

FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

April 2, 2015

Minutes of the Meeting

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 reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: OIT Governance, Moment of Silence, Senate Research Committee Resolution and Statement, Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Office of Government and Community Relations]

Present: Rebecca Ropers-Huilman (chair), Chris Uggen (vice chair), William Durfee, Eva von Dassow, Linda Bearinger, Gary Cohen, Gary Gardner, Maria Gini, Joseph Konstan, Kathleen Krichbaum, Susan Wick, Colin Campbell, James Cloyd, Jigna Desai, Allan Erbsen, Janet Ericksen, Karen Mesce, Jean Wyman

Guests: Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Office of Government and Community Relations; Bernie Gulachek, associate vice president, Office of Information Technology; Craig Bantz, associate CIO and IT director, Office of Information Technology

1. **OIT governance** – Professor Ropers-Huilman convened the meeting and introduced Office of Information Technology (OIT) guests Bernie Gulachek, associate vice president, and Craig Bantz, associate CIO and IT director. She then turned to Mr. Gulachek to provide introductory remarks. Mr. Gulachek began by noting that in 2012, OIT implemented a new governance model. The model was designed to gather input and get ideas from across the institution about where the University's technologists should focus their time and energy in the upcoming fiscal year. A PowerPoint presentation was distributed to members, which served to provide a context for the conversation. In addition to meetings with various groups across the institution, OIT collects data via an online survey ([IT Input Survey](#)). This information is then compiled and rationalized into themes, which are then vetted through the deans and the Operational Excellence group. From this work comes a small list of efforts that OIT rallies its technologists around in order to effect change. Examples from previous year's efforts mentioned by Mr. Gulachek included Enterprise System Upgrade Project (ESUP) Readiness efforts, installation of the Information Security Risk Management (ISRM) program, and rationalizing the use of video conferencing tools to name a few.

Mr. Gulachek solicited members' feedback about their ideas on technology opportunities for the institution, where investments and enhancements are needed, and existing tools and services that are no longer needed. Suggestions and concerns raised by members are summarized below:

- Increase IT's involvement in business process development.

- Greater use of social media.
- Educate staff and faculty about availability of existing technology tools and services, which many people are unaware of.
- Offer application development services for departments (for non-enterprise projects).
- Concerns around the University's home page 'branding' efforts.
- Boost electrical power in conference rooms and classrooms for devices.
- Enhance and expand video conferencing tools/equipment/spaces.
- Hold an IT fair or workshop to make faculty aware of what tools are available.
- Concern over the data center's strength and viability.
- Consider consolidation of central and Academic Health Center IT services.
- Offer proprietary software applications such as Stata & SPSS to meet students' needs.

In light of time, Mr. Gulachek thanked members for their feedback and a good discussion.

2. **Moment of silence** – Before moving on with the rest of the agenda, Professor Ropers-Huilman asked members to take a moment of silence for Jennifer Houle, a University student who recently passed away.

3. **Senate Research Committee (SRC) May 2, 2013 resolution and January 25, 2012 statement** – Professor Ropers-Huilman introduced the next agenda item, a discussion concerning the SRC's University Support for Institutional Training Grant Proposals resolution (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/trnggrantres.html>) and its statement, The Value and Measurement of Scholarship at the University of Minnesota Whether or Not Externally Funded (<http://www1.umn.edu/usenate/resolutions/committees/productivity.pdf>). To put the discussion in context, Professor Ropers-Huilman explained that while these are two different matters, they are being grouped together because a number of people question whether the administration has adequately paid enough attention to them. She asked members for their thoughts on how to bring greater attention to these documents so they get the visibility they deserve. Before getting member input, however, she called on former SRC chair, Professor Lyn Bearinger, and the current chair, Professor Maria Gini to say a few words about the documents. In their comments, both concluded that despite the tremendous amount of time spent on consultation in preparation for crafting the documents, and repeated attempts to garner senior leaders' attention to the problems identified in each, no real progress has been made. In Professor Bearinger's opinion, the Graduate School needs to be engaged in a discussion about training grants; it is not strictly a matter for the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR). The discussion then segued into a detailed discussion about indirect training grant costs, cost pool charges, per capita charges for graduate students, etc.

In the spirit of time, Professor Ropers-Huilman reiterated her initial question about how to get the resolution and statement back on people's radar. Would it be sufficient to have the SRC take them up again, or should the FCC invite Vice Provost Henning Schroeder

(Graduate School), Vice President Brian Herman (Research) and Associate Vice President Pamela Webb (Sponsored Projects Administration) to an upcoming meeting to discuss this matter. Professor Cohen suggested the FCC draft a resolution asking the Vice President for Research to prepare an annual report on research productivity and the quality of research at the University that goes beyond research dollars. Professor Gardner agreed that the research accomplishments at the University need to be highlighted rather than having the focus be on NSF and NIH funding. Professor Konstan added that looking at training grants through a budget and finance lens can corrupt the University's pursuit of its mission. Whenever the University talks about its excellence in research and measures this success only in dollars, it undermines the mission of the institution because our value is not only about how much money is generated but how much knowledge, invention, discovery and art is developed. Central cost pool charges associated with training grants has incentivized deans to not encourage their faculty to pursue them. This is a classic collective goods problem, particularly as it relates to training grants, noted Professor Uggen, and suggested some of the costs associated with training grants be centralized. He reminded members that when Vice Provost Schroeder met with the FCC in the fall that he wanted to part of the solution as it relates to the training grant problems. In Professor Gini's opinion, it is unrealistic to think that without numbers/metrics the story about why training grants are important will not be able to be conveyed. Professor von Dassow said it is the faculty's responsibility to push back and be idealistic and not simply accept that everything needs to be expressed in quantitative terms. It is the job of faculty to transcend the trends that are damaging to the University's mission. To wrap up the discussion, Professor Desai said that the FCC should ask Vice President Herman to present to the FCC two different definitions of research, one for the broader public and the other for internal discussions. While no final decision on how to proceed with increasing the visibility of these documents was reached, the committee was leaning in the direction of inviting Vice Provost Schroeder, Vice President Herman and Associate Vice President Web to have a discussion about training grants and then to have a separate discussion with Vice President Herman about the value of research. Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked members for a good discussion.

4. **Legislative liaison update** – Professor Gardner went off the record and provided members with a legislative session update.

5. **Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Office of Government and Community Relations** – Professor Ropers-Huilman welcomed Erin Dady, special assistant to the president, Office of Government and Community Relations, to the meeting. Ms. Dady thanked members for the invitation to come before them. She began by saying that the target adjournment date for this legislature session is May 18, 2015. She then distributed three handouts 1) the 2015-16 biennial budget request, 2) 2015 capital request, and 3) 2016-17 biennial budget request, and turned members' attention to the financial comparison chart on the biennial budget request handout. To date, said Ms. Dady, only Governor Dayton has put together his budget proposal, which includes funding for the University's tuition freeze request. She also reminded the committee that Governor Dayton launched a Blue Ribbon Committee to enhance the national prominence of the University of Minnesota Medical School. The House and Senate,

noted Ms. Dady, have each released the targets for their respective budgets, and, over the next couple weeks, will decide how to split up their higher education target budgets between the University, MnSCU and state grant programs. Governor Dayton's budget target is at \$288 million, which is the highest. The Senate's higher education target budget is lower at \$205 million, and the House's budget target is at \$53 million. It is clear that Governor Dayton, the Senate and the House have three different approaches for dealing with the \$2 billion surplus. The University's request was for \$148.2 million, which includes \$65.2 million for access and affordability, \$15 million for facility condition improvements, \$55.5 million for Healthy Minnesota and the Medical School, and \$12.5 for Vibrant Communities.

The bonding bill will also be something members will be hearing about in the coming weeks. It is expected that Governor Dayton will propose a large bonding bill at the beginning of next week for \$850 million. The University's 2015 capital request includes 1) \$55 million in Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement (HEAPR) funding to maximize the effectiveness and extend the life of the University's 29 million square feet infrastructure, 2) \$18 million for a veterinary isolation laboratory to replace two obsolete isolation laboratories in St. Paul, and 3) \$4 million to replace the St. Paul greenhouse with an efficient greenhouse to protect and provide access to the University's rare-plant collection. The University is also anticipating that there will be an additional project in Governor Dayton's bonding bill, which would be a predesign and plan for a building on the AHC campus. While Governor Dayton's bonding bill is at \$850 million, the House is proposing \$0, and said they are not open to a bonding bill this year. The Senate's proposal is somewhere in the middle, recognizing that the Capitol renovation is over budget. Typically, in a non-bonding year (2015), sometimes there could be a smaller bonding bill and sometimes not.

Professor Gardner said the House has talked about a bonding bill to be spent on roads and bridges, but will their bonding bill be brought forward in 2015 or in 2016? Ms. Dady said the House is planning to propose an \$850 bonding bill in 2016.

Ms. Dady said the Office of Government and Community Relations will be undertaking some advocacy work, and the FCC's help would be greatly appreciated. Over the next six weeks, a number of Regents will be at the Capitol visiting with legislators. The Office of Government and Community Relations will also activate its Legislative Action Network, which has about 19,000 members who will be called upon to contact their legislators about the University's priorities. Additionally, said Ms. Dady, her office will be conducting postcard campaigns with students on all five campuses focusing on the tuition freeze request and the investment in the Medical School as well as making targeted phone calls to key legislators, writing letters to the editor and editorials in newspapers across the state.

Legislative Liaison Professor Bearinger said it will be important for faculty to be more than simply a legislative district member; they will need to vocally advocate for the University. It has been her experience that legislators are fascinated with the stories she and Professor Gardner share about the University in terms of research, etc. The

remaining six-week strategy should include an effort to make faculty more visible at the legislature. Ms. Dady said her office has been targeted around the budget request, but this focus can be expanded over the course of the next six weeks. For example, regarding the Healthy Minnesota mining proposal, Duluth faculty have been and will continue to meet with the Duluth iron range delegation. Similarly, in terms of Healthy Minnesota and the Medical School investment, a number of faculty are scheduled to testify next week about these proposals.

Is the Vibrant Communities still on the University's biennial budget request, asked Professor Cohen? If so, have any faculty participated in these conversations. Yes, it is still in the request, said Ms. Dady. Faculty have participated on the mining piece of Vibrant Communities but not on the other parts.

What are the other components of Vibrant Communities that are being targeted besides mining, asked Professor Ropers-Huilman? Ms. Dady said nothing besides mining is moving forward on the University's Vibrant Communities request. Originally, it included work around immigration and achievement gap issues.

Professor Wyman asked for clarification around the Healthy Minnesota and investment in the Medical School request, specifically as it relates to workforce needs. Is the Healthy Minnesota proposal focusing on the Medical School only, or are the other AHC schools going to be a part of this initiative? Ms. Dady explained that initially the Healthy Minnesota and investment in the Medical School were two separate proposals that came together as one. In the initial biennial budget request that was passed by the Board of Regents there was just a Healthy Minnesota proposal and not a Medical School investment proposal. Once it was clear Governor Dayton was passionate about an investment in the Medical School is when the two requests were combined into one. There was some overlap in research areas in the Healthy Minnesota and Medical School proposals, which led the Healthy Minnesota request to be lowered slightly and the Medical School investment added in. That being said, there are still a lot of conversations at the legislature about course needs, and all the AHC deans have been involved in lobbying and educational efforts around Healthy Minnesota.

Why does the University in talking about its request sometimes refer to it in terms of an increase in its budget and other times it talks about its total request, asked Professor Cloyd? In his opinion, this lack of consistency causes confusion. Ms. Dady said the legislature is focused on how to spend the \$2 billion surplus so this is when the University talks about the increase in its budget request rather than the total budget request. The University talks about its total budget request when it refers to the State appropriation trend because it feels it is important to get the message out that the University's trend is going down. Professor Cloyd urged the administration to think about how this information is conveyed because it can be confusing, even to University employees.

Will the Legislative Auditor's Report have any implications for the University's budget request, asked Professor Bearinger? Naturally, there are a number of legislators who are

concerned about the report and have asked a lot of questions, said Ms. Dady. Professor Durfee did a great job when speaking to the Senate Higher Education Committee about it recently. In Ms. Dady's opinion, she does not see the report intermingling with the University's request. While legislators are concerned, she believes they will be looking for thorough follow-up and successful implementation of needed changes.

Professor Desai commented that the University still has a lot of work to do as it relates to demonstrating what it does in terms being productive and creating Vibrant Communities. The story about how faculty and the research they conduct are helping Minnesota communities needs to be told and faculty need to tell the stories in order for them to be compelling. Ms. Dady agreed that a better job needs to be done at telling these stories. Along these lines, Professor Uggen highlighted the President's Community-Engaged Scholar Award (<http://www.engagement.umn.edu/presidents-community-engaged-scholar-award>), which will be held tomorrow. The award recognizes one faculty or academic profession and administrative employee for exemplary engaged scholarship in his/her field of inquiry. Professor Gardner suggested Ms. Dady connect with Associate Vice President Andrew Furco from the Office for Public Engagement (<http://engagement.umn.edu/>) as he will have stories about the amazing work that is being done at the University.

In the past, recalled Professor von Dassow, there was a mechanism for bringing faculty members to the legislature to talk about their research. She suggested reinstating this mechanism so legislators have an opportunity to hear regularly from faculty and students who do different kinds of research. Ms. Dady said that for the first time this year the University did a 'night of discovery' for legislators who were bussed to the AHC, and each school in the AHC made a presentation geared toward educating legislators about Healthy Minnesota. The feedback from legislators was extraordinary. It is challenging during the session to get legislators to come to the University. During session, it is the University's strategy to give legislators stories and let them hear from people aligned with its request. Once the session is over, during the summer a strategy is developed for bringing legislators to campus during the fall for tours and educate them about the work being done here.

Professor Ropers-Huilman thanked Ms. Dady for meeting with the committee. She encouraged members' talk with Ms. Dady after the meeting or connect with Professors Gardner and Bearinger, the legislative liaisons, to make sure this communication continues.

6. Adjournment - Before adjourning, Professor Ropers-Huilman distributed a list of possible agenda priorities for the remainder of the year and told members she would initiate an e-conversation to determine members' top issues for the remainder of the year. Hearing no further business, Professor Ropers-Huilman adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate

