

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, February 26, 2009**  
**12:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

- Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Shawn Curley, Dan Dahlberg, William Durfee, Janet Fitzakerley, Michael Hancher, Kathryn Hanna, Brian Isetts, Judith Martin, Michael Oakes, Nelson Rhodus, Cathrine Wambach, Becky Yust
- Absent: Gary Balas, Susan Berry, Marti Hope Gonzales, Caroline Hayes, Martin Sampson
- Guests: Several Faculty from the Graduate School Executive Committee (current and past); Provost E. Thomas Sullivan; Vice President Kathryn Brown; Vice President Karen Himle, Assistant Vice President Ann Aronson (University Relations)
- Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the President); Assistant Vice President Sharon Reich Paulsen (Office of the Provost)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion of the Graduate School with faculty members from the Graduate School Executive Committee; (2) faculty compensation policy; (3) discussion with Provost Sullivan (Graduate School); (4) football game-day parking; (5) reviews of senior administrators; (6) trademarks and logos policy]

**1. The Graduate School**

Professor Hoover convened the meeting at 12:15 and welcomed the several faculty representatives from the Graduate School Executive Committee. She informed the Committee and its guests that she had received over 1000 emails about the elimination of the Graduate School and had spent much of last weekend on the telephone with people on the same subject. She has heard a high level of anger about how the decision was made, although people are split on whether it was a good decision. She suggested that this discussion focus on the implementation committee charge and on what Graduate School programs are most valuable and which should remain centralized.

The Committee held a spirited hour-long discussion with its guests; the following points were covered:

- Establish metrics to ensure accountability and evaluation
- Define ways of obtaining information from constituent groups, particularly DGSs and the current Dean of the Graduate School who can explain the breadth of the operation
- Review everything under the aegis of the Graduate School, including all McKnight and other endowed funding
- Staff the implementation committee from the president's office

---

\* 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.

- Involve the Vice President for Research in the reorganization of graduate education and research support for faculty
- Study the advantages and disadvantages of centralization versus decentralization of graduate administrative functions, including specifically working with professional graduate programs.

Professor Hoover thanked the faculty from the Graduate School Executive Committee for joining the meeting.

Following the departure of the guests, Committee members discussed briefly what they had heard. Among the issues touched on were the difficulty in balancing working with the administration versus protesting; the need for the administration (1) to be frank about not claiming to consult when it did not do so, and (2) simply saying that it is unable effectively to consult on some kinds of decisions; the function of this Committee; and the fact that all of governance is "by grace" because the Regents, and through delegation of authority, the administration, ultimately hold decision-making responsibility.

## **2. Faculty Compensation Policy**

Professor Hoover asked the Committee to review the revisions to the Faculty Compensation Policy that had been forwarded from the Committee on Faculty Affairs. Professor Hanna explained that the major change was to bring under the purview of the policy those who hold endowed chairs.

The Committee discussed the policy briefly and then voted unanimously to place the revisions on the docket of an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

## **3. Discussion with Provost Sullivan**

Professor Hoover welcomed Provost Sullivan to the meeting.

Provost Sullivan was asked if he could explain the timing of the decision on the Graduate School. He noted that, given the looming \$156 million cut to the state, there was a serious need to begin decision making for scores of decisions that needed to be made in the next several months. President Bruininks had asked the administration to consider where reorganizations might increase the educational excellence while at the same time reducing redundancies, duplications and overlap to achieve cost savings. The President needed to begin to report to the Board of Regents on decisions relevant to how the University would cut \$156 million. He wanted to start those discussions and recommendations first with administrative cuts and administrative overhead so as to take pressure off the colleges. As the Graduate School reorganization idea was being discussed, the Provost learned that the Twin Cities deans independently were considering efficiency and cost-reducing measures, including their own recommendation for restructuring the Graduate School. The deans were coming forth with their recommendations on Monday, February 9. Hearing this recommendation from the deans, a decision was made to join together and to submit jointly a plan to the President. The plan submitted to the President was endorsed by all of the collegiate deans (16). At the Board of Regents meeting in February, the President announced his decision to restructure the Graduate School, along with other early budget decisions, and that an implementation team soon would be established to make recommendations on issues related to the reorganization of graduate education at the University. He believed that under the present structure there are many ambiguities about accountability and the setting of priorities, including

inefficiencies, duplication, and redundancies. Underlying the decision, in part, was the conclusion that decision making and accountability are not aligned at present.

Provost Sullivan said that the reorganization of graduate education will be designed to make more effective the responsibility to enhance excellence at each opportunity in graduate education and to achieve cost reductions. He noted that all of the functions now conducted by the Graduate School that add value will remain and that the implementation committee is being asked to make recommendations as to the appropriate location for all those responsibilities, including whether responsibility should be retained centrally, distributed to colleges or programs, or located in another administrative office. The goal, he said, is to integrate and align more closely the responsibilities of graduate education to and through the colleges and departments. Certain functions may be more effective through decentralization and distributed out in the colleges and departments, thereby reducing overlap, redundancies, and barriers to more efficiencies.

The Provost underscored that the decision was one made at a "50,000 foot" policy level to restructure and reorganize to promote accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. The dean for graduate education would be charged with advancing quality control between and among the various constituencies, promoting interdisciplinary graduate programs across departments and across colleges, and particularly focusing on excellence in the Ph.D. degrees. In short, he said that the dean for graduate education should be an advocate, coordinator, monitor, and supporter of graduate education across the colleges and departments, working more closely with the colleges and the faculty in the departments. Within the decision to restructure graduate education, the implementation committee will be charged to make recommendations for all issues related to the reorganization, and is not limited necessarily to the specific requests contained in the charge letter. He said that the implementation committee would have flexibility and broad discretion to consider all relevant areas, including organizational ideas, within the decision to reorganize graduate education. He noted that the implementation committee's charge was very analogous to the 35 task forces that were set up early during strategic planning, particularly those task forces that were related to collegiate reorganizations. The implementation committee is to make recommendations on all of the related details for a restructuring of graduate education. He noted that the committee is broad-based, with students, faculty, deans, DGSs, and other individuals with knowledge and experience of graduate education and its financing. He noted that once the administration receives the implementation committee's recommendations, there will be a public comment period before the president makes any final decisions on the details of reorganization.

With regard to the timeline for the implementation committee's recommendations, he noted that a spring report is being requested so that the public comment period can take place this spring while faculty and students are still on campus. He also noted, as outlined in the implementation committee letter, that the expectation is that the reorganization will start July 1, with a substantial period of time for implementation to take place—perhaps up to the fall of 2010 or even longer. There is no expectation that all implementation could or would take place by July 1, 2009. Until the final implementation decisions are made, the normal decision making will continue as it is at the present. (No changes are anticipated in admissions or fellowship cycles or program reviews during the transition toward final implementation.) Provost Sullivan noted that he specifically is asking the implementation committee to consider very carefully three very important areas: accountability for the Ph.D., the reporting lines and responsibility for master's degrees related to the Ph.D., and the promotion of interdisciplinary degrees across departments and across colleges. He also noted that he anticipates the award of fellowships and block grants, and related awards, would remain through a centralized committee of faculty, as is the case now

with advisory groups in the Graduate School. He expected that, in addition to faculty advisory groups making recommendations on allocation of dollars for graduate education, these discussions would be more formalized in the compact discussions with the collegiate units and the dean of graduate education.

He noted, in summary, that he expected the implementation committee to have broad and flexible discretion to make recommendations as to how graduate education should be restructured and that the particular areas of inquiry by the committee were not necessarily limited to the issues identified in the charge letter to the implementation committee.

He mentioned that he understands there are differences of opinion on the timing and the nature of the discussions leading up to the President's endorsement of the restructuring of graduate education. He observed that opinions will vary greatly on this subject. He said that he respects the difference of opinions and that the broad-based implementation committee will be asked to give recommendations on how graduate education should be restructured and aligned, broadly defined. He said that hindsight is very informative and that much has been learned in the last several weeks about process and proceeding forward. He noted that this is very much a work in progress, with all of the details to be worked out through recommendations of the committee on the nature of the restructuring.

He discussed with the FCC the nature of discussions with the University's constituencies when there are big decisions to be made with short timelines as we face the difficult task of cutting \$156 million from the University's budget within the next several months. He noted that, while the process here progressed more quickly than during strategic positioning, the timelines here are considerably shorter under the mandate of the state budget cuts. He concluded by saying that we have learned much from this policy decision and we continue to learn how we can better communicate and discuss changes to be made in improving the University and reducing costs. He said he hoped the broad and flexible discretion given to the implementation committee on how the restructuring should be achieved and the opportunity for broad-based public comments regarding the implementation committee's recommendations are illustrative of how this and other processes should go forward.

Professor Hoover thanked the Provost for joining the meeting.

#### **4. Football Game-Day Parking**

Professor Hoover next welcomed Vice President Kathryn Brown to the meeting to discuss football game-day parking. (The original agenda item was to be reviews of senior administrators, which will be rescheduled, except for a brief discussion at this meeting.)

Vice President Brown explained that over the last several months a game-day operations committee has been at work looking at all the issues associated with bringing football back on the campus in fall 2009. One subcommittee has been working on tailgating and parking. Information will be provided next week to all season-ticket holders and those interested in purchasing tickets, including information about parking.

Game-day parking will be purchased for the season, with the season football ticket, so that patrons will have an identified lot or ramp (of their choice), some of which will be identified for tailgating and which will allow the consumption (but not sale) of alcohol. The sites will allow for open trunks, grilling, and the activities associated with tailgating that occur at football games around the Big Ten.

They are trying to make this a positive experience, Ms. Brown related, as well as set directions. They want the environment to be festive and safe. Part of the reason for bringing the stadium back to campus is to bring people (fans, alumni, etc.) back and to help build community.

As a result, those who have contract parking will not be able to park in their usual designated ramp or lot on the seven Saturdays of home football games. There will be a designated ramp on each bank and St. Paul for all contract holders. Almost all parking facilities (certainly facilities with 50 or more spots), will be set aside for football parking on game days, although it is possible that not all spots will end up being sold. Ms. Brown cautioned that contract holders will not be allowed to enter their usual ramp, garage, or lot if it has been designated for football parking; she pointed out that 50,000 visitors coming to campus are going to put a strain on campus facilities and services and people need to be mindful of the challenge.

Vice President Brown told the Committee that Parking and Transportation will receive the revenues from game-day parking.

They are taking care of the needs of hospital workers, Vice President Brown assured the Committee, and are trying to be thoughtful about other employees who need to be on campus. If a particular need arises, or if there is need for staff for a lab that runs 24/7, there is a process to address those needs.

Professor Yust noted that there are places on campus that earn revenue through events held on Saturday; must they forgo that income? They are working closely with those organizations, Ms. Brown said. One challenge they face is that games could be at 11:00 in the morning, in the afternoon, or in the evening, and the University may not know the time until a week or so before the game. If someone is planning a wedding on campus, it would be best they not plan it for 7:00 in the evening of a game day. They have learned from other campuses that most event-holding units dedicate their facilities to game-day events. They are working with the Campus Club and the McNamara Center to help organize different kinds of activities that they hope will generate the revenue the organizations need. But it will be a challenge to have business as usual, she agreed.

Professor Chomsky reported that she serves on the Campus Club board and maintained that people have or will cancel events and the replacement activities will not make up for the revenues lost. The Campus Club is substantially dependent on events, and the University also supports it, so there must be thought given to this problem the next time it arises. Professor Hancher observed that game days will be profitable for one University unit—Parking and Transportation—but the games will cost the Campus Club real money, a loss it could not foresee. He said the University should make sure the Campus Club is made whole, and one obvious potential source of money to do so would be parking. The Campus Club should not be unduly damaged, he maintained. Vice President Brown said the administrative team is aware of these issues.

The availability of regular parking for contract holders on game day will be driven largely by the time the game is scheduled and the hours allowed for pre- and post-game activities. If a game were scheduled at 11:00, for example, it is possible that regular contract parking spots would be available to contract holders that evening. But nothing is decided yet.

## **5. Reviews of Senior Administrators**

Vice President Brown told the Committee that a process for reviewing central administrators will be implemented and she will be glad to return to the Committee to discuss it.

Professor Chomsky noted that the Committee has discussed this issue before and expressed concern that those doing the reviews do not receive honest feedback because there is attribution of comments and they become part of the record. Vice President Brown responded that the process will involved a 360-degree review that will allow anonymous information to be part of it in order to ensure candor.

Professor Hoover thanked Vice President Brown for her report.

## **6. Trademarks and Logos Policy**

The Committee next took up, with Vice President Karen Himle and Assistant Vice President Ann Aronson, the proposed policy on trademarks and logos.

Vice President Himle said she was hoping to achieve closure on the policy. This was one of the first subjects she ventured into when she took her position at the University, because she believes that consistency in the use of University marks will be beneficial for the institution.

The target of the policy is not faculty, it is P&A staff who serve as communications professionals who support the deans in development work. Her office has studied the non-academic publications of the University and learned that there is a lot of money tied up in them—and they also learned that most people who receive these publications throw them away without reading them. People are spending time and money preparing them, including hiring some of the best designers in the country to develop symbols, with the result that the publications do not look like they came from the University of Minnesota. Two members of the Board of Regents have spent time in their own institutions studying the use of organizational marks and asked that she develop a policy for the University.

Ms. Aronson reported that they have checked the policy with the Office of the General Counsel to make sure that every word counts, and they also consulted with every college and every campus, with follow-up meetings to be held with Duluth and Morris in the next two weeks. They have received overwhelmingly positive feedback, she reported, and they have tried to speak with everyone who will have occasion to use University marks to be sure they understand the policy. The good news, Ms. Himle reported, is that the practice is catching up with the policy; with declining funds, units see the availability of free services (which University Relations provides) as more desirable than spending money on outside designers.

In response to a question from Professor Carpenter, Vice President Himle explained the extent to which they consulted with the coordinate campuses about the policy. The goal is to allow campuses (and units) their own flavor and to preserve unique aspects of what they do within the architecture of University marks. This policy recognizes and allows for the use of intercollegiate athletic mascots on the various campuses.

Committee members raised questions about specific elements of the policy and associated documents.

-- The FAQ about requiring the wordmark on individual faculty work is not clear. The question of what "official business" is needs to be refined. (Is a syllabus official business? That is not clear.) Ms. Aronson commented that faculty work has not been their top priority in developing the policy; they are not focused on faculty work.

-- Not EVERY umn.edu website needs to use an official header and footer, such as those that have class notes and lab pages, which may run to hundreds of web pages. Nor should personal web pages, even if with a umn.edu identifier.

-- There are different categories of student organizations, and it may be that some could or should use University marks.

-- On enforcement, the policy needs to work and not be top down, and faculty are not going to be brought up on charges because they did not use the logo. Faculty do not really need to worry too much about this policy, do they? (They do not, Vice President Himle affirmed.)

-- There should be a provision allowing for exceptions to the policy. Vice President Himle agreed.

-- It would be helpful if there were a brief history of each of the major University trademarks and logos—the wordmark, the block M, and so on—because they do not exist forever, they exist in a historical moment. Vice President Himle agreed that would be useful because it also opens the door to considering changes and shows the policy is a living document.

Professor Curley said he objected to the approach embodied in the policy. He noted that he is from the Carlson School, which has an extensive branding document and resources available to help staff and faculty use the marks and symbols. It is not a policy; everyone recognizes the usefulness of using University marks and they are internally motivated to do so. This policy introduces a club, which is not the right approach. When external motivation is imposed where internal motivation exists, the internal motivation can be lessened. At any rate, it is not necessary to take it this additional step. Vice President Himle said she understood the objection and said she wished everyone concurred in the value of using University marks. She would not have started down the path of a policy if they did, and she noted again that the Board also asked for the policy.

Professor Yust related how her college (the College of Design) worked with a private firm on developing a new identity when the college was created. They developed marks that are "unGopherlike" but that are clearly University of Minnesota and have the endorsement of University Relations. There was a sense that this policy was something coming from on high and the attachment explaining the need for the policy helps. The point is to ensure that one is still connected to the University as one goes through web pages, Ms. Himle said; they do NOT want everything to look the same.

Vice President Himle inquired what word she should use to convey the sense of the consultation that took place at this meeting. Professor Durfee suggested that when the policy is taken to others, that the minutes of the FCC could be cited as evidence that faculty were consulted.

Professor Hoover thanked Vice President Himle and Assistant Vice President Aronson for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:00.

Faculty Consultative Committee  
Thursday, February 26, 2009

8

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota