

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, June 12, 1997 (Part I)
1:30 - 4:30
Room 229 Nolte Center**

Present: Virginia Gray (chair), Carl Adams, Carole Bland, W. Andrew Collins, Mary Dempsey, Sara Evans, Dan Feeney, Gary Gardner, M. Janice Hogan, David Hamilton, Russell Hobbie, Laura Coffin Koch, Michael Korth, Harvey Peterson, Craig Swan, Matthew Tirrell

Absent: Victor Bloomfield, Gary Davis, Fred Morrison, Michael Steffes

Guests: Executive Vice President and Provost-designate Robert Bruininks; Dean Hal Miller and Associate Dean David Grossman (University College)

[In these minutes: Discussion with Executive Vice President-designate Bruininks about organization, positions, and decision-making, distance education and UC; the military science minor]

1. Discussion with Dr. Bruininks

Professor Gray convened the meeting at 1:30 and said that Dr. Bruininks would talk about the organization of his office and planning for its staffing, something in which Committee members had expressed an interest; she welcomed Dr. Bruininks.

Dr. Bruininks distributed copies of an organizational chart and proposed positions to be created in his office; he noted that part of the organizational chart was directly attributable to earlier comments by FCC. He said he also hoped to talk about the proposal sent to FCC by two of the provostal FCCs to re-establish an FCC like them under the new structure; he said he wished to inquire about it. He is trying to meet with both groups.

Professor Gray reported that incoming FCC chair Bloomfield would be appointing a task force on governance to examine changes that may be needed to relate to the new organizational structure; that group will also assess what is needed.

Referring to the organizational chart, Dr. Bruininks said he had tried to avoid convoluted matrix management relationships that cut across multiple structures and they tried to divide campus and system responsibilities into two separate charts. The latter is difficult to do, and he has spoken with Professor Koch about this on several occasions; often some campus entities have at least indirect system responsibilities as well.

In terms of the system, there will be an associate to the Executive Vice President, a sort of chief-

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

of-staff. Part of the problem is that he must consolidate three existing offices (the three provosts). He said he has concluded it is difficult enough to make the transition to a new job when one is at the institution, because it is easy for anyone to call, and it is difficult to do two full-time jobs. What makes this one especially challenging is the need to close two offices by June 30, and then figuring out how to work out the personnel relationships and deal with continuity and take up the initiatives and projects and activities. This has not been an easy task, and even though he is not yet in the position, he estimates he is spending about 45 hours per week on it. There have been glitches, and occasional miscues, but for the most part the process is going smoothly and people are finding options for themselves. There are a lot of talented people in the offices, and the administration is helping them find positions.

The system organizational chart outlines the office of Academic Affairs; there is one position still under review, Assistant Vice President for Student Services. There is some feeling that all of the offices that deal with admissions and enrollment management and so on should be put together. Dr. Bruininks said he did not intend to move on that suggestion until he has had time to think about it. Most of the offices on the chart are already in place and have system-wide responsibilities.

The campus chart includes three positions that would be created, vice provosts of at least 50% time to handle academic leadership issues that cross colleges. One would be for undergraduate education; some areas of responsibility would include liberal education requirements, honors, advising, UROP, teaching, the freshman year, the residential program. He said he did not see the vice provosts as having line responsibilities, but instead building relationships and leading initiatives. They would not have major budgetary and personnel portfolios. There is a single search committee for all three positions, and people are encouraged to apply.

The dilemma he has, in explaining the positions in the abstract, is matching the strengths of those who apply with the things that need to be done. He would like one position to be a major leadership position for undergraduate education, but has put no line responsibilities under the position because they often get into college business or in the operation of other campus units. He has received suggestions to give this officer line responsibility, something with which he has discussed with Professor Koch. The posted positions, however, do not include line responsibilities. He has tried to define them as leadership positions; once people are identified, the job descriptions will be shaped. He told the Committee he had read carefully a memo from Professor Koch, and found it very helpful.

When he counted the number of people who report to him, on the two charts, he found that there were 27. That needs to be reconsidered, Dr. Bruininks said, but he wants to build a team as quickly as possible.

Professor Gray asked about the time of the vice provost positions; Dr. Bruininks said they could be as much as 90% time, but he wanted the incumbents to have some academic role--teaching or active research. He wanted the positions to be attractive to faculty, and feared that if they were full time, they might not attract some of the most creative applicants. He would like them to be at least 50% time; the Council of Deans thought they should be about 75%, which may be optimal. Professor Hamilton cautioned that these positions would be 100% time in fact, and will do overload to maintain their academic status.

One thing he has learned, Professor Hamilton related, is that a chief executive officer--which is

what Dr. Bruininks will be, in a way--should have no more than six people reporting to him. Twenty-seven is reminiscent of the arrangement that Dr. Infante had; perhaps Dr. Bruininks can cope with that, but it is VERY difficult. Dr. Bruininks assured the Committee he did not intend to actively manage 27 people, and has been thinking about models that would make sense. His preference is to spend most of his time on the campus chart, working on the campus academic agenda--as did Dr. Infante when he began.

Professor Swan inquired about human resources. At one point, he thought all faculty and staff human resources would be under the vice president, but there is a vice provost position on the chart; who will be doing what? Professor Swan added that he liked the chart, where promotion and tenure, for instance, are handled in Academic Affairs, rather than a department called "human resources."

The issue of what happens to human resources has been discussed during the transition, Dr. Bruininks responded. One thing people felt good about, under the provostal structure, was the decentralization of human resource people into the various offices. The assumption has been that as they make the transition to the Vice President for Human Resources office, the decentralization model will remain in place. When it comes to academic human resources (primarily faculty), that must be centralized in his office; this is primarily faculty development. There may be times when consultation is needed on institutional human resources policy, but the promotion and tenure process must be managed in his office. As he thought about the vice provost positions, he thought one should deal with undergraduate education while another should deal with academic human resource development issues; another could serve as a liaison to graduate and professional education. Sorting out the responsibilities will depend in part on the experience of who shows up to be considered for the positions.

In the case of promotion and tenure, there were 160-some files last year, and those would still come to his office; there would still be joint review with the Graduate School--Dr. Bruininks said he saw nothing changing in that respect. He said he wanted to preserve campus traditions that have worked in the past. Promotion and tenure files for the coordinate campuses will come from the chancellors' offices to the President, probably without review by his office but with continued review by the Dean of the Graduate School. There is concern that that would continue, Professor Dempsey said, and she was glad to hear that the process would continue.

Dr. Bruininks asked Professor Dempsey to remind him about this issue, and commented wryly that it was bewildering to try to keep track of all the issues. There are pages and pages of issues under consideration, and it is a major task simply to sort them out and identify who will track them. He said he worried that things could fall through the cracks, and he didn't want academic human resources to be one of them.

Professor Adams inquired about the use of the term "executive officer." The position will coordinate the internal management of the office, Dr. Bruininks said; it is not an executive officer position in the sense of having people report to it. The person will coordinate budget and planning, and manage the office. The term is ambiguous and could create difficulties, Professor Adams commented. Dr. Bruininks affirmed that the position is held by Dr. Kvavik.

Professor Swan inquired about the proposed responsibility of the human resources vice provost for "retention/counteroffers." He recalled that several years ago Academic Affairs told the colleges they

were responsible for these, and one would have to go back a dozen years to find a time when the deans argued each case with Academic Affairs. Dr. Bruininks said the present situation would not change; there is no central retention pool, and that line should be taken out of the description. But the issue of dealing with retention concerns on the institutional basis, how the University will be competitive, should be addressed; Professor Swan agreed. Dr. Bruininks said it would not be a good idea to revert to the old practice.

Professor Hamilton inquired about the responsibility for facilities under the executive officer; Dr. Bruininks said it would be liaison with Facilities Management. He said that the University's planning, budgeting, space management, capital management issues are dealt with in a variety of offices; he said he would feel more comfortable if they were all in one place and coordinated on the academic side of the house. That is difficult to accomplish.

The process has not been coherent enough, Dr. Bruininks said. The University does planning one time of the year, budget work at another, capital planning is done elsewhere; it is important to the future of the University to bring these into alignment, or it will continue to think short-term and not make investments that would serve the University well in the long-term. One example is capital requests, which come up through independent channels, one at a time, and are rarely viewed in terms of a campus-wide academic strategy as a whole. This is an area that needs more coherence, and is one that he is very interested in and has worked for years on it.

President Yudof is also concerned about this, and he is likely to insist that there be careful integration of capital and academic budget planning. For example, if the technology investment agenda is not integrated into careful thinking on the academic side, the University could make multi-million dollar investments that will not serve it very well in the future. Dr. Bruininks said he has already asked a group of people to start thinking about how to better coordinate these various offices. At present Dr. Kvavik is chairing the committee, and over the last 2-3 years the capital planning is more focussed than it has been--although it is still not tied closely enough to the academic agenda.

Professor Gardner noted that the provosts and vice presidents had a major line role in budgetary decisions. As Dr. Yudof has described a flatter administration, that would not be the case. Will his office play the role that the provosts have played, or will the President's Office. Dr. Bruininks said not. The budget unit that Mr. Pfutzenreuter directs is in Finance and Operations; it needs to be coordinated between the two vice presidencies, and he has spoken with Senior Vice President Jackson about this. She agrees they need to be working together closely. About 80% of what the people do in Mr. Pfutzenreuter's office has to do with academic priorities and academic budgets; to think that it can work without careful coordination with Academic Affairs is foolish. If they cannot figure out a way to bring these units into alignment, Dr. Bruininks warned, he will be forced to build a shadow budget operation to protect the academic side--and it would be foolish to spend extra money on that. There has been discussion of attaching all of this to the President's Office, and Professor Morrison has so urged. Dr. Bruininks said he would argue against that, because it does not address the problem of how to keep them in close contact with academic units.

Professor Swan asked if the problem of the academic work done by Mr. Pfutzenreuter's office could not be solved by moving part of that office to Academic Affairs? Dr. Bruininks said it would, but that would be tough, and that office also does budget planning for other parts of the University. He said

he has raised the possibility; what he would rather do, instead, is establish a joint effort, perhaps with joint reporting and a careful integration of Finance and Operations and Academic Affairs. If that does not work, then another look will have to be taken.

Professor Hamilton inquired about the dotted line between Dr. Bruininks' office and that of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. Dr. Bruininks said the responsibility of the vice provost in his office would be for academic curriculum and programs (e.g., Public Health and Social Work, the biological sciences), not at the senior management level. The assumption is that he and Dr. Cerra would work closely together, but there is not a direct reporting relationship. Dr. Cerra seems satisfied with the relationship thus far.

Professor Adams inquired about distance education and the virtual university. On the system chart, they are the joint responsibility of the Dean of UC and the Chief Information Officer; it is not clear how this works at the campus level. What is of concern to him is his belief that the key to success in distance education is the quality and the content; it is not clear how distance education is organized at the campus level. The key to success is not novelty, but quality; it is through the regular colleges and departments that there is access to high quality content. To succeed, it is necessary to harness the people on the campus to be involved. The way it is structured, there is the implication that that is not important, but that something is occurring at the system level. If distance education is a significant activity, one of the vice provosts should have responsibility for it. The relationship of UC to distance education is not clear.

Dr. Bruininks said that the chart indicated a lack of clarity and responsibility, and that needs to be faced up to. It is an issue he will have to deal with in the next three to six months. Now responsibility is divided and diffuse, and the strategy appears to be dominated by short-term thinking and small grants rather than leveraging and long-term programs, and there is not enough decentralization to collegiate units so the academic agenda can be driven where the quality resides. He has thought a lot about this, he said; without disparaging anyone, there is too much diffusion of responsibility and too little clarity about where the University wants to go. And there is not enough decentralization of resources to let faculty and administrators work on the issues in the colleges.

He said he viewed UC and information technology as being more in a support role, not driving the academic agenda but responding to it. Figuring out to make more sense of this will be very challenging, but it has to be done, or the University will fall farther behind. When there was decentralization of information technology to the provosts, they discussed what to do with the money and thought about soliciting grants. The usual practice is to fund small grants, but then nothing is leveraged and it is not coherent. They suggested decentralizing resources to the colleges, which Provost Allen did, and that led to amazing creativity, at least in the development of web systems. The University's management and investment strategies need to be rethought, and he asked Committee members to think about it.

Professor Gray urged that Dr. Bruininks retain the thought about not giving small grants; one of the biggest wastes of faculty time, she said, is writing little grants and serving on committees to award little grants and receiving little grants. It would be better to throw darts to determine the winners; the process of competition for grants has gone too far.

Professor Collins returned to the issue of the provostal offices; he said it is not only a matter of

losing talented people, but also the loss of an enormous amount of expertise in areas for which he is assuming responsibility. One recent example is the initiatives in undergraduate education, many of which took place in Provost Shively's office. There is much history, expertise, and insight there; has he thought of a way to capture that in the new structure? Dr. Bruininks said it was difficult, because there is no one to work on the issues. In each office, however, people are summarizing the agendas and initiatives that are under way. They have also extended the existence of the offices for another three months so they can buy more time. In a few cases, people on contracts will continue, and he will meet with them, which should help to ensure continuity. Provost Shively has appointed Joel Weinsheimer as chair of the Council on Liberal Education, and is also developing a set of recommendations to help with the transition. There will be some awkwardness, but he said he has been very pleased with the provosts and the people in the offices; they have worked hard to identify issues and have been constructive and helpful.

Dr. Bruininks said he hoped the Committee would help him with such things as distance education or the configuration of his office, and that people at the meeting would think about the positions themselves. Also up in the air is the letter on consultation. He was urged early on to appoint a new consultative committee in the structure, and thought it was a good idea, but concluded that the relationship to the Senate Consultative Committee had to be worked out. If a consultative group is to be established, there must be a clear sense of mission and purpose for it. He said there is a consultative committee in the Academic Health Center, and now a proposal for a \$160,000 budget for. Dr. Bruininks said he would not be prepared to fund anything like that, but that there are governance issues that need to be addressed. He said that the Senate created the provostal consultative committees, and the same process must be used to decide what the structure should be in the future.

Professor Gray said there would be a recommendation to the Senate in the fall concerning the two provostal committees outside the Academic Health Center. Presumably the AHC committee will continue, and there may also be an assembly, but what its relationship to the Senate will be is to be determined. She recalled that it took a year of consultation before the provostal committees were established, and that it would be wise to let Dr. Bruininks' office be settled before any decision is made about the governance structure. Dr. Bruininks said his position will be that he is open to consultation, but the decision must come through the Senate and FCC. Professor Gray told him that the provostal FCCs had been asked to continue to serve until further notice, and take up whatever work they deem appropriate.

Professor Gardner recalled Dr. Bruininks' vision of UC as a service organization to faculty-based units; later in this meeting FCC will talk with UC Dean Hal Miller and Associate Dean David Grossman about content in degrees. He asked Dr. Bruininks if he had a sense of the administrative and promotional responsibility of UC as opposed to the academic units of the faculty.

The primary role is a strong support position, Dr. Bruininks. UC has a great deal of accumulated knowledge and expertise on life-long learning and alternative forms of instruction and alternative ways to deliver instruction. There must be a strong unit such as UC on campus, as this becomes more of a learning society; at the same time, UC should NOT be in the business of competing with the colleges. If UC gets into the joint degree programs with MNSCU, the University must work hard to be sure that the academic units are at the center of the programs and that they have the appropriate quality.

He would also argue, Dr. Bruininks told the Committee, that times will become more difficult in higher education and choices have to be made about investments. There is little gain in having a number of University operations in competition with each other. Nor does he want to have a situation where the academic colleges are held to fairly stiff requirements with respect to the development of new degrees--and have an "anything goes" philosophy with respect to UC.

Dr. Bruininks said he had a good and close working relationship with UC as a dean; Education is one of the most active players in UC, all over the state. He has a great deal of respect for what UC can bring to the academic enterprise. But he said he would like to make sure, as the University moves into virtual education, that the academic colleges have a strong presence in the decisions. On the one hand, one doesn't want to kill the entrepreneurial spirit, because it will be important to the University's long-term survival; at the same time, it has to be managed well, purposeful, and fit the planning priorities of the University.

Professor Evans said she had a question that arises every time there is a reorganization and people see the call going out for sundry associate and vice provosts and so on. Can he tell the Committee if the creation of his office, and the dissolution of the provosts' offices, will result in a net increase or decrease in administrators?

It will result in a net decrease in administrators, Dr. Bruininks replied, and it will result in a net decrease in cost--"or I will have a six-course teaching load in a couple of years." This requires a longer conversation, he said, but he has a strong feeling that the administration costs too much, and the quality and efficiency of performance must be improved, and more invested in the academic enterprise. In some cases the University must "grow" resources; it must also systematically shift resources from overhead into productive activity. One of the reasons he may be in this position is that he set out, six years ago, to seriously reduce administrative costs in the college. They did not drastically reduce employment, but the types of people who are employed is different; there are many more in communications and technology and many fewer sending requisitions back and forth. He said that he has hope for the enterprise systems, if they are well managed, but he is not naive enough to think a lot of money can be saved, unless there is a solid human resource policy to go with it. What they found is that one can engineer and re-engineer systems and processes--to use the jargon--but if one does not work at the grassroots level with people in the reorganization of work, and in retraining, the savings cannot be captured.

The simple answer is that the number and budget will be reduced, although it will not happen overnight, because there are transition rights. His view is that this should happen throughout the administration, and the colleges. Much more of the investment should be in the academic enterprise.

Professor Gray thanked Dr. Bruininks for joining the meeting.

2. Committee Business

Professor Gray reported that the regents would be taking up the tenure proposals the next morning; the committee chairs would be present, and Committee members were invited to attend if they wished.

This would be the last regular meeting of FCC for the year; there will be a briefing on research with President-elect Yudof next week. Professor Hamilton said there are very important issues with

respect to research that Dr. Yudof needs to know about from a faculty perspective. They include such things as the impact on principal investigators and departments of decisions made in grants management related and ORTTA issues.

Professor Gray asked that the impact on graduate training be included, and the cost of graduate students; Professor Hamilton agreed, and said that many bright people had studied the issue without reaching resolution, although the Graduate School has recently attempted to ease the situation somewhat.

Professor Adams emphasized that Dr. Yudof appears much more interested in solutions to problems rather than spending too much time simply discussing the problems.

Professor Hamilton reviewed information about research at the University, including many good things about the University, and commented that there will be problems that must be dealt with in the near future.

Professor Gardner asked for specifics on grants management. Professor Hamilton noted that there is a "roles and responsibilities" document; most departments and PIs do not know about it. The net effect of it is that much of the responsibility for grants is at the level of the PI and the department. What has happened with the NIH compliance agreement is that these roles and responsibilities have been codified, so PIs and departments are REQUIRED to do things that they have not had to do before (such as records that must be kept, checking to be sure certain things occur). The solutions to these issues are being dealt with by a task force on which he serves to deal with software. To bring this solution into the University will take resources, and may not be one that Dr. Yudof is not counting on.

If one presents a problem to Dr. Yudof, is it one that needs to be fixed or one that is being addressed and he is being informed about, Professor Gardner inquired? Both, Professor Hamilton said.

Professor Tirrell said he believed the solution to the problem of the cost of graduate students is direct charging for tuition. The University went from a very expensive and complicated and unnecessary system to something that he thought would end up at direct charging, and that is less expensive and makes no sense to him. One hopes it is purely an accounting device.

Professor Gray drew the attention of Committee members to handouts related to the discussion with Dean Miller and Associate Dean Grossman about the Military Science minor. It appears the consultation on this issue occurred in early 1994; one question is whether there is a statute of limitations on consultation! The original discussions may have taken place in the early 1980s, Professor Koch said.

Professor Gray mentioned that there has been a subcommittee of SCEP, but the subcommittee has not been appointed by the governance system, nor has it been staffed or guided by the governance system. Some of the "blame" can be on the governance system for not tracking its own subcommittee. The Senate reorganized in 1989, Professor Koch told the Committee, and what had been a standing Senate committee on ROTC became a subcommittee of SCEP. Last year she was notified of the existence of the subcommittee, and SCEP met with its chair and two members; SCEP told them they needed to send minutes to her and that SCEP needed to know what they were doing. They agreed, but SCEP has never heard anything from it. Professor Koch said she will be sending a letter to them calling for more consultation, and informing its members that a new subcommittee will be appointed after next

year. Professor Collins suggested the chair be an ex officio member of SCEP.

Professor Swan inquired about the faculty status of people assigned to teach in ROTC units. The ROTC subcommittee approves the appointments, and they have professorial appointments of some kind. Professor Koch reported that the military science departments report to the Office for Student Development and Athletics. Professor Gray said the Committee would talk with the deans about the more general issue of faculty oversight.

Professor Gray declared a recess.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota