Chapter 2

Governance

The Site Visit Team Report noted concern regarding the “status of the management and governance structure, including the Board of Regents.” Although the Statement of Affiliation Status provided little specific detail, other sections of the Site Visit Team Report provide insights about the nature of particular concerns about governance and administrative structure that were evident to the site team in May 1996. An overlapping issue concerned the divisive discussion about proposed changes in the Tenure Code, one of the issues about which faculty voiced strong concerns in their discussions with members of the site visit team.

The Site Visit Team report included the following commentary:

“The presence of strong high-quality faculty, staff, and administrative leadership has been accompanied by the development of an institutional culture that features a great deal of local independence at departmental and school levels accompanied by relatively weak functional coupling and communication among organizational units. It can be argued that this relatively high level of local autonomy has contributed materially to the University's strengths by fostering academic and administrative entrepreneurship. However, together with the University's very large size it has also fostered the development of an organizational structure that appears extremely complex and fragmented. This clearly has contributed to some of the University's current difficulties by making it difficult to detect problems early and by impeding the development of coherent and effective responses at the institutional level.

Further, the administrative structure and the individual leaders that populate it seem to have been rather consistently in a state of flux. Appendix B of the Self-Study contains a list of the persons occupying thirty senior administrative positions from President to Deans during the period 1985-1996, essentially the decade between our Team's visit and that of the immediate previous team. The average number of incumbents of these thirty important positions during the decade is 3.3! At the time of the Team's visit the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs was within a few weeks of leaving his position, the President's announcement of his intention to retire in June, 1997 and the impending departure of the Provost for the Academic Health Center (to become President of Johns Hopkins University) were still relatively recent news, and during the visit the resignation of the Associate Vice President for Facilities Management was announced.

The University has recently changed its top-level academic organizational structure to a "provostal system," i.e., one in which line responsibility for the University's academic programs is divided among three senior executives called "provosts." The benefits of this change remain to be seen. Whatever they may turn out to be, the Team did frequently encounter faculty and staff concerns about
administrative and organizational instability. Many of the University's people report feeling uneasy and insecure about "not being able to count on" University decisions because of frequent changes in administrative leadership, and there is not a little skepticism, cynicism, and confusion about the University's goals and directions in evidence below the senior levels of administration.

Governance

Though the University's constitutional autonomy gives it an unusual degree of freedom from political influences, it does not render it immune from such influences. The Team encountered various indications that the Governor and the Legislature sometimes fail to resist the temptation to inject themselves into University policy matters. This is of course not unique to Minnesota, nor is it inappropriate in some circumstances, but many on the campus are seriously concerned about recent examples of what they view as political meddling.

One feature of the University's governance that does appear to be unique to Minnesota is that the members of the University’s governing board, the Board of Regents, are elected by the Legislature without formal involvement of the Governor. One Regent is elected from each of Minnesota's eight congressional districts and there are four additional at-large Regents (one a student or recent graduate), for a total of twelve. Regents are elected from a pool of candidates Recommended by a Regent Candidate Advisory Council which acts as a search and screening committee. This procedure has won Minnesota a merit award from the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities. All members of the Team met with three of the twelve Regents at a meeting that also included Twin Cities community leaders. The circumstances were not conducive to the kind of substantive discussion that would have permitted the Team to explore with the Regents present certain concerns Team members encountered in their campus interviews about Regents' understanding of and attitudes toward the many academic and administrative challenges the University faces and about alleged intrusions into non-policy operational matters, i.e., "micromanagement."

Academic Tenure

In the months preceding the Team's visit a controversy over academic tenure arose within the University. This controversy appears to have had origins both in the Board of Regents and in the Academic Health Center, where it initially centered on clinical faculty in the School of Medicine. It quickly became a major issue for the whole University and also, thanks to the World Wide Web, something of a national issue. While the Team agrees that a reexamination of the University's tenure system is entirely appropriate, it believes that the initial stages of the discussion were made unnecessarily contentious by the same poor communication and administratively dominated early discussion mentioned above. By the time of the Team's visit the debate appeared to have been guided back into proper channels of shared governance, but the Team nevertheless encountered considerable faculty suspicion and distrust about the current discussions of tenure. This issue must remain a carefully managed concern of the University."
Each of the following sections briefly describes the events that have transpired in the last four years that have resulted in a much-improved management and governance structure for the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. The final section provides examples to support the assertion that new and emerging issues are now being addressed in a more harmonious manner than was true in May 1996.

**Changes in Management Structures**

*Presidency of the University of Minnesota*

President Kenneth H. Keller, inaugurated as the twelfth president in November 1985 was succeeded in March 1988 by Interim President Richard Sauer, who served until Nils H. Hasselmo was appointed President in January 1989. President Mark G. Yudof succeeded President Hasselmo on July 1, 1997.

*Administrative Structure*

Until about a year before the May 1996 site visit, the positions of Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for the Twin Cities campus were held by the same individual. Concerns about that particular administrative structure included the need for arts and sciences leadership to parallel leadership in the agricultural and health sciences areas, and the wide span of control that such a model required. Effective July 1, 1995, operational responsibility for collegiate units on the Twin Cities campus rested with three provosts: Academic Health Center; Arts, Sciences, and Engineering; and Professional Studies. Figure 3 is a more detailed description of the organizational structure for the Twin Cities campus in effect during May 1996; and Figure 4 shows the overall organizational structure for the University of Minnesota at that time. Figure 3 indicates the collegiate units that reported to each of the three provosts on the Twin Cities campus, and Figure 4, the system administration across all campuses of the University of Minnesota. Organizational changes continued throughout the 1995-96 academic year as the senior administration considered whether or not existing reporting relationships would be effective in addressing institutional change issues. Clearly, the organizational structure was undergoing an uneasy and confusing transition period when the site visit occurred in May 1996.
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Figure 4

Prior Organizational Structure for University of Minnesota System in 1996
A Transition Advisory Committee was appointed to advise on governance issues prompted by the reorganization. The related Transition Task Force Steering Committee, chaired by the two senior vice presidents, was instructed to manage and coordinate the assignments to be performed by the Task Force Systems Subcommittee and the Task Force Provostal Subcommittee. The principles used to guide the implementation of the new organization were as follows: (a) assign explicit decision-making authority and accountability to the Chancellors of the coordinate campuses and to the three provosts of the Twin Cities campus; (b) assign explicit responsibilities to system officers providing staff support to the President; (c) separate system and campus responsibilities; (d) separate staff and line responsibilities; (e) provide clear reporting and consulting lines; (f) assign manageable spans of responsibility; and (g) flatten and decentralize the organization to minimize the number of layers between faculty and central administrators.

The well-intentioned and costly change was not met with widespread support on campus and was a short-lived experiment in a multiple provost model. The three-provost model continued for only two years before being replaced by a new organizational structure effective July 1, 1997 when President Yudof began. The current organizational structure is depicted in Figure 5 below.
Figure 5
Current Organizational Structure for University of Minnesota, March 2000
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On August 29, 1997 Executive Vice President and Provost Bruininks reported to the Board of Regents on the continuing restructuring of academic administration. The activities of the Offices of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Vice President for Planning, the Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering, and the Provost for Professional Studies were consolidated into the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. The consolidation yielded annual savings of $600,000 in personnel costs that have been reinvested in academic initiatives and improvement strategies within colleges. The three principles governing the reorganization were: Flatten the academic administration; reallocate funds to academic programs and initiatives; and decentralize authority, resources, activities and accountability to the collegiate units.

Board of Regents

Two of the General Institutional Requirements (GIR numbers 5 and 6) serve as the context for the discussion of this aspect of governance changes since May 1996:

5. *It has a governing board that possesses and exercises necessary legal power to establish and review basic policies that govern the institution.*

Operating authorities for the University of Minnesota are derived from the Board of Regents. Since the University of Minnesota was established prior to when Minnesota became a state, the institution has constitutional autonomy.

6. *Its governing board includes public members and is sufficiently autonomous from the administration and ownership to assure the integrity of the institution.*

The twelve-member Board of Regents is the governing body of the University. The Legislature chooses one regent from each of Minnesota's eight congressional districts and four from the State at large. One of the four at-large regents must be a University student or have been graduated from the University within the five years prior to election. Regents serve without salary for six-year terms. Vacancies that occur when the Legislature is not in session are filled by the governor. The president of the University is *ex officio* president of the Board of Regents.

