

Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 19, 2009
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Marti Hope Gonzales (chair), Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Shawn Curley, Janet Fitzakerley, Kathryn Hanna, Emily Hoover, Walt Jacobs, Michael Oakes, Martin Sampson, Kate VandenBosch, Cathrine Wambach, Becky Yust

Absent: Melissa Anderson, Brian Isetts, Jeff Kahn, Russell Luepker, Jan McCulloch

Guests: Provost E. Thomas Sullivan; Vice President Stephen Cawley, Vice Provost Gerald Rinehart, Vice Provost Billie Wahlstrom; President Robert Bruininks

[In these minutes: (1) educational policy changes for the Faculty Senate; (2) discussion with Provost Sullivan; (3) constituent relationship management project; (4) discussion with President Bruininks]

1. Educational Policy Changes for the Faculty Senate

Professor Gonzales convened the meeting at 1:05 and asked Committee members to review the several policy changes brought forward by the Committee on Educational Policy.

-- Clean up the policy on Awards for Outstanding Contributions to Education and expand the definitions of the criteria for the awards. The Committee decided to send the draft back to the Committee on Educational Policy to clarify the award definitions.

-- Amend the Grading and Transcripts policy so that its language about when finals are due (three business days after the last day of final examinations) conforms to the practice and the provisions in other policies.

-- Expand the Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences policy to include final examinations, which it previously did not.

-- Add a provision to the policy on Class Scheduling for Undergraduate and Graduate Classes to prohibit holding classes on official University holidays except with the approval of the appropriate dean (e.g., in some animal-care classes and some of the health sciences fields, classes and instruction must be held every day). The policy was also amended to say that departments are expected (rather than encouraged) to schedule classes to maximize use of classroom space while ensuring student access.

-- Change the Grading and Transcripts policy so that a student accused of scholastic misconduct in a course may not withdraw (receive a W) from the course (in order to avoid an F or an N for scholastic misconduct) until the matter has been resolved, and to provide the Registrar the authority to re-register a student for a course and put the F or N on the transcript if the appropriate campus procedure has

* 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.

determined that there was scholastic misconduct the instructor deemed worth of an F or an N. This change makes University-wide a policy that already exists in CLA, CBS, and at the Morris campus.

Part of the University Senate agenda will be devoted to a discussion of the financial situation. Professor Chomsky suggested that framing questions should be prepared for Senators to consider.

The Committee unanimously approved the Faculty Senate docket sans the changes in the teaching-awards policy.

2. Discussion with Provost Sullivan

Professor Gonzales now welcomed Provost Sullivan to the meeting. The Provost said that Professor Gonzales had asked him to comment on several items.

-- Financing the future: It is now 12-14 months before there is any legislative decision about the 2011-13 biennium, but the University must have a three- to five-year plan. The deliberations over the next few months must address three major matters: defining the scope of the mission, revenue enhancements, and cost efficiencies.

-- Integration of clinical services in the AHC: The President has appointed a committee to lead the on-campus discussion and asked him to co-chair it. He has identified nine areas where conversations need to begin: understanding the present structure of the University-Fairview relationship, understanding the vision of a first-rate academic health system, putting the proposal in the context of the current national health-care discussion and determine if the proposal is aligned with trends, fully understanding the proposed structure and governance responsibilities, examining the financial profiles and expected financial outcomes (the gains and the costs), understanding academic issues (how the proposal will advance academic quality, how achievements will be measured, related personnel questions, the effect on the educational mission of the Medical School and the other AHC colleges, and how it will affect the research mission), understanding the legal issues of governance and structure, how relationships will be affected (what its effect will be on the University's reputational capital and brand, on community relationships, and whether there are peer models), and in the event the integration does not work out as intended, what terms will provide for a rollback? The committee will start a broad University conversation on these points.

-- Conflict of interest: The draft policy is an opportunity for a broad and rich conversation. There has been a positive response thus far; there is need for further discussion of a number of points. For example, the language about a "commercial entity" could have a deleterious effect on normal, valuable, and positive relationships with external organizations, especially with the professional schools and colleges.

Professor Curley inquired what processes would be used to address the Provost's second and third issues. Provost Sullivan said he assumes that this Committee (FCC) will be engaged in the conflict-of-interest discussions and that it can help in suggesting committees and colleges to be consulted. He said he hoped the draft policy will be part of faculty-staff discussions, because words are important and faculty and staff must understand all the implications of the words. There will be opportunities for changes in the draft policy. In terms of the clinical integration, there will be monthly conversations with constituents in the AHC, and the Board of Regents is taking up the subject each month. This will be a multi-month

conversation; he said he hoped that everyone within the University with an interest or a need to participate will do so. The committee he chairs will hold regular sessions and will try to understand the ramifications. (It was noted that the conflict-of-interest policy will be discussed by the Senate Research Committee and the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, then this Committee, and then will be brought to the Faculty Senate in February.)

Professor Hoover noted that the colleges have been asked to form blue-ribbon committees to deal with financial issues. Are units that do not report to him using the same process? Provost Sullivan said that Senior Vice President Cerra sent a similar communication to the AHC colleges and Senior Vice President Jones sent one to the units that report to him. It will be the same process across the University. What about administrative units, Professor Yust asked—are they using blue-ribbon committees as well? They are not expected to have the same kind of committee because they do not have the same constituents, the Provost said, but they are having the same conversations this fall in their budget discussions and compact process. The questions are the same.

Professor Gonzales thanked Provost Sullivan for joining the meeting.

3. Constituent Relationship Management Project

Professor Gonzales turned now to Vice President Cawley and Vice Provosts Rinehart and Wahlstrom to discuss the Constituent Relationship Management (CRM) project.

Vice President and Chief Information Officer Cawley began by saying they wished to provide a brief to the Committee early on so that it could provide advice; they are early in the analysis phase. He distributed copies of a handout (appended below) and explained that at its most basic level, CRM tracks all interactions with constituents in order to better serve them. In business, the goal is to improve customer service and improve sales; in higher education it will aid in recruiting and admitting students, serving them while they are at the University, helping them graduate, and maintaining relationships with them after they leave: it will track them from K-12 through endowment contributions. From the viewpoint of his office, Mr. Cawley said, CRM is about information.

Vice Provost Rinehart said the University has come a long way in the last 15 years in terms of changing attitudes about the importance of serving students effectively. Without the attitude change, no technological advance would matter. The University now has a number of stand-alone student information systems that have helped, for example, to increase applications for admissions and track student enrollment behavior. None of these systems, however, are connected, and as a result, there is no overall system to monitor or leverage a student's various interactions with the University. CRM can provide an appropriate level of information about a student so that staff seeking to help him or her can see what the student might have been told previously, what other efforts have been made to address the student's concern etc. A project team is now in the process of identifying the needs and business requirements of potential CRM users.

One policy issue is how well resources are used at the University, Vice Provost Wahlstrom next commented. Once a student is recruited and admitted, there is little dissemination of information because the systems do not talk to PeopleSoft. CRM will be a transformation so that systems will talk to each other. On the one side, it will increase information transfer, so people will need to let go of information. On the other side, imagine that it is easy to find a student early and stay in touch with him or her, so that

the University can recruit the best all along the way. The University graduates the most professionals in the state, so it can track their professional education for them.

Mr. Cawley commented that CRM will also provide the ability to know more about the institution, such as the patterns of successful students and patterns of students in trouble. It will provide the ability to predict and take action--that is one of the powerful elements of integrated data. CRM will be available to all campuses. There will be a preliminary report in the next few weeks so they will know what the opportunities are; they have avoided talking thus far about technology, products, and integration, because that is for the next phase.

Professor Hanna said she has been interested in this kind of information for a number of years because she has had questions about alumni, the foundation, and so on. She has long thought there needs to be a seamless continuum of information covering students from pre-college to student to alumnus/donor. She said it has also never made sense to her that the University alumni association essentially "owns" former student addresses, etc., and that there is not a single office where current or former students can change their address. She also said it doesn't make sense that she has to pay to belong to the University's alumni association when she does not have to do so for the other two institutions from which she has degrees.

Professor Yust recalled that in her former college (Human Ecology), there was a project to look at students who had graduated in four years and then look back at what they had looked like when they came into the college, and they did find predictors. For as much money as the University spends on pre-college activities, it does not make sense not to track who the University successfully recruits. Right now all the information is segmented.

This is a great plan, Professor Oakes commented; where will the money come from? People will likely lose jobs in the upcoming years; do they know how much this will cost? Will their units cut staffs? There will be a benefit, but how can it be accomplished at this difficult time? The consultant costs were born by the three units in partnership, Dr. Wahlstrom said, so it was less painful. Vice President Cawley said they need to think differently about implementing information technology. Oracle makes a PeopleSoft CRM add-on but there are other ways to approach the goals of CRM. Professor Oakes said he was thinking about EFS and Google and the AHC; is there a plan? That is the next phase, Mr. Cawley said, and it could be that they will be able to pay for it if they "pass the hat" and take money that is currently going into existing CRM systems; there will clearly be a long-term return on the investment and the question is how to get there. There is a six-year plan for information technology, in order to avoid piling up projects, but there are no potential dollars for CRM so they will need to be creative.

Professor Curley asked about privacy concerns. Mr. Rinehart said they are identifying the kinds of information that will be available and who needs to see what. They have had limited conversations with students and there are genuine concerns about avoiding being perceived as Big Brother. If they cannot convince themselves and others that CRM will make life better, they will not pursue it, he assured the Committee. They also recognize the requirements of HIPPA, for example, that Boynton Health Service must follow. Professor Chomsky said she has the sense that current students, who put themselves on Facebook, are perhaps less concerned about Big Brother. She added that policy and structure will be important in implementation. There must be assurances that certain information is NOT being shared, so that when someone sees a communication from someone they have not talked with, they can be reassured there is appropriate privacy protection.

Information is fragmented because this is a big university, Professor Cramer commented. When one leaves the institution with a graduate or professional degree, one's affinity is for the small unit. They must permit units to keep personal relationships with their graduates. Dr. Wahlstrom said they have worked with both large and small departments; CRM could make things more efficient for all departments using it. She recalled one of Associate Vice President Kvavik's views about the University's attitude toward data: "enter often, use never."

Professor Yust asked if it is possible to make One-Stop know who she is so that messages can automatically go to the right people. That is possible now, Mr. Cawley said, and is done in My-U portal. They have every attribute of faculty, staff, and students that is tied to their X.500 ID and could use it in the portal. (There are 27,000 student users of My-U portal per day, Dr. Wahlstrom reported.)

What do faculty members need to know, Mr. Rinehart asked? He said they are unsure what impact CRM might have on the educational role. They have spoken with Vice Provost Carney about its application in promotion and tenure; what impact would it have in classes? They want to be sure they cover all the bases.

How will they know it is working, Professor Gonzales inquired? Because they hear more about satisfaction levels? Higher graduation rates? Increased donations? Those are important questions, Professor Curley agreed.

Professor Gonzales thanked Messrs. Cawley and Rinehart and Dr. Wahlstrom for joining the meeting.

* * *

(Handout to the Committee)

Our interest in CRM:

Academic and administrative units across the University of Minnesota have expressed a growing need to improve the quality of service, be more effective in communicating with internal and external audiences, and deliver additional services to contribute to the success of students in both credit and non-credit programs. To accomplish this, a more proactive and integrated approach is needed to manage relationships and interactions with constituents.

Positive Potential Outcomes:

- 1. Improved retention rates:** Leveraging constituent data to identify and address early indicators of student stop-out and student actions that negatively impact student progress across the University.
- 2. Improved graduation rates:** Leveraging Zetterberg research on why four-year graduation rates are important for both students and institutions.
- 3. Improved student satisfaction:** Leveraging data from Office of Institutional Research to demonstrate increased student satisfaction with educational experiences at the U, and opportunities for further improvement.

4. New revenue opportunities: Leverage constituent data to identify and market non-credit, extension and international programs to new local and distant audiences and develop lifetime learning opportunities to engage new constituents.

5. Operational efficiencies and cost savings: The siloed, distributed approach to tracking and using constituent data across the University has created data redundancies and relationship inconsistencies that would be improved by a coordinated solution.

Higher Education field perspective and trends:

In a recent Eduventures survey, 89% of higher education administrators articulated the need to use constituent data to better manage their institutions and improve business processes to build effective relationships with constituents. This life cycle of relationship management starts with K-12 activities and admissions and extends into alumni relations. In this survey, CRM ranked in the top-ten technologies for driving student retention rates.

Improvement Opportunities: Early Insights

The CRM project has conducted three workshop cycles and has begun to identify improvement opportunities across constituent lifecycles (recruiting, admissions, service and support, graduation/transition, and stewardship). The team is mapping the current state and best practices for constituent management across 23 key University entities. There are a number of early insights and areas that are worthy of further exploration:

1. **Recruiting** has had a high level of investment, especially in undergraduate recruiting, and is an effective function that is already utilizing a CRM solution. This is a siloed function and would benefit greatly by being seamlessly integrated with enterprise-level data and consistency of experience.
2. **Admission** is highly aligned with recruiting but would benefit from more tailored and proactive communications with constituents and more personalized experience in the early stages of a constituent's relationship with the University.
3. **Service:** There are opportunities to leverage institutional knowledge to improve service levels across the University. One-Stop Student Services continue to implement operational improvements, but gaps remain in the use of data to identify early intervention opportunities and retain key constituents at the University.
4. **Support** (e.g., advising and career guidance) is also hampered by siloed institutional constituent data. There is opportunity to improve understanding of needs and aligning University resources to value-added services such as ongoing rapport, coaching, and mentoring.
5. **Transition:** There are opportunities to leverage transition points and more actively promote lifelong relationships between constituents and the University. Leveraging summer program attendance to identify future freshmen, maintaining relationships with graduating constituents for continuing and distant learning opportunities, and international program relationships to develop future visiting professors are all possibilities that could result from more active management of relationships.
6. **Stewardship** is the culmination of multi-level relationships and the potential benefits from developing more intentional, integrated and interdisciplinary knowledge of relationships. Leveraging and aligning University relationships could have a lasting impact on building far-reaching constituent advocacy and support for the University.

Peer institution CRM investment:

The Ohio State University: developing a centralized CRM solution for Fisher College of Business. All core CRM functions currently performed by departments inside Fisher will be supported by this system. This software solution will be the system of record inside the college for all students, alumni, college contacts and company information and will support best practices for Higher Education CRM.

University of Illinois: providing a strategic and integrated program to identify, attract, retain and communicate with prospective, admitted and current students and provide a customer relationship management (CRM) system for enrollment in a higher education environment.

* * *

4. Discussion with President Bruininks

Professor Gonzales now welcomed President Bruininks to the meeting.

The President began by reporting that Provost Sullivan invited an outside group of experts to assess e-learning at the University, an extraordinarily well-constructed team. They (1) have asked the experts to send a DRAFT report that will permit the University to provide feedback, and (2) would like to think about asking a couple of the team members back to campus for further discussion (which could take place at this Committee, among other places). Is this a good idea? What came through clearly from the team is that the University has a lot of creativity in e-education, with good centers and support systems and a lot of entrepreneurial activities—but no overall plan. The whole appears to be less than the sum of its parts. There are silos that have great leaders who do not talk to one another. He asked the Committee to identify two or three people to take a look at the draft report when it is provided.

The team also said that a huge barrier at the University is the graduation policy that requires certain numbers of credits to be on the campus from which the student expects to graduate, the President related. He said he believed the data could show that as much as 5% of the graduation rate is affected by that policy. He said he hoped that the Office of Institutional Research could provide data.

[The policy requirements are as follows:

- To be eligible for a University of Minnesota undergraduate degree, a student must complete at least 30 semester credits awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which he or she is seeking to graduate.
- At least 15 credits of the last 30 credits earned prior to the awarding of a University degree, must be awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which a student is seeking to graduate.
- Students must complete at least half of upper-division major work (3XXX courses or higher) on the campus from which they are seeking to graduate. Study-abroad credits earned through programs sponsored by the University are considered resident credit.]

Professor Yust said there is a question about whether it is a University degree if a student transfers in a lot of credits. There are good reasons for all the policies, President Bruininks responded, but one must look at unintended consequences. He said he did not believe the University could increase its graduation rates any further by increasing ACT scores and college preparatory requirements. It has

done well in those areas but it will not do better without improving policies and practices; the policies need to be lined up and reviewed for their impact on graduation rates, whether they help students, and if they are right for the 21st century.

Professor Wambach said that another alleged problem is course access, but there are no data demonstrating that it is a problem. The President said the University has to mine its own data and think about what the policies do to effectiveness, efficiency, and cost. He agreed that the facts need to be assembled.

Professor Sampson said that as far as he knew, departments could not find out the graduation rate for their majors. They should be able to do so, the President said. He suggested the Committee hear from Peter Radcliffe, the new head of institutional research, so he can hear what is needed to make good decisions.

The President turned next to strategies to deal with the financial situation. The University has been engaged in some promising strategies to reduce costs and increase revenue for about two-three years or two and continues to pursue them. Some states have moved to a more privatized model of higher education with public regulation (something several Committee members suggested is the worst model possible for public higher education). It is what institutions often see, the President commented: fewer dollars accompanied by more regulation.

The President said he is resisting hysteria and made several points.

-- The University has taken a number of steps, such as deferring and cancelling capital construction projects, negotiating contracts to save money, etc.

-- The University has adopted policies for the long term that allow it to have higher tuition (the most stable source of income it has) and to provide significantly higher levels of need-based financial aid.

-- The University must break out of the biennial and annual budget cycle; it is now in a four-year framework. With the recession, and as the economy recovers, the cost pressures on state governments will be enormous—and higher education is not likely to be a top priority. So he is asking departments to take a longer view, mostly emphasizing the next five years because it is often unproductive to try to project ten years in the future.

-- He would like to think about net costs for students, and send a message about what it costs to get a high-quality education, but also to make clear the University is doing its part to reduce costs in the delivery of education.

-- The average total net cost of undergraduate education on University campuses has increased 3% per for the past nine years, significantly less than reported tuition increases, thanks to high scholarship aid and better cost controls.

-- He said he hoped the University does not get to the point that it starts thinking about the tradeoffs between academic excellence and the public mission; he said he believed the institution can leverage new resources in continuing to serve the state.

The President said the administration will need help as it gets deeper into the issues. They must be worked through more effectively; each one will be a heartburn issue because "for every inefficiency in higher education there is a strong constituency" (President Lee Todd, University of Kentucky). Moreover, 60% of the money the University spends is on human resources; another 20% is on space and technology. To address the potential problems means addressing those areas of expenditure, but he would rather find creative solutions than adopt furloughs and take similar steps. Some solutions will require more entrepreneurial activity, but some of those solutions belong to the faculty. He suggested that one area the faculty should examine is ways to improve outcomes in undergraduate education, which carries a lot of the University's reputational capital as well as much of its costs.

The President agreed that framing questions for the Senate discussion of the financial situation would be appropriate, and that the Committee should assist in framing them.

The President also returned to the topic of the University's agreement (contract) with the state. He said the value of the University to the state needs to be reset, and he asked the faculty to revisit the question of the University's unique contributions and its value in the global economy, what the University brings to the state, what obligations it has to the state, and what the state's obligation is to the University. He said he would like a small group of economists and other faculty and University leaders, including social scientists, to work on this issue.

Professor Gonzales thanked the President for joining the meeting and adjourned it at 3:10.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota