

Minutes\*

**Faculty Consultative Committee**  
**Thursday, October 23, 2008**  
**1:15 – 3:00**  
**238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Nancy Carpenter, Shawn Curley, Dan Dahlberg, William Durfee, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Kathryn Hanna, Caroline Hayes, Judith Martin, Michael Oakes, Nelson Rhodus, Martin Sampson, Becky Yust

Absent: Gary Balas, Carol Chomsky, Brian Isetts, Jeff Kahn, Cathrine Wambach

Guests: Chancellor Stephen Lehmkuhle (University of Minnesota Rochester); President Robert Bruininks

Other: Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) discussion with Chancellor Lehmkuhle, UM Rochester; (2) faculty ombuds recommendation; (3) discussion with President Bruininks]

**1. Discussion with Chancellor Lehmkuhle**

Professor Hoover convened the meeting at 1:15 and welcomed Chancellor Lehmkuhle to discuss the activities and programs at the Rochester campus.

Chancellor Lehmkuhle began by noting that he has been in office about a year and has been sharpening the plan for the Rochester campus that was developed by the Rochester Higher Education Development Committee (RHEDC) report, which provided the original justification to fund a new campus in Rochester.

As for the programmatic niche of the campus, Dr. Lehmkuhle said, the legacy at UMR is partnership programs that have been in place for a number of years. There are about 30 such programs today, 28 graduate and 2 undergraduate (a Bachelor of Fine Arts, delivered by faculty at Duluth, and a Bachelor of Science in Nursing, delivered by faculty from the School of Nursing). The two programs have a total about 90 students. The programs are delivered through a variety of mechanisms, including UNITE and interactive TV. All of the programs together enroll about 400 students, supported by the UMR campus. They have looked for ways to expand the programs, Dr. Lehmkuhle commented, and added that even though Rochester is a coordinate campus, that does not mean they do not want to continue to be a good partner with the other campuses. They are, for example, developing programs with the School of Public Health, serving as a host for a clinical laboratory science program delivered by the Center for Allied Health Programs, and the Principals Academy. UMR is the "face" of these programs, through its student services, but they are not "their" programs because they are offered through other units of the University. Through these partnerships being a portal to University resources, UMR can address

---

\* 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.

the educational needs of southeastern Minnesota. One leg of their strategy is to deliver programs through these partnerships, something they are well-equipped to do.

The second leg of their strategy is an MS and PhD program in Biomedical Informatics and Computational Biology. UMR provides the administrative arm to offer programs drawing on faculty from across disciplines from the University as well as from Mayo and IBM. The Hormel Institute is also a partner. There are 42 researchers involved, courses are offered at Mayo and the Twin Cities, students can interchange the courses. There are 7 students in the program at present, which was only approved in July. The program is a component of interdisciplinary informatics that is system wide.

The third leg of their stool is one undergraduate program, the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences, given provisional approval by the Board of Regents at its most recent meeting. Dr. Lehmkuhle said he views the structure of this BS degree as a tree: the students will have a common core curriculum in life sciences, physical sciences, the humanities, the social sciences, with health-sciences topics woven into the courses. The idea is that after 2-3 years of the core curriculum, the remainder of the curriculum would be personalized with a capstone experience. The capstones will prepare students to pursue a variety of health careers: professional and graduate programs; health professional certificate programs; and accelerated master programs in the health area. This is a health-sciences program, NOT a health-professions degree. They plan on about 150 students in the first class.

Professor Martin inquired if UMR will have the faculty resources to handle capstone projects as the program grows. Dr. Lehmkuhle described two paths that students could follow. One, they hope to expand on partnership programs with the Twin Cities, perhaps setting up 3+2 or 4+2 programs with health sciences programs, the Carlson School (health entrepreneurship), the School of Journalism (health journalism), and so on. The other track is in health-professions field (allied health fields), where there are a lot of 1-2-year certificate programs. In terms of the capstone project, they are thinking that if a student gets into a certificate program, much of this experience could fulfill a capstone requirement and complete a BS degree. They understand that these fields are becoming more complex and may need post-baccalaureate opportunities for professional development to keep abreast with the changes in the field. . In terms of faculty resources, students can study with Mayo, Hormel faculty as well as UMR faculty. They are well aware that they need the administrative structure to support the capstone experiences for the students.

They are nearing a Memorandum of Understanding with Mayo for a long-term relationship. There is also a campus master-planning process going on (that began before he arrived at UMR), Dr. Lehmkuhle said, that will go to the Board of Regents for approval. That plan suggests for the long term a campus for about 3000 students—but they will not own student housing, will not build a rec center, and will seek to develop a relationship with a local bank so students can have access a free debit card. They will build the campus through partnerships with the community. He said he has been told that it would cost about \$1.2 billion to build a 3000-student campus from scratch and they know very well that such resources will not be available.

Some might think that starting a new campus of the University does not make sense, Dr. Lehmkuhle commented, and it does only make sense in a place like Rochester. They are in a design-build mode but there is a chicken-and-egg problem: they have created the program but do not yet have the faculty, and they need the faculty to establish the program. They are currently hiring tenured and tenure-track faculty and will hire others to assist in instruction.

Professor Curley asked how many faculty are there at UMR. Right now there are 6, but they are in other programs offered at UMR, not UMR faculty. Chancellor Lehmkuhle said they are hiring UMR faculty in waves. Professor Hancher asked what the projected number of tenured and tenure-track faculty will be in five years or so. Dr. Lehmkuhle said that in two years, when they have 150 students, they expect to have about 8 faculty; after that, the number will depend on the size of the entering classes, and available resources and space, and the efficiency of the learning platform. UMR will not have colleges and departments; the academic home for all faculty will be the Center for Learning Innovation. The curriculum will be designed collectively by faculty from across the disciplines. UMR initially projects approximately 15-20 students per faculty member.

Professor Hancher noted that there is a bureaucracy associated with a tenured and tenure-track faculty, such as a 7.12 statement. Dr. Lehmkuhle said he has drafted a 7.12 statement, which he knows is supposed to be written by the faculty. When there is a sufficient number of faculty hired, they will rewrite and resubmit the 7.12 statement. Given the current streamlined administrative structure at UMR, there is no opportunity for a second-level review for promotion and tenure for UMR faculty, he added, so he has asked that the all-University committee serve that role. They want high-quality tenured faculty and the Twin Cities faculty can help with the second-level review. Professor Yust noted that there are different models for doing tenure review; some units, like General College, did not have departments, and such approaches may still exist in places like the Humphrey Center and the Law School.

There will be a second category of staff, which they are calling student-based faculty, who will support the curriculum designed by the tenured and tenure-track faculty through, for example, learning studios. These individuals will not be assigned courses and give lectures, rather they will work with small groups or students and with individual students much in the same way that graduate teaching assistants do on the Twin Cities campus. UMR will not have access to a large cohort of graduate teaching assistants to assist students.

Professor Martin noted again that to have about 200 students per year graduating will require a huge commitment of faculty time for capstone projects. Dr. Lehmkuhle agreed and said that it may be the faculty will approve the projects or students may go to other programs for the project. So Mayo or Hormel faculty will oversee the projects, Professor Martin asked? They would, Dr. Lehmkuhle said, and the students could go to the Twin Cities or to North Dakota or wherever they wished, as long as they meet the criteria for a capstone project that was approved by the UMR faculty. He said he understood the need to provide faculty and administrative support for the capstone projects.

Professor Oakes said that Dr. Lehmkuhle will doubtless be asked why it is wise to spend money in Rochester on a new campus in tough economic times. What is his answer to that question? The campus will contribute to workforce needs in Rochester, Mayo, and the health professions. Professor Martin noted that the Rochester community has sought this campus for 25 years; in part because the Waseca campus closed, Professor Hanna added.

Professor Sampson asked what Dr. Lehmkuhle envisioned for UMR in building needs. Typically the state bonding bill provides for one building for a coordinate campus every two years. Will that work for UMR? And what percentage of the operating budget comes from state funds? Dr. Lehmkuhle said UMR has \$6.5 million in state funds and they are building the academic program is within that budget. There will be a need for a capital item approved by the state at some point, he said, but he does not know

now if UMR will do it alone or in partnership with others. Rochester is very interested in an urban village to create more downtown life; Mayo and its 3000 students will probably locate there. UMR will probably also join in. The city, Mayo, and the University could be brought together in a synergistic way. He said he had no idea at this point what state investment might be needed.

Is there a research mandate for the faculty, Professor Durfee inquired? They are hiring faculty, per their 7.12 statement, who will do research in student learning, Dr. Lehmkuhle said, but they are not hiring exclusively from education fields. They want content knowledge of the discipline but research on how to teach it (e.g., chemistry). They will provide support, such as funding for postdoctoral fellows who want to build a teaching/learning portfolio. The 7.12 statement also provides for secondary research in their field; they want faculty to stay abreast of their discipline but they will not assume the faculty will be PIs on grants. They will expect publication in the scholarship of learning.

Professor Durfee said that the setting seems like it could provide an opportunity to do research in ways that could be easier than in the Twin Cities, through connections with Mayo and IBM. Dr. Lehmkuhle said that student learning is the focus of the 7.12 statement, but faculty may have a research agenda as well, and there may be joint funding of research with Mayo or partnership with their labs. UMR will not have the resources to build labs—that is simply not in the cards. But if someone is doing nanotechnology research at the Twin Cities and drug research at Mayo, for example, UMR will build connections between faculty and they hope to nurture and support their work.

Professor Dahlberg asked several questions related to the UMR budget. The answers, consolidated, are that UMR's \$6.5 million all comes from the state, at present the 400 students (all in Twin Cities and Duluth colleges provide UMR revenue in the 25% of tuition UMR receives, and they expect the \$6.5 million to remain flat for the next few years). The expected growth of the BS program, however, should provide significant tuition revenue to support the operation and provides the basis of the budget model. When the new undergraduate program is filled across its four years, there would be about \$12 million in tuition revenue but there would still be substantial funding from the state (the \$6.5 million). They will need to factor in future facilities, rental costs, and possible bonding as they generate tuition revenues, Dr. Lehmkuhle said, but will have to see how the situation unfolds.

Professor Yust said she was at UMR last summer and was impressed by the gracious front office and staff. She asked Dr. Lehmkuhle if he had spoken with the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education about UROP dollars. Morris has had a large amount of UROP funding, and while it is not the same as postdoc funding, it does provide a way to help get research done. Dr. Lehmkuhle said he would look into it.

Professor Curley said as he understands things, UMR wants teaching faculty like those who might chose a private college, which is fine. He said he was surprised, however, that the 7.12 statement would build in a limit on research, given the opportunities available at Rochester. They could consider giving the faculty more freedom to determine what their research will be. Dr. Lehmkuhle pointed out that the 7.12 statement provides for primary and secondary research. In the case of the latter, the faculty member chooses. The UMR model, however, is focused on teaching and learning, and taking it to a higher level through a focus on informatics. If they can understand where students struggle in math, for example, they may be able to predict where they will have problems in physics and chemistry and try to help them.

What is the strategy for the P&A faculty, Professor Curley asked? They will be a student-support group, Dr. Lehmkuhle said. Students will go to lectures and then do exercises with the help of the P&A faculty. That group will implement the curriculum designed by the tenured and tenure-track faculty, but they will not be asked to teach a course. There will be four or five P&A faculty to work with the learning-design faculty, but the number will depend on the overall size of the class.

If there are to be approximately 1000 students in the BS program, Professor Hanna said, what is the target for the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty? About 40-50, Dr. Lehmkuhle said. Professor Hanna said the coordinate campuses, including Waseca, had student numbers in that range and had about that number of faculty. They used teaching specialists for recitations. She suggested he talk to the other campuses that have programs of a similar scale.

Professor Hoover thanked Dr. Lehmkuhle for joining the Committee.

## **2. Faculty Ombuds Recommendation**

Professor Hoover turned now to Professor Hanna to introduce the report and recommendations on the faculty ombuds service from the Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA).

Professor Hanna noted that Committee members had been provided with the report of the ad hoc subcommittee, the report from the Office for Conflict Resolution on services provided at peer institutions, and the draft minutes of the discussion at SCFA. In essence, the recommendation is to create a half-time tenured faculty position closely integrated into the Office for Conflict Resolution to create a place where faculty could visit and bounce ideas around and consult. They did not try to put a budget on the recommendation; it could be a two-course buy-out. Professor Hoover surmised that a half-time faculty position would probably cost about \$50,000.

Professor Hancher said he had looked at what some of the other schools provide, and most of them tend to be more inclusive, with service directed not only at faculty. Staffing varies and some draw on retirees. What is the advantage to restricting this service to faculty? And how are the needs of other groups met? Professor Hanna said that students have had an ombuds service for a number of years. The Office for Conflict Resolution can handle grievances and offer informal processes for any non-bargaining unit employee (faculty, P&A, civil service) unless it is a tenure-related matter for a faculty member, in which case the matter goes to the Senate Judicial Committee. The subcommittee, in reviewing the exit interviews and other sources on why faculty leave, concluded there appeared to be a need for a faculty person to be a listening post for faculty who need help. Why would it be done differently here, Professor Hancher asked? To have a faculty "point person" who could serve as an ombuds person and help with the climate of the institution, Professor Hanna replied.

Professor Yust said she read of the disappointment of the Faculty Affairs Committee at the response from Drs. Carney and Carrier. She said she had a couple of questions about the recommendation. The subcommittee learned that faculty sometimes leave because they are disgruntled with climate issues; did those faculty ever approach the Office for Conflict Resolution? She said she appreciates the proposition that faculty feel more comfortable talking with a faculty member, but she has used the Office for Conflict resolution for faculty with problems and thought Ms. Chalmers, the director, did a good job and her doing so did not hinge on her being a tenured faculty member (which she is not). One person she referred to the office, however, said it was not worth the time. She agreed that having a

faculty member could be useful. But what happens if the issue is faculty versus staff? The faculty member will choose the faculty ombuds; where is the equity? Professor Hanna said the individual would be more of a counselor, not a mediator.

The Office for Conflict Resolution would not disappear, Professor Martin observed. Professor Hanna concurred; the faculty ombuds, she said, would be integrated into that office, so it would be another service provided. The idea is to avoid having frustration build up without any place for someone to blow off steam.

Professor Hancher asked if they had any estimate of a case load. The subcommittee did not say, Professor Hanna responded. They don't know. They examined exit interviews and the PULSE survey, among other sources. Professor Martin suggested Committee members could probably speculate about the number of cases by generalizing from the number of frustrated faculty in their own departments. Professor Gonzales suggested contacting peer institutions to ascertain the caseloads they see.

The administrative bench is cool to the proposal, Professor Hanna related, as Drs. Carney and Carrier related to Faculty Affairs, in part because of budgetary implications. Her argument is that the University spends a lot on wellness; to her, the ombuds service would be analogous: if the University loses faculty due to frustration, it incurs a tremendous expense. The Faculty Affairs Committee passed the recommendation to this Committee with a request that it carry it forward.

Given the administration caution, Professor Hancher said, perhaps it would help to include a sense of the projected cost. Perhaps recommend creation of the position for a finite number of years and see what needs are met. Or take the money out of the wellness funds, Professor Oakes suggested.

Professor Carpenter said she did not believe anyone on a coordinate campus would take advantage of a one-half-time faculty member on this campus; she said she did not believe this proposal is actually system-wide. She has mixed feelings about the recommendation; they have at Morris a grievance committee that is rarely used and she does not know if the Morris faculty use the Office for Conflict Resolution. She said she would prefer that system-wide funds not be used for the position, were it to be established.

If the Faculty Senate were to vote on this and the administration accepted some proposal, who would handle the logistical details, Professor Durfee inquired? There would need to be a follow-up committee for that, Professor Hanna said, as recommended by the subcommittee. Professor Durfee urged the Committee to propose a pilot program, a time-limited experiment.

The Committee agreed it would adopt a statement to that effect. Professor Hoover thanked Professor Hanna for the report.

### **3. Discussion with President Bruininks**

Professor Hoover welcomed the President to the meeting. He and the Committee touched on a number of topics:

-- What he has been doing with respect to the Enterprise Financial System and the questions he has been asked of those responsible for the system. The President said he would welcome from Committee

members suggestions of questions to be asked. He commented that the University needs a system that is streamlined, efficient, and provides accountability, but that also recognizes people who work for the University comes to do an honest day's work. There is a need for checks and balances, but organizations are so engulfed by the Enron atmosphere that they sometimes build systems carry high transaction costs and a loss in productivity. He apologized for the problems and said he and others thought the transition would be smoother than it has been.

One question that needs to be on the top of the list is about what is being done to help staff retrieve their equilibrium and a belief in themselves, Professor Martin said.

Professor Sampson said that if this system is used primarily by for-profit organizations, as has been pointed out a number of times, that fact suggests that businesses use a more expensive model than the stewardship model the University has long used.

-- UMORE Park. The President said it is important for the University to move forward on its plans. This is a long-term effort that will benefit the University.

-- Various budget and legislative-request matters. (1) The scholarship drive has reached \$250 million. (2) Compensation and the protection of positions will be the University's top priorities. (3) This is no time to disinvest in education. (4) Tuition will be the last resort to balance the budget; the first strategies will be cuts, the second will be deferring investments, and tuition only third. The University must also work to increase other sources of revenue beyond state support and tuition.

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

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota