Minutes*

Faculty Consultative Committee
Fall Retreat
Wednesday-Thursday August 27-28, 2008
Minnesota Humanities Center

Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Gary Balas, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Shawn Curley, Dan Dahlberg, William Durfee, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Kathryn Hanna, Carolyn Hayes, Brian Isetts, Jeff Kahn, Judith Martin, Michael Oakes, Nelson Rhodus, Martin Sampson, Becky Yust

Absent: Cathrine Wambach

Guests: Vice President Karen Himle (University Relations); Associate Vice President Judy Kirk (University of Minnesota Foundation); Vice President Stephen Cawley (Office of Information Technology); President Robert Bruininks; Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Vice President Richard Pfutzenreuter; Associate Vice President Gail Klatt (Department of Audits); Senior Vice President Robert Jones; Chancellor Jacqueline Johnson (University of Minnesota, Morris), Professor Jennifer Windsor (Subcommittee on Metrics and Measurements), Vice President Tim Mulcahy

Other: Sharon Reich Paulsen (Office of the Provost)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Vice President Himle (University Relations); (2) discussion with Associate Vice President Judy Kirk (University of Minnesota Foundation); (3) discussion with Vice President Cawley (Office of Information Technology); (4) discussion with President Bruininks; (5) discussion with Provost Sullivan and Vice President Pfutzenreuter; (6) discussion with Associate Vice President Klatt (Department of Audits); (7) discussion with Senior Vice President Jones; (8) discussion with Senior Vice President Jones and Chancellor Johnson; (9) discussion with Professor Windsor and the Metrics & Measures Subcommittee]

1. Discussion with Vice President Himle

Professor Hoover called the retreat to order at 8:30 and welcomed Vice President Himle. The discussion covered a number of points.

-- Vice President Himle explained how much she has learned about the University and higher education in the 18 months she has been in office.

-- Vice President Himle explained how the perceptions of the administration of higher education (which on paper is structured on an organizational chart like other kinds of organizations) differ from the reality of how a university works. She explained that the more people are able to understand how the University works, the more likely they are to trust it, and the more likely they are to support it financially

* 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.

(e.g., donors, the legislature). The question is how to get the word out; how can she help faculty get the word out about what they do?

-- Internal communication was discussed at length. Vice President Himle said that sometimes the University tries to say too much and ends up saying too little. It has reached the point where people say more and more in the hope that someone will hear. Email can serve as a bar to effective communication. She suggested it is time to draw faculty and administrators together to talk about what they want to achieve when they communicate. At the same time, her office does not want to get in the way of conversations and consultation. She said she believed it is possible to make inroads on improving internal communication.

-- There is a tension in communication, Professor Chomsky related. People want a sense of openness and availability of information, but do not want so much they are bombarded, annoyed, and can't do their work because of the communications. They need information available—in a form that is easily digestible—and a map to finding it. People want openness but they do not want all the information all the time. The Committee discussed the nature of information that should be available and how it should be presented (e.g., what kinds of decisions are being made, and why, and metrics used).

-- There need to be responses to/feedback to/communications made. For example, people need to be informed how the University is responding to the results of the PULSE survey. People need to believe responding to such surveys is worth the time because the administration acts on the results. In communications work, responses need to be contingent on the message received—and people need to know that decisions will be contingent on feedback. Vice President Himle observed that the best companies have robust communications systems with their employees and agreed that responses need to be reported back.

-- By the same token, faculty, chairs/heads, and deans say they do not receive responses to communication, or if they do, the response is not engaged. When there is communication faculty to administration, the responses need to be engaged with the subject.

-- The information on the web needs to be more focused on information that people need to know.

-- Publicly-traded companies are called to account every three months and are measured and tested. There is no similar measure for communication. The University, on the other hand, has metrics in spades; there is no single metric.

-- It is endemic in universities that different levels do not listen to each other. The ability of an individual to rise in university administration is not based on communications skills and often universities do not know how to have a conversation. Departments can usually communicate; the problems begin when the department communicates to the dean. Is there a need for training about communication? Or discussion about expectations in communication, Vice President Himle suggested.

-- There is a sense among some that the communication is largely one-way. What percentage of her time is spent on internal communication? The majority, Vice President Himle said; she has an outstanding staff who deal with external relations. She was asked to help build a cohesive environment inside the University.

-- This is an issue the Committee has been dealing with for several years but nothing seems to have changed. The Committee knows there is a problem, where it is, and ways to change to make the situation better, but has been unable to convince people they must do something about it. It takes time, Vice President Himle said.

Professor Hoover thanked Vice President Himle for coming to the retreat.

2. Discussion with Associate Vice President Judy Kirk

Professor Hoover welcomed Associate Vice President Kirk to the meeting to inform the Committee about the activities of the University of Minnesota Foundation.

Ms. Kirk provided data on the gifts and pledges to the Foundation over a number of years as well as information on the source of the gifts and how the funds are used. (In FY 2007 the Foundation raised $250.5 million; in FY 2008 it raised $289.5 million.) She noted the significant increase in funding for scholarships, increasing from $51 million in 2004 to a cumulative total of $233 million by 2008. About $24.1 million was dispersed for scholarships and fellowships; these funds assisted about 7000 students in 2007-08.

Of the gifts for FY2008, 34% were for academic support, 29% for research and outreach, 19% for scholarships, 11% for capital projects, 4% for faculty, and 3% for strategic initiatives.

Ms. Kirk provided information on fund-raising going back to 1982 (when about $30 million was raised) and explained the Foundation's role and services. She also reviewed briefly the national trends in large gifts from individuals (of the 60 largest, 31 were for higher education, totaling $3.7 billion; 10 of the 31 went to medical schools or health initiatives, 7 to institution-wide initiatives, and 7 to business schools). Twenty of the 31 gifts were from alumni, which gives the University a potential advantage given its large number of alumni.

Several points were covered in the discussion.

-- It has not been their experience that increased private support has had an adverse effect on public support for the University. There have been significant gifts for academic purposes as a direct result of contacts related to the stadium.

-- Ms. Kirk said she could not say what the effect would be on a Division I public university's fund-raising if the school were to drop intercollegiate athletics. She said that athletic fund-raising does not detract from institutional fund-raising and that the stadium has actually helped since it has resulted in over 900 new donors. She added that strategic positioning—an institutional direction—as well as the "Driven to Discover" campaign related to teaching and research have also increased overall fundraising. One advantage of the University is its breadth, but that also means one can donate to 1000 things; there is a need to focus the private-giving effort, something the Foundation is working on.

-- The Foundation should discuss with Vice President Himle the potential usefulness of communicating with faculty about the value and benefits of private funds for faculty work.

-- Professor Balas said there is a much greater expectation of department heads that they will raise private funds, an effort that used to be primarily a decanal responsibility. Ms. Kirk agreed and said that nothing is more powerful than faculty and students telling their stories. The challenge for the Foundation is how to use faculty most effectively without taking time away from them to do their work.

-- Scholarships are great but they do not really help the faculty. The message to donors cannot only be about scholarships because the infrastructure needs support as well. Ms. Kirk agreed; the scholarship discussion starts the conversation and is a good way to engage donors.

-- Ms. Kirk explained how the Foundation works with and coordinates activities with the University's other foundations, especially the Minnesota Medical Foundation. She noted that they do work together, and that when someone (faculty or anyone else) makes an end run around foundation efforts, it appears to a prospective donor that the University doesn't know what it's doing—and people will leave money on the table.

-- It is very difficult to raise unrestricted funds. They do seek them, and in the future they will try to make donor agreements more flexible (e.g., so that if a program is discontinued, the funds can be used for other purposes).

-- How do proposals bubble up and get the attention of the Foundation? Some are strategic choices, from the President or Provost, and some from priorities established by the deans. They also visit with prospective donors to find out what they are interested in and try to match their interests with University priorities. Ms. Kirk emphasized that the Foundation does NOT set priorities; they assume there has been a process in the University for doing that. They work with deans and faculty to help create a vision for a donor.

-- Ms. Kirk and the Committee discussed the upcoming capital campaign. She noted the importance of adequately funding the campaign from the beginning, and said they have increased funding for college development offices. Professor Yust said it will be important for the faculty and colleges to know that the Foundation will help them in the capital campaign. Ms. Kirk agreed and also reported that the Foundation Board has asked them to try to quantify the return on investment in development staff in order to put their funds where the private-giving potential is the greatest (and it appears that may be in CLA).

Professor Hoover thanked Ms. Kirk for coming to the retreat.

3. Discussion with Vice President Cawley

Professor Hoover next welcomed Vice President Cawley to the meeting to talk about the activities of the Office of Information Technology (OIT). Several points came up.

-- OIT has made a number of changes in order to help support strategic positioning and to be more aligned with the needs of the colleges. The organization is fairly large and has been around since 1995; recent years have seen an emphasis on building the University's enterprise systems.

-- Mr. Cawley said he would look into the disappearance of the Faculty Toolkit.

-- Mr. Cawley reviewed the organizational structure of OIT. About half the staff (220 people) has been focused on enterprise systems, about one-quarter on networking and telecommunications, and the remainder on academic computing services and academic applications. He commented that there are usability issues with the new EFS system, but that OIT is limited in what it can do when the University buys packaged products; the University has decided not to make modifications to EFS because of the substantial costs associated with them (although some may be made, once particular issues have been identified).

-- The size of OIT at the University is typical for institutions this size, about $75-80 million in recurring funds, 80% of which comes from being part of the cost pools and about 20% of which comes from charges. Funding for OIT has evolved over time; in 1995 only 30% of the funding came from central sources, but it has evolved to more of a common-goods model. The change does create accountability issues, so he meets with the deans to explain what they are paying for. They share data with the deans about services and discuss reasonable service levels.

-- The Committee and Mr. Cawley discussed the order in which cost-pool budgets and academic budgets are developed (with cost pools coming first). Mr. Cawley said he seeks from the deans their priorities and also works with the collegiate IT directors year-round. He also works with coordinate campus IT directors and meets with them.

-- The Committee and Mr. Cawley also discussed the appropriateness of an oversight group on setting cost-pool rates and providing feedback. Professor Balas noted that people using the services provided by the cost-pool units cannot say they do not want the service or that they do not agree with cost increases, so there should be an oversight committee that cost-pool units meet with before recommendations go to the President and Provost. The deans should constitute the largest group in the oversight committee.

-- The Committee raised questions about how faculty can learn what services are available from OIT and what mechanisms exist to determine what will be used. The Digital Media Center is one place faculty can get help and OIT asks college IT directors to help. Research needs are even more complicated, Mr. Cawley said, and there is a group trying to map what faculty are doing and what they need.

-- Mr. Cawley reported that OIT works closely with the libraries and with the Office of Classroom Management (OCM); he noted that OCM determines what appropriate technology for classrooms is.

-- Servers have been centralized and OIT provides service to the colleges. Mr. Cawley agreed that there are cases when it makes sense for specialized servers to exist, but in general the desire for a separate server is swimming against the stream because, for example, audits require certain levels of security compliance, as does the federal government. In those cases where a separate server is needed, OIT wants to help. They are also working on storage issues for faculty and students; the College of Design has particular needs in this area.

-- Mr. Cawley agreed that synchronizing UMCal with widely-used programs on PDAs and other computers is a problem. Blackberrys and iPhones do not synch with UMCal.

-- While OIT generally warns against using outside packages because of security reasons, some are very good and OIT does not wish to replicate them. They have security-breach meetings to discuss HIPPA, FERPA, etc. with respect to outside packages, and they worry about putting student ID numbers on outside systems. They are working on licenses with companies (e.g., Google applications) that can provide the necessary security.

-- It is beneficial for the University to continue to have the Minnesota Supercomputer Institute separate from OIT because the Institute provides a unique service.

-- The Committee and Mr. Cawley discussed the frustrations that many have felt about EFS. Mr. Cawley said it is his sense that some areas are more frustrating than others but that eventually the problems will get worked out. The next issue will be reporting.

Professor Hoover thanked Mr. Cawley for joining the retreat.

4. Discussion with President Bruininks

Professor Hoover welcomed the President to the meeting. The Committee and the President discussed a number of issues:

-- the University's message to the legislature and the likely budget scenarios;

-- that there will not be a wage/salary freeze;

-- the need to reduce costs (and the growing resistance to tuition increases);

-- the lack of public understanding of how tuition is actually paid (that is, it includes a great deal of aid and that many students pay at deeply-discounted rates);

-- internal communication (it was suggested there be a 70/30 rule: central administrators should spend 70% of their time listening to faculty, staff, and students)

-- administrative positions and costs;

-- messages to K-12 education from the University and the impact of those messages;

-- implementation of strategic-position initiatives and the need to ensure that they are working before starting up a lot of new activities;

-- metrics and measures for faculty work and for teaching and research resources; and

-- the need to increase efficiency in business processes (the new Higher Education Act imposes a lot more reporting requirements on colleges and universities).

Professor Hoover thanked the President for attending the retreat.

5. Discussion with Provost Sullivan and Vice President Pfutzenreuter

Professor Hoover welcomed Provost Sullivan and Vice President Pfutzenreuter to the retreat to discuss budget issues. They covered a number of topics with the Committee.

-- The conceptual framework for the 2009-11 biennial request, including the major elements of incremental increases to the University's budget (e.g., it is, on average, about $80 million per year, of which 45% is employee compensation, 22% is programmatic investments, 15% is facility operations, and so on). The items that might be included in the request were the subject of conversation.

-- Cost-pool increases from FY2006 to FY2009, which averaged 6.8% in 2007, 8.8% in 2008, and 4.7% in FY2009, and the timing of setting cost-pool budgets (before academic budgets). It was suggested by one Committee member that these rate increases could not be sustained because they exceed the rate of inflation and the rate at which department budgets are increasing; another suggested that the deans should have an opportunity to influence the cost-pool charges, not just be informed about them. Provost Sullivan noted that each year the deans had an opportunity to hear and question the proposed increase at presentations at the Deans' Council.

-- There is need for a consultative group for the "Administrative Service Units Systemwide" cost pool, which is the single largest cost pool.

-- Strategic planning investments 2005-2009 total $660.7 million and represent both reallocation and new money in the University's budget. The dollars are allocated through the compact process.

-- The need to track the strategic-positioning investments to determine if they are providing any advantage to the University.

-- A new initiative in the arts and humanities, which will provide funding for $3000 grants for about 500 faculty, transition funding, funds to buy out class time, and two new endowed chairs in the arts and humanities. The proposal to provide a semester leave for research, with pay, to all probationary faculty members has been slowed because of budget cuts. It remains a high priority. An announcement will follow in September.

-- The various rankings of colleges and universities. In the most recent international rankings by Institute of Higher Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, "Academic Ranking of World Universities," Minnesota went from 33rd in 2007 to 28th in 2008. In the last rankings of "The Top American Research Universities" by TheCenter for Measuring University Performance at Arizona State University, Minnesota was in the second tier (which puts it in the top eight public research institutions).

-- There will be 27 pay periods in FY2010, which will require adjustments in paychecks. The University's payroll every two weeks is about $50 million.

Professor Hoover thanked the Provost and Vice President Pfutzenreuter for joining the retreat.

6. Discussion with Associate Vice President Gail Klatt (Office of Internal Audit)

Professor Hoover welcomed Associate Vice President Klatt to the meeting, who provided an overview of her office and then had a discussion with Committee members. Professor Hoover noted that

the vice chair of this Committee sits with the Board of Regents Audit Committee and she thought it would be useful for the Committee and others to know what the audit office does.

-- While she has a dotted-line relationship to the President's office, she reports formally to the Board of Regents. The President has been respectful of her role and has made her part of the executive team. The office has 18 professional staff and 1 administrative employee. The professional staff are professionally-credentialed and/or hold advanced degrees, and many of them are long-term employees committed to the University and to public service. They audit "with a couple of caveats, anything with the University of Minnesota name on it" (not the four University foundations or University of Minnesota Physicians). They are funded by O&M allocations (the cost pool) and do not bill for services; her office accounts for 2% of the administrative services cost pool or .4% of total cost-pool charges; 95% of their budget goes for salaries and fringe benefits.

-- They have a limited portfolio of services. Their primary service is to conduct audits to provide assurance to the Regents and the administration that policies are being adhered to. They also advise on risk and control processes and investigate areas of financial or operational misconduct.

-- Ms. Klatt outlined how her office determines the audits that are needed, based on several factors (external risk assessment, operational risk assessment, internal risk assessment, and overall risk assessment). It is a disciplined method and focuses on how the University mitigates risk—so the process focuses on identifying the biggest risks to be worried about.

-- The major external risks (drawn from across higher education) are information technology and data security (number one on everyone's list), sponsored account management, conflicts of interest, and expansion of international activities. Others include declining sponsored funding, corporate ethics/Sarbanes Oxley, capital projects/construction, student health and safety, and emergency/business continuity planning.

-- Operational risk assessment includes the impact of a unit on University mission, impact of information technology, regulatory compliance, organizational change/turnover, complexity/diversity of operations, known or perceived control concerns, and audit history. The criteria for assessing risk have changed with the EFS implementation; the risk criteria have been reduced from 9 to 7 but the auditable units have increased from 145 to 160. Some units are high risk and will see more frequent audits; others will rarely see the auditors. Ms. Klatt emphasized that "high risk" does not mean poorly-managed or controlled; these are units that are very important to the University and often VERY well managed.

-- Internal risk assessment identified several issues: implementation of the EFS system, new organizational models, potential for significant turnover of long-term employees, changes in key leadership positions, expanding international activities, light-rail plans, accuracy and credibility of new institutional metrics, and UMORE Park plans. None of these, Ms. Klatt assured the Committee, makes her lose sleep at night. On the other hand, the entire picture does make her somewhat nervous--there is no significant item causing worry, but there are a number that can distract the leadership (e.g., light rail) and one worries about what will not get done. These concerns are understood by the Board of Regents and senior officers.

-- Ms. Klatt provided a "heat map" of institutional risks, identifying various units in a quadrant (the X axis equals impact on the University, the Y axis indicates likelihood of risk). There are areas in the

upper right of the map that present the highest risk (greatest impact and greatest likelihood of problems): academic quality, quality of faculty and staff, research, strategic-positioning outcomes, funding. Moderate risk issues include athletics, fringe benefits, investments, financial management, associated organizations (e.g., the Foundation, the Alumni Association), student experience, leadership, technology, and so on. Her office focuses its audits on the areas of high and moderate risk.

-- They look at strategic positioning to identify where they should audit; they also try to incorporate faculty interests (they read the minutes of committees and identify issues that bubble up, such as cost-pool rates, investments in advising vis-à-vis graduation rates, metrics, student fees, and so on). They do a very good job in research but do not do as much in education, and are interested in any suggestions the faculty might have. Ms. Klatt said they are open to ideas and said the faculty should look at her office as a resource; they can provide information on areas of interest.

-- Units do see the audits as an intrusion and interruption, Ms. Klatt said, and that can't be avoided, but they are gratified by the results of surveys of PIs, who routinely comment that they receive very good training from the audit staff. The audits are intimidating but they are not a "gotcha" because they want to help people do their jobs.

-- They do not do unannounced audits. So much information today is electronic that it would be difficult for anyone to destroy very much.

-- In response to a question, Ms. Klatt said they do not audit the quality or impact of internal communications but they have been contacted by the Vice President for University Relations, who is interested in doing this type of evaluation. Ms. Klatt said she would be discussing this with Vice President Himle and would think about whether attention to this area in the audit process would add value.

-- They do receive "hot tips," and 10-15% of their time is reserved for the President and executive team; they also have a special projects budget so they can respond to whatever may come up. About 85-90% of their audits are planned, but they are quick to respond when things come up. With regard to their investigative work, they receive concerns from all over—the state, the public, and faculty and staff—-and follow up when they believe the matter is substantive enough to investigate. They issue reports, which are privileged until responses are completed, and they do not dictate disciplinary action—-that is up to the administrators. It is important that disciplinary action be consistently applied and she will work with Human Resources and the Office of the General Counsel on a case-by-case basis. The President is also apprised of situations as necessary. Because of privacy concerns, they do not “broadcast” the outcomes of their work, and so complainants may not always be satisfied. Nonetheless, she and the administration take complaints seriously.

-- In terms of who is responsible for taking corrective actions recommended in an audit, that is the unit’s leadership responsibility. The audit staff follows up on the status of the recommendations quarterly, until appropriate action has occurred. The results of this follow-up are reported to the Audit Committee of the Board of Regents, the President, and the appropriate VP responsible for the unit. Units can decide not to address an identified risk (eg assume the risk) and not take the recommended action. Depending on the nature and significance of the risk, the assumption of the risk may be acceptable; in cases where the risk is considered to be of a level of significance that the decision warrants concurrence at a higher level, Ms. Klatt would escalate it as needed, even to the Board of Regents, if necessary.

Professor Hoover thanked Ms. Klatt for joining the retreat, and adjourned the session until the following morning.

7. Discussion with Senior Vice President Jones

Professor Hoover welcomed Senior Vice President Jones to the meeting to discuss the activities and units that report to his office.

-- Dr. Jones reviewed the history of the establishment of his office, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration (created in part because President Bruininks, when Provost, had concluded the Provost had too many system responsibilities). The President retains authority for selecting the coordinate campus chancellors, but response to day-to-day administrative issue for the campuses rest in his office. His office also serves as the liaison with the University's statewide activities and to integrate various vice-presidential responsibilities across the system. Two deans report to him (Extension and International Programs), as do several multi-disciplinary research centers that are extensively involved in public engagement and where the University has significant public visibility and an innovative national reputation. These centers are faculty-driven and, except for the ones that focus on urban issues, are system-wide resources.

-- The Committee and Dr. Jones discussed the tensions that exist on system versus Twin Cities issues. There are conversations under way about how to improve the system and how to help the coordinate campuses, without dictating from central administration, on how to allow the campuses to pursue their own missions while also being part of the University system.

-- Dr. Jones said his office is looking to establish metrics to evaluate the functioning of the system and the single-enterprise approach. They are not all worked out, but will be, and his office also intends to evaluate programs and initiatives after five years to determine whether or not they've had an impact.

8. Discussion with Senior Vice President Jones and Chancellor Johnson

Professor Hoover welcomed Chancellor Johnson to the meeting and turned the discussion to issues that the Morris faculty have raised with this Committee during two meetings with FCC members that have taken place on the Morris campus.

-- Chancellor Johnson said the problems are structural and organizational but not unusual in a system such as this one. Some offices work better than others with the Morris campus.

-- There is a continuum: on one end is totally separate operations by each campus and on the other is all actions as a system; the University is probably somewhere in between. Is it at the right place? Chancellor Johnson noted a few areas where the tension inevitably exists: the coordinate campuses don't have their own boards of trustees, they do not control tuition rates or salary increases, and there is concern about whether they get value for the money they put into the cost pools.

-- The primary focus of this Committee is academic matters; it has heard concerns from the Morris faculty about lack of connections between Morris and the Twin Cities on academic matters. Has the situation improved? There need to be conversations, and deans and department heads need to reach out

(both ways). Existing as part of a Research I university sets parameters, Chancellor Johnson said, and there are opportunities for Morris faculty to work with Twin Cities colleagues, and while they want more interaction, it is not clear the sentiment is reciprocal. It might be useful, Professor Hancher suggested, to have regular meetings of department heads from all campuses in each discipline.

-- There could be postdoctoral or "late" doctoral appointments at Morris to fill in faculty positions when needed, and perhaps 4+1 and 4+2 programs could be set up with professional/graduate programs on the Twin Cities campus. Travel money is important because face-to-face meetings are extremely important, Professor Hanna said.

-- Senior Vice President Jones said that strategic positioning has provided an opportunity for each campus to think about its mission and not be forced into the Research I model. The University wants to be a single-enterprise system but what that means, given the different niches and goals of the various campuses, needs to be worked out more carefully.

-- There is a lack of mid-level communication between the campuses and a perception that it all comes from Minneapolis.

Professor Hoover thanked Senior Vice President Jones and Chancellor Johnson for joining the retreat.

9. Metrics and Measurement Subcommittee Report

Professor Hoover next welcomed Professor Windsor and Vice President Mulcahy to the retreat to discuss the draft report of the ad hoc FCC subcommittee on metrics and measures (which included as its members Professors Durfee, Hoover, and Kahn in addition to the chair, Professor Windsor).

-- Professor Windsor reviewed the contents of the report (which was focused on the Twin Cities campus only), noting the metrics recommended by the strategic-positioning Metrics and Measurements Task Force in 2006. She noted the University's rank on various rankings systems and how different they are. She noted that significant scholarly and creative work is central to a great university, that there are multiple measurement perspectives, systems, audiences, and constraints, and that there are issues of granularity*/level of measurement* and problems with 'one-size' measurement.

-- The subcommittee considered both external campus measures, conventionally defined, aggregated measures that are used to compare institutions; there are also internal measures that can include intermediate benchmarks to external measures as well as unit-specific or segment-specific measures to examine progress over time. The latter are more flexible and need not be defined conventionally.

-- Professor Windsor reported the findings of the subcommittee on measurement issues from the administration and from faculty. In brief: (administrators) different perspectives on relevant appointment categories to include in any measures, information often is not shared systematically, data often are not collected/maintained systematically, the Vice President for Research tracks research expenditures, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Development is paying more attention to major faculty awards, the Graduate School and Office of Institutional Research pay attention to NRC rankings, but there is less attention paid to scholarly/creative output per se; (faculty) different perspectives about

measurement constructs and value, emphasis on quality as well as quantity, consensus that there is no single measure of department excellence and that no single measure applies across departments, faculty scholarly/creative output, process (especially in the arts and humanities) and reputation are major points of comparison for departments, as are research funding, awards and honors, and graduate-student placement, excellence must be considered in the context of resources, and measurement should not lead to unnecessary workload.

-- There are conventional ways to track faculty journal publications (but not books and creative works), such as Thomson Reuter's Essential Science Indicators and Elsevier's Scopus.

-- The data suggest Minnesota may be at a competitive disadvantage in faculty award applications. The University has fewer members in the American Academy of Arts & Sciences than its aspirational peers and has fewer Guggenheims and Howard Hughes Medical awards. The Academy of Medicine and some other organizations accept nominations only from their own members.

-- Professor Windsor outlined the recommendations from the subcommittee on the external and internal metrics and measures that could be used to track faculty scholarship and creative work:

Faculty awards, including national academy members
Research Expenditures (Total and Federal)
Intellectual property commercialization
Publication in scholarly journals (using several possible measures)

The subcommittee recommends that faculty and staff diversity and faculty satisfaction not be considered external measures of scholarly/creative productivity but instead be put in a category of their own.

-- Vice President Mulcahy said he agreed with the substantial majority of the report. One important measure of faculty work is impact—but that is a very diffuse measure, difficult to compare across institutions.

-- The elephant in the background is the upcoming National Research Council rankings, Professor Hancher said. The University needs to steer by that report and hire faculty to help the University's rankings the NEXT time that the report is prepared. He urged that the NRC report be highlighted in the subcommittee report and that the ranking 12 years ago be considered a benchmark. The question is what the University is doing about the NRC ratings; how is the leadership thinking about them?

-- Professors Chomsky and Hayes maintained that faculty and staff diversity should not be removed from the measures of scholarship and creative work. There was discussion about possible ways to articulate the importance of diversity and its relationship to research and discovery and other measurement categories.

-- Professor Oakes said a measure of reputation is how many faculty from Minnesota another institution wants.

It was agreed the subcommittee report, when final, should be distributed to the Faculty Senate, the deans, the chancellors, the Provost's Research Council, and that recommendations should be made to the Provost.

The Committee thanked the subcommittee for doing an extraordinary job.

Professor Hoover adjourned the retreat at noon.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota