

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
October 1, 1992**

Present: Mario Bognanno (chair), John Adams, Judith Garrard, Paul Holm, Benjamin Liu, Karen Seashore Louis, Irwin Rubenstein, James VanAlstine

Guests: President Nils Hasselmo, Professor Paul Johnson

1. Discussion with President Hasselmo

Professor Bognanno convened the meeting at 10:10 and welcomed the President.

NEWS ARTICLES ON ALG AND SUPERCOMPUTING: President Hasselmo started with the news articles about the dismissal of Mr. Condie, head of the ALG program. What must be remembered, he said, is that all of what has come about with respect to ALG is a result of the University's own audit; the news today is a direct result of that audit. One might wish the process had moved along faster, but the University's procedures identified the problems.

In the case of the Supercomputer Center, the President said, "diversion" of funds is a misnomer. The University in 1987 provided services in return for preferred stock in the company; there was nothing illegal or improper about the transaction. There should, however, have been clear statements about the relationship between the University and the Center when the University established a for-profit corporation. Those relationships have since been clarified, the President said, so they are now VERY clear.

In all instances such as these, the President told the Committee, his instructions to everyone are that the University will be straightforward in addressing problems and that the institution is not served by anything except complete candor.

Questions were raised by Committee members about the role of the Director of the Center. The President said that this involved identifying the problematic issues as the University has moved into business with itself as a consumer; the person in charge of the business probably should not be a user because the perception of conflict of interest is too great. This has been a collegial environment based on trust, the President said, but the University faces complexities unknown a few years ago, and trust is not enough; it can fail or inadvertently allow improper activities, so controls are needed. Also a question, said one Committee member, is who has access to supercomputing time; there are a lot of researchers who want time but who can be pushed aside unless in a favored position. The Director should be one above the operation who can set standards for the use of computing time.

One Committee member told the President that these kinds of issues DID occur a generation ago, and they have evolved over time. The change now is in the financial implications: there are "torrents of money" involved, and the question is who directs things. The agenda of a unit can get lost in the profit-

* 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.

seeking; the mission and what the unit was structured to achieve can be pushed aside. The University, looking for the correct line between itself and the Supercomputer Center, is feeling its way; one cannot throw a switch. And the time at which the discussions are occurring, when the competition is at its most intense, is when it is most difficult to see the first principles.

The President agreed, and also noted that in the nature of the process, one can see in hindsight that there were critical decision points--although the fact was not realized at the time. That is why, he said, the watchdog, consultative function of FCC and other committees is important; it helps to ensure that the administration evaluates by basic ethical standards. Few people are actually UNETHICAL, he added, but complexities can be missed.

Professor Bognanno reported that he had received a number of calls asking why FCC had not obtain the facts and ensured accountability; he took pains to point out, at the meeting, that FCC cannot be an investigative body. Its watchdog function is limited; it cannot be judge and jury because it does not have the resources. It can ask questions, it can be interested in issues, it can seek policies (such as ones that allow adequate financing of research interests but that also ensure there is regulation so that research and the University's integrity is not compromised). In the instance of ALG, is the problem with policy or with implementation, he asked.

The problem is mostly implementation, the President responded. The University has good policies, but in a decentralized institution, there are hundreds of people making judgments--and it is there that failure most often occurs. He agreed that FCC is not an investigative body--although it could be if it wished--but that it should raise questions and hold the feet of the administration to the fire when it spots problems.

STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY SPEECH & PLANNING: The process continues, the President said; the State of the University address will lay out more. His conversations with the Committee, he commented, have suggested to him that it is time to get back to the fundamentals of the University. The theme of the speech will emphasize retention of basic University values and how, in a complicated world, it can operate more effectively. The President told the Committee that he hoped the message that the University must change its ways to preserve its values is important--and saying this does not imply that our predecessors did not do a good job. They did.

REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS: The President distributed copies of a memorandum sent out in January by Senior Vice President Infante concerning reviews of administrators. While many conduct reviews, to ensure consistency a policy was developed that applies to all. It calls for annual reviews and a review with broader feedback every 3 to 5 years.

One concern about reviews, the President was told, was whether or not those who are supervised (faculty members) will be part of the process. They are educated individuals who know the programs--and they are also human beings who grouse--so there must be screening. But there is a sense that faculty have NOT been involved in the process. If they were, there might be more collegiality in units where it could be slipping.

Further, it was pointed out, how many deans survive five years? Asking for faculty participation in the review of a dean only every five years is not sufficient. If it were sought earlier, maybe more

deans would make it to the five- or ten-year mark; if problems were aired and the administrator received "feedback."

There is a tradeoff, the President commented, between the apparatus to be constructed and the amount of faculty time to be consumed. He recalled that in the discussion of post-tenure reviews of faculty, Senate members were concerned with the amount of time they would take. There must be evaluations, with faculty participation, but one must also be mindful of the time involved.

If properly structured, observed one Committee member, the assessment need not be onerous. One way of doing evaluations in the private sector involves relying on a simple form, with everyone who reports to an individual submitting an evaluation every year. While University administrative functions are different, for the faculty they are not so different that one could not use a simple form.

The President commented that he **INSISTED** on being evaluated every year because he wants to know what is going on and so that problems do not fester--even though it takes a lot of time, it also sets an example. The problem, it was suggested, is that the people who are most likely to benefit from a review are those least likely to conduct one if a principle of voluntarism is used. Nor would it be a wise expenditure of time for every department chair to have a review similar to that of the President.

Another important question is how to "close the loop" in a decentralized institution: how does one ensure the reviews are conducted? There needs to be a reporting mechanism. One way is to have everyone involved had to sign the review, although the memo from Dr. Infante does not require such a step. The President said he did not want the reviews flowing up administrative lines; if the individual reviewed did not agree with the results, there should be review up one level--but no more.

With his review, it was pointed out, the results are shared with subordinates (everyone at the University). By analogy, the academic administrator reviews should be shared with the faculty, it was argued. One must consider privacy in personnel actions, the President responded; at Arizona they decided to release a summary of the issues raised in the review but not the entire review.

It was agreed that the Committee would review the policy with Senior Vice President Infante in the near future.

GENDER EQUITY IN ATHLETICS: President Hasselmo next distributed a report prepared for the Board of Regents, at its direction, on how gender equity in intercollegiate athletics will be achieved. Principles and options for achieving equity are outlined in the report; the interim goal will be to achieve a 60/40 balance, men and women, in participation rates (the plan unanimously adopted by the Big Ten Conference presidents). The preferred method of accomplishing the objectives would be through NCAA legislation; barring that, the Big Ten will consider adopting its own rules, and if that fails, individual institutions will have to decide on their own what steps to take.

Gender equity in athletics involves complicated questions and has significant financial implications. In an era of constrained resources, it is unlikely the University would put public funds into the programs beyond what is already being contributed. The first option for achieving the goal of gender equity is to increase revenues in athletics, and this means investing in the football team. While this is the least problematic way to increase income, it must be accomplished without compromising the academic

values of the University--a proposition to which the athletic directors and faculty representatives are committed.

The report was prepared by a group chaired by Professor Ted Labuza, chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, so the questions and issues are linked to the governance system. The report remains, however, an administrative document. It was agreed that FCC and ACIA would review the report and continue to be apprised of progress and plans.

One change that has occurred, the President told the Committee, is that the athletic department budgets are now set in the same manner as the colleges; the budgets have been separated from expected revenues. It is expected that the women's proportion of total athletic expenditures will increase.

Asked who would be responsible for implementing the report, the President replied that he would be. Senior Vice President Erickson will be involved in the financial issues, and the two athletic directors would have direct responsibility for making the recommended changes.

Professor Bognanno thanked the President for joining the meeting.

2. Review of the Graduate School

Professor Bognanno next welcomed to the meeting Professor Paul Johnson, the chair of the Graduate School review committee.

Professor Johnson began by reciting the circumstances under which the review was initiated by Vice President Petersen and told the Committee that its central focus is the improvement of graduate education. He also reviewed the procedures the review committee has used to solicit views from constituents and the expected schedule (the report is to be completed by mid-December). The review is modeled on the reviews of graduate programs conducted by the Graduate School itself.

Vice President Petersen, he said, made it clear that any subject was fair game for the review--funding, graduate faculty status, admissions, fellowships, organization of her office, and so on--but the principal task is the improvement of graduate education. The committee has asked "how are we doing?" and "where are we doing especially well?" and "where we are not doing well, how can graduate education be improved?"

Asked what dimensions of quality are being considered, Professor Johnson said quality has been partitioned. There are different needs and different constituencies, for example, in the professional schools and in the liberal arts departments; measures of high quality may not be the same in both. In terms of students admitted, the professional schools may wish to take prior experience into account. A second measure is output: where are the program graduates five or ten years later? Another measure is the strength of the faculty (which, again, can differ between professional and other programs; in the former, clinical practice may be as important as publications).

Asked about the distinction between graduate programs and professional programs under the aegis of the Graduate School, Professor Johnson reported that Vice President Petersen has expressed the opinion that the Graduate School should be more open to embracing professional programs than it has

been in the past. Those programs should not be obligated to come under Graduate School purview, but they should be permitted to do so if they wish.

One question that arose in the recent past concerned the relationship of the Graduate School to the colleges: when faculty members are supported through their college, they have responsibility but no funding for graduate programs. The problem is even worse, Professor Johnson pointed out, for interdisciplinary studies, which draw on faculty from a number of departments but which have no funding.

The review committee has discussed this issue, he related, and recalled that several earlier reviews of the Graduate School called for more decentralization. The Graduate School has moved some ways in that direction, but it has retained central control over a great deal. It may need to "federalize" more than it has and must give up control--while remaining a center for periodic checks on quality. Central control has resulted in huge information processing requirements and, as a consequence, an overloaded staff and delays. If some of the functions were decentralized, funding would perhaps be less of a problem.

Two areas where decentralization could occur, Professor Johnson said, would be in admissions (who but the faculty know best who to admit to their programs?) and in awarding graduate faculty status.

Several points were made by members of Committee:

- The problems of interdisciplinary programs must be emphasized and are largest in the sciences, where faculty members may also belong to several different departments. Quality, moreover, is related to need; in the sciences, support for students and expensive equipment are needed, and one measure of quality is the amount of external funding a faculty member can generate.
- There should not be too much decentralization in some of the professional programs, which can be subject to the vagaries of the dean; a strong Graduate School role can help to ensure quality. In professional schools, where the deans have professional experience, the graduate programs could suffer.

Professor Johnson assured the Committee there is no intent to abrogate the notion of quality; there must be a mechanism to ensure it if control is decentralized. The trick to accomplishing it will be periodic reviews that have teeth--the Graduate School must have the authority to intervene or even close a program. There must be consequences if a program does not improve quality (by whatever measures are appropriate). The review committee is being helped in this respect by the information it has received from other schools.

Central to the review, suggested one Committee member, should be consideration of what graduate education should be in 10 or 15 years. If there is no clear vision of how it should be managed, the committee will rearrange details without attention to the long-term effort. The major questions about going in the right direction must be asked, and they will overlap with questions about leadership and funding for graduate programs. The deans cannot say a graduate program is the responsibility of the faculty, and wash their hands of responsibility--in an institution where the Dean of the Graduate School has not traditionally had much money. Strong graduate programs have often been built with "faculty

blood, sweat, and tears," which is perhaps as it should be--but not with 30 hours per week of faculty time piled on top of their other responsibilities.

Another problem which must be addressed is how the concerns of students in graduate programs are dealt with. The new grievance procedure, as it is unfolding, would be limited to employment-related problems and would not extend to academic issues. There must be a mechanism in the Graduate School to receive and resolve academic issues--a proposition with which Vice President Petersen agrees. Graduate students, observed another Committee member, are MORE vulnerable than undergraduates: they cannot readily switch majors and their entire career is on the line. When they come to the University, it must take on the responsibility to ensure that if they do not thrive it is because of their inability, not because of the environment. The Graduate School has done nothing to ensure this, and one measure of quality should be that the graduate student experience is at some minimal acceptable level.

There are also problems in the sciences which need to be addressed. In order to be competitive, students must be permitted to rotate in programs, and the one from which they received first-year financial support may not be the one they end up in. Second, what is to be done when grants are not renewed? What is the student to do? There should be a series of fall-back funding arrangements, from department to college, with the Graduate School as the last resort as a sort of central bank guarantor of support for students so long as they make academic progress.

It was suggested that there are three system issues which the review committee should take up: 1) a complaint system; 2) examination of the ICR rates and the allocation of funds to infrastructure costs; and 3) Senate policy on academic reviews, which called for equal emphasis in the review on undergraduate and graduate programs and for the reviews to be conducted jointly by the college and the Graduate School.

Professor Johnson noted also significant underfunding: Berkeley has \$16.5 million in graduate fellowships; Minnesota, by comparison, has about \$3 million. Both at Berkeley and at some units at Minnesota there is a quota on the number of matriculated graduate students one could have in a department. In his own case, Professor Johnson reported, they have 114 funded Ph.D. students, and the slots are allocated among six departments. If a department does not do a good job in generating degrees and provide a good education, the slots are moved--and there is a review every two years. The system works very well, he said, and puts the incentives in the right place. It is unclear if this would work across the University, although it might if there funds to back up students.

Committee members disagreed about some current practices of the Graduate School. Opinions ranged from the proposition that it is picky, that regulations change too often and that Directors of Graduate Study (DGS) have a hard time keeping up with them, and that Graduate School people are rude to students to the proposition that students don't read the regulations. There appeared to be agreement that the quality and performance of DGSs varies considerably, from those who do virtually nothing to those who actively seek to remove barriers for their students. Inasmuch as the Graduate School adopts policies but the implementation rests with the DGSs--so how they do the job affects students.

Professor Johnson inquired of Committee members their views of the functioning of the Policy and Review Councils. One Committee member commented that they are often not staffed by the best faculty; it would help, it was agreed, if the Graduate School would require that they be composed of DGSs.

Another commented that they seem to have a lot of clerical functions (which were often helpful, such as in dealing with course and program overlap), but policy issues never seem to be brought up. The chairs are also important; if they have vision, the Council will do more.

One method of reducing their workload, Professor Johnson suggested, would be to remove decision-making on graduate faculty status. Even though individuals are turned down, usually a department will get its way. With occasional reviews, said one Committee member, that should work; the larger problem is that a department cannot REMOVE graduate faculty status once granted unless the faculty member agrees, even if they are doing nothing. Professor Johnson recalled that Dean Holt had tried to effect change in this policy and ran into a hornet's nest. This is an important issue, opined another Committee member, that the review committee should look into; "just because the faculty squawk" does not mean the dean cannot act. It is a problem when faculty who do nothing can stand in the way of those who want to accomplish things.

Professor Johnson invited Committee members to provide additional opinions and said he would be glad to revisit the issue. Professor Bognanno thanked him for his time.

3. Report of the Chair

Professor Bognanno reported briefly on two items:

- The administration has agreed to review the status of Senate actions. A protocol will be developed by which Senate actions are communicated to the administration; the administration, in turn, will develop a protocol on how it will deal with Senate actions.
- There appears to be a need for a protocol for Senate committee participation in interviews of candidates for major administrative posts at the University. The protocol would include both an outline of the procedure to be followed as well as an itemization of which committees should interview candidates for which positions.

On the latter, it was agreed that committee interviews should not be permitted to hold up a hiring decision (e.g., if interviews are scheduled during the summer). Another problem is that often there are no faculty members who can attend interviews of all candidates, which means the appointing authority receives a set of unconnected opinions. In addition, the involvement of the Committee itself has changed; in the past, the Committee was asked for names for search committees, but that has not happened recently.

The Committee agreed that a protocol should be developed; Professor Bognanno said one would be drafted for later review.

The Committee adjourned at 12:10.

-- Gary Engstrand