things the Committee believes she should think about, she would appreciate knowing them. She said she has a number of directions in which she would like to see the University go—but in order to begin any advocacy she would like to learn more.

Professor Cramer asked Committee members why governance at Minnesota works so well and how it keeps working well.

Professor Chomsky agreed that it does work well and is robust, although it has its ups and downs. Much of its success has to do with both faculty and administrators paying attention to it. Administrators come and go and may not think about governance, but they must keep in mind that there are opportunities to consult before decisions are made, which is beneficial to all. Also, governance committees have a history of being honest and direct, sometimes in private and sometimes in public, which makes the consultation worthwhile. The relationship is cooperative, not only critical, and it is about moving the University forward. Continuing conversations open to any issue are a big part of how the system works. Another element of the system that makes it robust is the minutes: They are detailed, distributed widely, and read widely, so there is a good flow of information and people feel that there are open conversations. They try to socialize both faculty and administrators into governance and participating effectively.

Provost Hanson asked about the number who read the minutes and the participation rate in elections for this Committee. Professor Chomsky said there is widespread reading of the minutes and there is good participation in the elections. But they have struggled recently with getting faculty members to run for this Committee; in trying to identify candidates for the slate, she was told repeatedly that FCC is very important—reinforcing the effectiveness of governance--and they were flattered to be asked, but that they were too busy. Participation requires supportive deans and department heads who respect the time it takes and its importance.

Professor Cramer noted that terms for Senate committees are three years: One learns about the committee the first year, becomes adept the second year, and is an expert the third year.

The other element that makes the system work well is the staff, Professor Chomsky said. The governance system would not function without the Senate staff support.

Provost Hanson said she understood the concerns probationary faculty members might have on being asked to participate in governance; what about those who have just been granted tenure? Are they eager? Professor Chomsky pointed out that junior faculty are advised not to spend time on governance when they do not have tenure, and they must be turned around to see it as important and an obligation after they pass that milestone. That is why the attitudes of deans and department chairs are important.

Professor Ben-Ner commented that in many colleges, with a merit-based system, one that is heavily based on research, service counts much less, so there is a strong disincentive to participate.

Professor Cramer noted that the Committee seeds the discussions every year by talking with various groups of faculty members, and with department chairs and heads every year, to encourage participation.

When faculty members receive tenure is the time they come up for air and take on new projects, Provost Hanson commented. She asked if there is a way she can help encourage faculty to participate. She noted that there is the Academic Leadership Program of the CIC, which provides an opportunity for faculty members who think they may want to try out an administrative post; it might be possible to have something similar at the local level for faculty members who want to try out governance. Professor Cramer observed that Vice Provost Carney runs a number of seminars and that perhaps it would be a good idea to raise the issue with newly-tenured faculty members in the sessions they have. Governance is raised, Professor Chomsky said, although most of the focus in those sessions is on getting promoted to Professor. It should be possible to focus on the new responsibilities of those who achieve tenure.

Professor Bearinger commented that deans and chairs should understand that it is advantageous to have someone from their units on these committees. Service is almost on one's own time, but having faculty members on the committees means they can learn more and influence more.

Professor May said that everyone is doing more work for less, and a number of good candidates for University committees have obligations in their departments and colleges. She said the Provost could request that deans and chairs allow faculty members willing to serve at the University level to be released from college and department committee work.

Provost Hanson inquired if every college has a consultative committee. It varies by college, Professor Cramer said. Representation on this Committee is institution-wide (9 members from the Twin Cities and 1 from Morris); candidates from the Twin Cities campus are identified by a Nominating Subcommittee that seeks to ensure broad representation. The Committee on Committees identifies the members of other committees.

Professor Bitterman said that serving in the Senate provides the faculty with access to the leadership, which can be an advantage if events require it. He said he learned a lot more at the Senate during the tenure debate of the mid-1990s. Sentinel events affect participation; the tenure debate let many faculty members see the Faculty Senate as critical to institutional governance and quality. Administrators come to the University and do their jobs for a term, but it is the faculty who make the long-term commitment and who have a responsibility to make sure the University works well.

Professor Luepker observed that change is unfolding at the University: The Academic Health Center colleges will now report to the Provost. He asked Provost Hanson if she had any thoughts about that change. Provost Hanson said she is aware there will be an external review of the AHC; up to this point she has attended one AHC deans' meeting and has met individually with the deans. She has not focused yet on the change in the reporting lines but said the first crucial point will be the promotion-and-tenure process. She said she would return to the Committee later to discuss how the new arrangements are working.

Professor Cramer asked the Provost if she had any thoughts on the fluctuations in funding for graduate programs and the way that funds were distributed. The details of the funding mechanism are still being worked out, she responded, and Vice Provost Schroeder is taking comments from a number of quarters. There is flexibility in how the next cycle will be approached. Moreover, schools are also concerned about the loss of tuition revenue if students are allowed to take dissertation credits earlier in their career (an option, however, that is seen as desirable from an educational standpoint, and the University should not let the budget model drive its educational decisions). Provost Hanson also

commented that the decision to leave size out of the equation in assessing program quality may need to be revisited. She said she did believe that putting the fellowship funds in the programs was the right decision and deans must be ready to offer multi-year packages.

Professor Cramer said the greater concern among the faculty is that the quality metrics were not followed up in the way it was thought they would be—and there needs to be a system that the faculty can support. These events raise the question of how faculty can assist in making very important decisions, Professor Bitterman commented. The final decision on implementing the quality metrics for allocating funding was not brought back to this group; it is important that this Committee see it and have the opportunity to engage colleagues who have extensive experience in graduate education. Short timelines are not a problem for faculty; they deal with deadlines all of the time. It is important, when there are proposals to reshape pedagogy University-wide, that there be consultation with expert faculty. It is important to bring the decision to this group, Provost Hanson agreed, but also important that it be brought to the deans; it is through the deans that the process is implemented, and deans are in a position to look out for the good of their various units. She concurred that there is wisdom in a committee such as this one but she must also be sure that the decision reaches down to the units. Professor Cramer said the Committee concurred that parallel paths of consultation would be appropriate.

When quality is being assessed, the process should start at the lower level, Professor Cramer maintained: The units should be asked what measures they themselves would use. The metrics can then be evaluated and refined at higher levels.

Professor McCulloch commented that her experience on this Committee, and from going through the Wave One mergers, has made her aware of the different ways that colleges and departments do things. A strategy that tries to make them all the same creates stress, does not fit, and disrupts the units even if they are currently efficient.

Professor Cramer turned next to the topic of grades in context (i.e., adding information to transcripts that permits one to see how a student's grade compares to all of the grades awarded in that class); he asked about the approach taken at Indiana and whether it addressed the problem of grade inflation. Provost Hanson reported that they used the data on grades in context for a number of purposes at Indiana (e.g., Phi Beta Kappa decisions, honorary recognition) but she said she did not believe it had much effect on grade inflation. One thing she likes about it is that it can provide helpful feedback to students about how they are performing vis-à-vis their peers—they can tell if they have a false sense of confidence or a false sense that they have been crushed in a course. There is a concern that providing the information will put students at a disadvantage in the external record if one institution is a lone adopter of the practice (although there are a handful of schools that do so). One could think about adopting grades in context for internal consumption and there are issues for the Registrar around implementation; it will be necessary to balance the good that is achieved versus the cost. But it would provide an element of truthfulness, especially in reporting to students, the Provost concluded.

Professor Sheets inquired if the students at Indiana resisted the change. (They did not.) In terms of the possible competitive disadvantage, he said, could it work the other way? Provost Hanson said she did not know; this would seem to be an empirical question, and there were other trends occurring that created pressures in the opposite direction. But it is worth looking at, and she said she did not know how often the faculty in units come together to assess grades.

Professor Boyle asked if context for grades were added, would that be a way to add incentives to reduce grade inflation? There was a lively discussion in the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Professor Brothen reported, and the thought was that it would probably not reduce grade inflation. Where one stands depends on where one sits, Professor Cramer observed. In colleges that award a lot of A grades, providing context would probably not be attractive; in colleges that award a lot of Cs, it would be an advantage for the students. The Carlson School puts a limit on the number of As that can be awarded. They have done so for three years and there seems to be partial student buy-in, Professor Ben-Ner reported.

Professor Brothen said it was important to differentiate whether an instructor is grading on a curve or on whether the students have learned the material. With the increasing academic preparation of the students now coming into the University, one would expect grades to continue to rise. Why would the University want to put them at a disadvantage when applying to graduate or professional programs? (Professor Cramer wondered rhetorically which schools in the nation would agree to award primarily Cs so that the top tier could award primarily As.) As the quality of students' academic preparation is ratcheted up, the faculty could ratchet up the challenge of the courses as well, Provost Hanson observed. Some schools have accreditation standards, such as Veterinary Medicine, Professor Brothen pointed out. Professor Bitterman agreed, and said that professional schools are different with regard to grading—they cannot let students leave not knowing certain things. Medical students must know about the heart, the lung, the kidney, etc.—they cannot just know a C or D amount. There was consensus that pass/fail grading can be effective in courses where content mastery is an either/or proposition, and that the grades in context question is more important at the undergraduate level than the post-baccalaureate level.

Grading is a fraught issue, Professor May commented. There are many advantages to providing comments to students; they are more helpful than a letter grade alone. She agreed that the discussion about grades in context is about undergraduate education; one can look at all the scores and grades a student earns and not know what they mean. She said she would like to see an in-depth conversation on the subject. Provost Hanson said the topic is worth talking about because it has to do with the relationship between faculty and students and is tied to some of the central educational purposes of the University.

Professor Cramer thanked Provost Hanson for joining the meeting.

2. Discussion with the OIT Fellows

Professor Cramer now turned to the Office of Information Technology (OIT) Faculty Fellows (Professors John Bryson, Humphrey School; Christina Clarkson, Veterinary Medicine; Sehoya Cotner, Biological Science; Michelle Driessen, Director of General Chemistry) and Dr. Lauren Marsh (Manager, Faculty Development and Consultation Services, OIT's Collaborative for Academic Technology Consultation), Dr. Kimerly Wilcox (Senior Academic Technology Consultant, OIT's Collaborative), and Dr. D. Christopher Brooks (Research Fellow, OIT's Collaborative). Committee members were provided a copy of the report developed by the 2010-2011 Faculty Fellows (which can be found at http://www.oit.umn.edu/prod/groups/oit/@pub/@oit/@web/@consultation/documents/asset/oit_asset_375602.pdf).

[The report describes the program: "The Office of Information Technology's 18-month Faculty Fellowship Program fosters a multidisciplinary learning community that explores possibilities and good

practices in technology-rich learning environments, produces scholarship in this area, and advances faculty leadership around these issues." The statement from the 2010-11 Faculty Fellows reads in part as follows:

What would it take to bring about a learning revolution at the University of Minnesota? To enable faculty to develop the skills, adaptability, and resilience they need, not simply to persist through the challenges facing the University of Minnesota, but to be catalysts for creating the future of the academy?

We believe the answer lies in a coordinated, sustained, and holistic approach to faculty development in technology-rich teaching and learning. We, the 2010-2011 cohort of fellows from the Office of Information Technology's Faculty Fellowship Program (FFP), want to acknowledge how critical the FFP has been to informing and enhancing our individual crafts of teaching and learning. As a result of this program, we know better not only our own pedagogies, but also the signature features of our disciplinary pedagogies. We were inspired and carefully guided to improve those pedagogies by developing smart ways of integrating technology into what we do in and out of the classroom – sometimes even reinventing the classroom. We strongly believe that this kind of faculty development should not be a unique and isolated experience, but should permeate the teaching culture at all levels of the University. In particular, experimenting with educational technology and exploring its impact on emerging practices is a necessary requirement for effective teaching and learning in the 21st-century university.]

Dr. Driessen began by explaining the nature of the report and said that the report has two parts (an introduction followed by descriptions of the characteristics of successful faculty development programs as well as implications at the levels of the university, the college/department, and the individual instructor), and described how the Faculty Fellows developed the report as well as their belief that it should be disseminated across the University, not confined to the six individuals who participated in the program. She was charged to teach an online course in 2009 and found it a frustrating experience because she needed many pieces from all over to assemble the course. She then went through the Faculty Fellowship program, which was a transformative experience that changed how she looks at teaching. She said she cannot envision going back to a lecture hall with 300 students and will teach general chemistry in the fall as a hybrid course. The fellows all agreed that a program similar to the FFP should be available to all faculty members, so they put the report together as a way to initiate conversations and provide a foundation for creating change in the teaching and learning culture of the institution.

The fellows identified six elements necessary to a "successful faculty-development program, promoting excellence in teaching and learning with technology; it

- Fosters use of **good practices**.
- Offers an ongoing **learning community** that includes peer learning and support.
- Incorporates **mentoring by experts** in teaching and learning with technology.
- Responds to **different levels** of skill, knowledge, and experience.
- Acknowledges that teaching is an **experimental and iterative** experience.
- **Evaluates** to ensure effectiveness, and to justify resources expended."

Dr. Cotner said one can make the case that this is a cost-effective program, and, in fact, doesn't have to have a big price tag. What they went through was intense, and this takes a lot of time, but it

changed the way they teach and makes them better able to meet their instructional goals. Many faculty members are teaching to hundreds or even thousands of students per year, so these improvements in teaching are affecting a large number of students. They believe this kind of program needs to be available for all faculty, and while academic technology is an important part of this faculty-development program, it is tangential to the goal, which is "to inspire and energize faculty who in turn inspire and energize their students." Their question is how to ensure that the work permeates the University culture at large.

A number of points were made in the ensuing discussion.

-- This is the tenth iteration of the OIT Faculty Fellowship Program; all the recipients receive a \$10,000 stipend; admission to the program is competitive; it takes 18 months, is research-intensive, and supports leadership and scholarship in technology-enhanced learning. There will be 8 fellows in the future but that is the maximum number that can be accommodated in this particular program; they are looking for ways to infuse faculty development in technology-enhanced learning across the system.

-- Fellows teach classes of varying sizes; some are large and some small. Question: In some departments large classes are a fact of life; is this a way to make large classes even larger—even if that is not part of the agenda? Response: Those who teach large classes can learn how to make them even more active and engaging, but there will be a limit to size, and University of Minnesota Technology Surveys (<http://www.oit.umn.edu/research-evaluation/selected-research/technology-surveys/index.htm>) tell us that face-to-face interactions remain important to both students and faculty. One of the Fellows said she puts the lectures online and uses class time for smaller active-learning groups.

-- Will this help create small learning communities with more face-to-face interactions? Do they envision more online instruction with more faculty?

-- This is different from classes offered by OIT on how to use technology; the Faculty Fellowship Program is focused on pedagogy, for which technology is a tool.

-- While faculty often spend a great deal of time talking about research, they do not talk nearly so much about teaching and learning, and much more could be achieved if they did so. One option might be to have small lunches across campus once per month. While faculty often spend a great deal of time talking about research, they do not talk nearly so much about teaching and learning, and much more could be achieved if they did so.

-- The University could change the culture by rewarding the faculty development experience and encourage the scholarship of teaching and learning, making it possible to focus on student learning without losing sight of the research mission.

-- There have been a lot of discussions over the year about teaching and learning and one can have a sense of déjà vu all over again. They (the Fellows) are right, this is not about technology, it is about learning, and if one left off the reference to technology in their materials, all the statements ring true about teaching development in general, and could easily have been produced by the Center for Teaching and Learning to describe best practices for all efforts to support teaching and learning. Are there ways to collaborate with CTL to further the OIT effort the fellows describe? CTL, too, has asked for years how to get faculty involved and how faculty can receive credit for their effort. There are number of models for involving faculty members developed and implemented successfully at CTL; with the multicultural

fellows, there was an obligation to develop a plan to disseminate their work. How can these efforts be put together to use the strengths from both sides? It was noted that the Academy of Distinguished Teachers also sponsors events designed to enhance teaching skills. The guests from OIT agreed that collaboration is important and said they do partner with CTL and they are working toward increasingly integrated models, but this is hindered to some extent by the fact that CTL and OIT report to different people. And while CTL and others have certainly had a number of successful models over the years, they were dependent on that centrally-supported unit, and thus limited in how many instructors could be served. What the fellows are proposing would promote faculty development programs at all level of the institution.

-- It would be desirable to see this work as part of the culture of the University, but it raises the question of centralization versus decentralization. Not all colleges have the resources to provide the support that faculty members need to deliver a hybrid or online course. The report from the Fellows is a roadmap that can be used in different ways and identify things that any program should do. There can be many models, but those six features are important if a program is to be successful.

-- One aspect of the program that made it work so well was that it was not just focused on teaching and learning and collaboration, but also included a required research project, so it aligned the teaching and research agendas of the Fellows.

Professor Cramer thanked the guests for their report.

3. Discussion with President Kaler

Professor Cramer now welcomed President Kaler to the meeting. He recited a list of topics that he and the President had agreed would be of interest to the Committee.

The President began by discussing the operational-excellence efforts. He is convening a group of seven senior leaders who meet weekly to focus on moving costs out of the organization and improving operations and revenue. The University does many things very slowly at great cost where there is minimal risk. They have held listening sessions and learned that the University is too risk-averse, that it can be more entrepreneurial, and that it needs to improve its change management. Consultation is important but the institution can over-consult, which affects the speed of change. The President explained his view that the University's risk aversion likely arose because of scandals in athletics and the Medical School, with the result being layers of cumbersome procedures (e.g., conflict-of-interest, compliance, and legal). There needs to be change in the ways the University does things.

The motif he uses, the President related, is around risk and recalibrating risk, and he is asking everyone to change to be more effective day-to-day. He cited a few examples of decisions the Operational Excellence group has made to improve operations:

-- The equipment capitalization threshold at most of the University's peers is \$5000 or more (that is the amount at which items are depreciated and that is used in the institutional F&A rate for indirect costs, and if something costs less than that, it is an expense). The University's threshold is \$2500, and if it were to move to \$5000, it could cut markedly the number of items it has to count, have inventory tags for, and so on. So the Operational Excellence group has decided to lower that threshold, which will be done the next time the University negotiates its F & A rate.

- The group has also revised the external sales agreement from eight pages to one page.
- Moving to electronic payments to vendors.
- Also this year, the group has charged Human Resources with completing a dependent-eligibility audit on health plans, which most organizations do to determine whether everyone on the health plan is eligible. Doing so will save the University money because, unfortunately, some employees claim dependents who are not eligible.

President Kaler asked for ideas and suggested, for example, that the University may be able to reduce the burden of processing purchasing card expenses if it did not require documentation for certain, low-dollar purchases. This is an idea he'll bring to the group for analysis

The Operational Excellence group has also looked at centers and institutes across the institution and the President will be asking deans to review those in their colleges. The University has many centers but no consistent process to review their activities to determine whether they continue to align with college and institutional budgets and goals. He has assured the deans he does not want to take their money, he wants to be sure the money is being used well.

On the last issue, Professor Ben-Ner said he knows of many centers and institutes and observed that all of them report to someone. Is there a suspicion that something is wrong with the reporting relationships? President Kaler said he was only asking the deans to evaluate the centers and their budgets.

Professor Bitterman urged that computers be on the list of items made easier to purchase. At present it is extremely difficult to purchase one on sponsored funds for a research project—at the same time his collaborators at other institutions can get one immediately. The President said he was both dismayed and not surprised.

Professor Luepker said that with respect to the review of centers, some have never been reviewed and it will be important to develop a systematic way to do so. He also observed that some centers are in vice-presidential offices as well as in the colleges. Those will also be under scrutiny, the President assured him.

Professor Chomsky said she had no problem with what had been said thus far in the meeting. But she noted that the executive summary of the Operational Excellence Group only listed a couple of examples of the problems it was addressing, and one of them was a long set of procedures (29 pages) for evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure. She commented that she had been involved in the development of those procedures and said she was not sure that those procedures are a good poster child for what the OEG is trying to accomplish. Promotion and tenure has many implications (especially if it is done wrong). She said she would be concerned if someone believed the tenure procedures could be reduced to a one-page document, and the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and Vice Provost Carney are receiving thanks for making the process clearer. President Kaler observed that the document is longer at Minnesota than at other institutions and agreed that the procedures are well-documented; he said, however, that perhaps that extensive set of procedures is for the best. [Ms. Phenix noted that the comment was heard in a listening session.]

Professor Kohlstedt said she was interested in the concept of risk assessment. She has a colleague who works in the field and he has said that an organization should not have regulations for everything but should have scrutiny on occasion—have a "we trust you but we will check on occasion"

approach. The President agreed that sampling is a great way to approach risk assessment and there is a science around it. Vice President Mulcahy's office has taken the lead in reducing inspections for units that have a great track record and creating a culture of responsibility and ownership. Right now the approach seems to be that the University doesn't trust anyone.

Professor Cramer suggested that changes to reduce administrative burdens and to make transactions easier be rolled out with those affecting the largest number of people first, so that the message of greater risk tolerance can begin permeating the institution as quickly as possible.

The President and the Committee had a brief discussion of the graduate-student unionization effort.

President Kaler then turned to philanthropy. He said he has been spending a fair amount of time on fund-raising, both locally and around the country. The University's foundations have done a good job; where the University has not done as well as its peers is in mega-gifts of \$50 million and more, and it also needs to fill the pipeline with gifts in the \$5-10 million range. But it takes time to build relationships and to align donors with University interests. Faculty members play a key role in the process: Many donors find faculty research interests to be important or were touched deeply by a faculty member while a student. He asked faculty members to consider helping the foundations find former students or colleagues who might consider donating to the University.

In his State of the University address on March 1, the President said, he will touch on several subjects. First, he will ask faculty to seriously consider the academic calendar and adding third semester. A longer break in January would allow short winter courses, study abroad, and internship or volunteer opportunities. A three-semester model would more easily allow students to earn 120 credits and graduate in less than four years. It could offer a huge opportunity for faculty members on 9-month appointments to ration their time in different ways. A third semester could increase tuition revenues by as much as 50%, could allow an increase in the number of students and faculty members, and it would allow better use of the University's real estate and physical plant (while also being mindful of existing summer programs). One challenge is addressing financial aid rules and the University possibly repackaging institutional financial aid. He said he believes the possibility should be investigated.

On the research side, he will advance a proposal for an entrepreneurial research leave program. The faculty member who takes it would receive 0% salary from the University but would receive 100% of benefits and the person's place would be held for a year (with the possibility of extension in special cases). At present the plan is to be proposed only for tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

The President next mentioned the six-year capital planning process and the need to move to a similar approach for supporting the University's research infrastructure. He also suggested the need for considering depreciation and the possibility of considering a depreciation cost-pool for the physical sciences. Many details will need to be worked out.

He will also speak about the implications for land-grant universities of the 150th anniversary of the Morrill Act and what it means for Minnesota.

Professor May inquired about the extent to which donors can earmark the funds they donate (for example, athletics brings in money to the University; does it all go to athletics?). The liberal arts see

fewer donations and have fewer large donors. She also expressed support for the entrepreneurial leave option and said that many faculty members in the liberal arts will not think it applies to them, so the language defining the leaves must be broad so that liberal arts faculty members could consider them as well.

President Kaler said that some donors do direct their gifts, whether to research in prostate cancer or basketball scholarships. He recalled that when President Bruininks raised money for the football stadium, some of those gifts were earmarked for scholarships. Part of the challenge is not to take gifts that eat and eat (like a free dog), and those can be difficult conversations. He also said Professor May could be surprised by the possible donations to the liberal arts, such as a recent \$14 million gift for scholarships in the College of Liberal Arts; there are opportunities, he assured her.

Professor Cramer thanked the President for joining the meeting.

4. Discussion with Regents Cohen and Larson

Professor Cramer now welcomed Board of Regents Chair Linda Cohen and (by telephone) Vice Chair David Larson. He noted that the chair and vice chair of the Board join the Committee every year for a wide-ranging conversation.

Regent Cohen began by saying that she was very glad to join the Committee and believes that the work of the Committee members is crucial, a foundation of what the University is about. She related a story for the Committee. When she was no longer an educator (after she had received her Ph.D. from the University and become a therapist), she had a brilliant young man in therapy. Purely for family reasons, she started a Facebook page, and the young man—now a faculty member in Japan—contacted her via Facebook to tell her how much he valued his education at the University of Minnesota. Regent Cohen quoted his message to her:

I really enjoyed the University of Minnesota. I found that every class I took was interesting and challenging. I was truly given the opportunity to develop myself in a deep way. I had many great professors who challenged me to examine every aspect of the subjects they introduced.

The student also sent along a quotation from Richard Rorty which he hoped would interest Regent Cohen. It did and in large part reflects her views also.

The point of non-vocational higher education is . . . to help students realize that they can reshape themselves--that they can rework the self-image foisted on them by their past, the self-image that makes them competent citizens, into a new self-image, one that they themselves have helped to create. . . . Non-vocational higher education is also not a matter of inculcating or educating the truth. It is instead, a matter of inciting doubt and stimulating the imagination, thereby challenging the prevailing consensus. If pre-college education produces literate citizens and college education produces self-creating individuals, then questions about whether students are being taught the truth can be safely neglected. [Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and Social Hope*]

She concluded by thanking the faculty for all that they do, including providing that kind of education for the University's students as well as their research and outreach.

Regent Cohen said she wished to highlight four things that the Board of Regents is doing. One, it is developing relationships with legislators and people in the State in order to be sure they understand the great value of the University to the State. Two, they are discussing the Academic Health Center (AHC) with President Kaler because they believe that area of the University is so important; the Board is aware that there will be an external review of the AHC and examination of what structures would be best. Three, the Board's Finance and Operations Committee, in conjunction with the administration, is looking at both the short-term and long-term finances of the University, including tuition, state funding, and philanthropy, and how the Board and the administration can get the University on a sound financial foundation. Four, they are devoted to supporting the success of the new president; they have sensed energy and excitement about the new administration and President Kaler brings both energy and thoughtfulness to the job.

Regent Larson agreed with Regent Cohen's list and said he would add only one item: He believes the University can do a better job of managing its brand. It can elevate the brand in the minds of the citizens and make it meaningful to them—and like it or not, intercollegiate athletics is an important part of the brand so the University must do a good job of it. He said he thus sees the selection of the athletic director for the Twin Cities campus as not unimportant.

Professor McCulloch thanked Regent Cohen for beginning her remarks as she did. The Committee often deals with specific issues and it is sometimes easy to lose the long view.

Professor Sheets inquired about the question of brand management; he asked Regent Larson if he had specific thoughts about how to promote the University's brand. Regent Larson commented that he has a great deal of personal experience in brand management for a large organization and revolutionizing a brand and said he believes there are some from outside the academy who could bring helpful ideas to the party. He said he is not sure the University has had a brand-management strategy and that it could be a higher priority—and that the institution could be more consistent in how it manages its brand. Organizations tend to be reactive, which is not a good way to manage a brand, and a number of members of the Board of Regents have had experience with brand management and could be helpful.

Professor Jacobs inquired if Regent Larson had any suggestions for faculty members about brand management—when many faculty members find the very idea of brand management distasteful. Regent Larson said that the institution needs to understand what it is promoting, what it is trying to sell, and it is all about image: It must be meaningful and truthful. The University must position its brand so that all, especially those in leadership positions, support the institution and can make its message come true. The University has not done a good job of this in the past, but the brand influences a lot of people in the state, both the average person and leaders who make decisions. There are at present too many people in the legislature who do not have a high regard for the University.

Professor Hayes said she could not agree more with Regent Larson. As an organization, the University can get behind meaning and truth—it is what the University is about. It represents something not emphasized enough in society: It is not just about money or the short term, it is about having a mission and the long term. She has often been told by students that that they are hungry for meaning. Young people want to learn how to change the world. The videos that have been made by University Relations are tremendous and there is great need for more in-depth stories about student and faculty successes at the University. Professor Bitterman suggested that the new Big Ten Network is one gateway to providing such stories because people all over the country watch it.

Regent Larson said the University must enable students to live out their dreams. It should help them live out their ambitions and help them make the world a better place. It must also sell the fact that an increasing number of the meaningful jobs in the future will require higher education. The days are gone when a high-school graduate could get a job that pays more than one a college graduate can get. And those jobs are about more than pay, they are about people who can contribute, who can make the world better for society and their families, make contributions, not just increase the size of their own pocketbooks.

There are a number of ways to spread the University's brand, Regent Cohen added, including through personal conversations, University Relations, and the impact of faculty, staff, and students on their own legislators. Each of the members of this Committee no doubt has an amazing story, she surmised, and telling it would help the brand. The Board of Regents, she repeated, has concluded it must pay attention to the issue.

Professor Bearinger reported that in a recent meeting between a legislator and a few members of this Committee, it was suggested that a faculty member and a student in each legislator's district be identified to tell stories. She also commented that faculty do not readily digest the idea of a brand, but it can be tied to grant proposals: Faculty members are selling ideas and selling the institution to do the work of the proposal.

Faculty members are not by nature pack animals, Professor Cramer observed, but they are nearly all united in being passionate about their students, and one brand failure is the perception that the faculty does not care about students. Having faculty members talk about students and putting a personal face on the mission would go a long way to helping the brand. And students must talk about themselves individually, Professor May added. She reported that she had put University Relations staff in touch with three seniors to talk about what their education has meant to them—they jumped at the opportunity. These should not be slogans or soundbites but should be students expressing their passion.

Professor Cramer said that he was delighted that these plans are moving forward. He inquired if there were other matters that Regents Cohen and Larson, or Committee members, wished to discuss.

Professor May said that one obvious one is how to keep spirits up. It is a hard time at the University because of the financial collapse and political hostility toward the University in some quarters, something the Board of Regents understands, she said. How does the institution keep spirits up when it faces continuing budget cuts and political hostility, and how does it prevent people from going into a shell?

Regent Larson said the University can do a lot better job collectively of turning a problem to an opportunity. President Kaler has shown the way when he leads on changing the way the University does things. It must cut out bureaucracy and costs and focus on its mission, which is to create value for the state and the world. It must educate students and identify new ways to do things. It needs to eliminate unnecessary processes, but he said he is not interested in decreasing spending, just being sure the institution spends wisely. It could be thousands of little things done to cut costs to allow the University to invest in the future and invest in new ways. It is possible, and the Board of Regents needs to provide stronger leadership in this area—as could this Committee, he suggested.

In the last several years the University has dealt with declining state funds by increasing tuition, Professor Luepker observed. Do they have any thoughts on that topic? Have the tuition increases gone far enough? That is very much on the minds of the Board, Regent Cohen said, and they would like to see tuition increases be as small as possible. President Kaler's point, at many of his talks, is that there is a correlation between the state appropriation and tuition levels. The Board tries to minimize increases as much as it can, which is one reason it is focusing more on private philanthropy.

Regent Larson concurred and said the University also needs to increase its value proposition. Ten years ago the four-year graduation rate was below 50%; it has improved markedly in recent years. He thanked the faculty for accomplishing that change and observed that there remains room for improvement. The University will be competing more and more with private institutions; it must tell the legislators and the people of the State what its value proposition is. It is significant and the institution is not selling it as well as it could. He thanked the faculty for their help and support.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Regents Cohen and Larson for joining the meeting and said she was glad that the Board Chair and Vice Chair meet annually with the Committee. She asked if they feel they understand the faculty well. Many faculty members are here for their entire professional lives and have a deep commitment to the University. Do Board members feel they have gotten to know the faculty and have a sense of them? Are there mechanisms for them to get to know members of the faculty?

Regent Cohen said that the faculty is one element of the University to which she feels most connected. Finances are extremely important but she is attracted to the educational mission and interested in learning what departments and faculty members are doing. She recalled that she was a mid-career student so her experiences with the educational mission were not so long ago. It is crucial to have educators on the Board, but also finance and business people; she said she believes she can help the Board understand educational programs. She noted that the Board sometimes has lunch or dinner with groups of faculty members (e.g., the Regents Professors, stem-cell scientists).

Regent Larson said he wished there were ways they have more connections with the faculty but believed the Board is doing a good job of getting to know faculty members. Members of the Board value what the faculty bring to the party—the faculty are the University's value proposition. He said he was not sure what more could be done but he would be glad to hear Committee member's thoughts about how the Board can be and stay connected to the faculty. He said hoped that most faculty members realize how deeply the Board cares about the faculty; Board membership is a volunteer job, one that people do because they understand the value of the University and what the faculty bring to it.

Professor Bitterman inquired how the Board came to have lunch with faculty members doing stem-cell research. How do these arrangements come to be? Regent Cohen said the Board staff makes suggestions, Board members can ask about areas of interest, and it is possible for areas of the University to call the Board office to ask for time with the Board. Mr. Steeves reported that there is an extensive process around developing the agenda for meetings of the Board that involves the President and the senior officers, and once a lunch or dinner topic has been identified, the Board office will initiate contact with the appropriate individuals. One alternative mechanism to give the Regents access to the faculty might be to work through the governance system with faculty members who have many connections inside the institution, Professor Bitterman suggested.

The Board also visits with students, Regent Cohen observed.

Professor Brothen returned to Regent Larson's comment about challenges and opportunities: He reported that at the last meeting of the Board's Educational Policy Committee, a Board member asked if cuts in programs were being considered along with additions. Professor Brothen wondered if this reflected a general sense among Board members. Regent Cohen said the Board wants to be aware of programs and be sure that the University is spending as wisely as it can.

Regent Larson said that everyone must be aware the University exists in a competitive world: If it is going to build programs, it must sure they are world-class or heading in that direction. That is crucial to attracting the best people in the discipline.

Professor Ericksen inquired when the last time the Board met at the Morris campus was. She said it is important that Board members meet with research faculty from the Twin Cities campus—but it is also important they meet with the Morris faculty, who have different concerns. Morris, for example, has a larger percentage of Pell-eligible students and many first-generation college students, and it would help Board members to meet the students they serve. Does the Board plan to meet at a coordinate campus?

Regent Cohen pointed out that when the Board meets with groups of faculty members and students, the groups include people from the coordinate campuses. The Board is looking at travel to one of the coordinate campuses; it has not done so for a few years because of the cost and the demands on administrative time. They are weighing whether to have such a meeting, but in any case in the last few years they have had small groups of Regents visit the coordinate campuses, which permits them to become acquainted with the campus but avoids all the demands on staff time and the cost of a full Board meeting.

Regent Larson thanked the Committee for its good work and its past contributions to the University. He urged that the Committee bring its ideas and suggestions to the Board because it wants to be responsive to faculty concerns and advice. Regent Cohen said the Board values shared governance at the University and the willingness of faculty members to give up time to participate. She thanked the Committee for having them at its meeting. Professor Cramer thanked Regents Cohen and Larson for joining the Committee and adjourned the meeting at 3:50.

-- Gary Engstrand