In May 1996, the chair of the Board of Regents was Thomas R. Reagan, and the most recent former chair was Jean B. Keffeler. Both, but especially the former chair, led the Regents in their review of the Tenure Code. Members of the Board in May 1996 were as follows:

- Julie A. Bleyhl, Congressional District 2, First elected 1993, Term expired: 1999.
- Jean B. Keffeler, Congressional District 5, First elected 1989, Resigned, November, 1996.
Seven of the current members of the Board of Regents are new to the Board since May 1996. Current members of the Board are as follows:

- Maureen K. Reed, Vice Chair, Congressional District 6, First elected in 1997, Term expires: 2003.
- Patricia B. Spence, Chair, At-Large Representative, First elected in 1995, Term expires: 2001.

The current Board of Regents is structured with five standing committees and five special committees, to which regents are assigned to serve from 1999-2001. The Standing Committees are: Audit; Educational Planning and Policy; Facilities; Faculty, Staff and Student Affairs; and Finance and Operations. The Special Committees are: Academic Health Center; Alumni Association; Humphrey Institute; Litigation Review; and President’s Performance Review.

In its most recent Summer Retreat (August 1999), the Board of Regents and President Yudof identified national and local trends and policy issues that are expected to require the University’s attention in the next two to ten years. Discussion included the following issues: continued improvement in the quality of the student experience; technology transfer; international collaborations; capital improvement plans; capital campaign; the integrated institutional issues around the Academic Health Center; reward structure for faculty research, teaching and outreach; increasing diversity in admissions, hiring and retention; intercollegiate athletics, specifically, solutions toward maintaining the student-athlete status, improving gender equity, and academic misconduct; increasing communication with students and their representation; and the University’s role in larger issues across higher education, including: cost and price of higher education; affordability versus access; K-12 education and teacher preparation; economic development in Minnesota; implementation of recent federal higher education legislation; and federal support of University research; among other topics.
Through positive leadership, communication and planning, the current Board of Regents has established a positive, collaborative relationship with the President and University administration, forged effective working relationships amongst themselves, and restored trust and equilibrium with the University governance structures and the community at-large.

**Tenure Code Revision and its Resolution**

This section describes how the institution successfully negotiated the resolution of the “tenure crisis” that was building in May 1996, and events since then that have rebuilt a level of trust with faculty governance. The national publicity about the situation at the University of Minnesota was not anticipated when the self-study report was prepared under the guidance of the North Central Advisory Committee. Discussions in May, 1996 about the future of tenure provided a general context of skepticism and concern about the University of Minnesota.

**Background**

During the period from 1993-96, faculty consultative and governance leadership worked with University administration to address a series of human resources issues and management problems that affect faculty life and work in carrying out the teaching, research and outreach missions of the University. These efforts coincided with questions inside the University and outside (e.g., in the Minnesota Legislature, the Governor, the public) asking: How can the University maintain faculty and staff morale and improve performance in accomplishing its diverse missions during an era of persistent underfunding? The January 1996 discussion document *Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and the Research University -- Issues and Alternative* introduced the issue as follows:

"In response to plans set in motion by U2000 initiatives, to discussions between faculty and administration during the 1994-95 academic year, to the installation of a provostal system of administration on the Twin Cities campus, and to their own deliberations, the Board of Regents requested an analysis of the definition, status and role of faculty tenure both nationally and at the University of Minnesota. The discussion is being carried out during the 1995-96 academic year and is scheduled to conclude in summer 1996."

The discussion document served as background for a series of faculty-led, University-wide forums to discuss faculty appointments and tenure, and followed two discussions with the Board of Regents in late 1995. The first discussion focused on national trends and issues and featured a presentation by a prominent national authority on faculty tenure in higher education, and was followed by a faculty panel that provided responses to the discussion. The conclusion in the discussion document was that there was "...inevitability of change in the Tenure Code and the requirement that changes be designed by faculty working with the administration."

The second session focused on the tenure process, statistics, and critical issues at Minnesota. Materials provided a brief overview of the process for awarding or denying tenure, selected statistics showing the breakdown of tenure-track and tenured faculty by college and campus, the
rate of tenure, and an issues paper. In a February 12, 1996 meeting with department chairs, the chair of the Faculty Consultative Committee made the following observation:

"Across the country, most of the 200 peer institutions of the University are looking at tenure, so this is not unique to Minnesota. Some would say, in fact, that the way Minnesota is approaching the discussion is exemplary for faculty: it is a faculty-led effort. Both the administration and the Board have said there is a constitution in place and it will be followed."

Subsequently, two faculty-led forums on tenure occurred in March and an editorial appeared in the February issue of *Kiosk*, a newsletter for faculty and staff, to begin the process of debating the detailed proposals for language changes. Very quickly the process deteriorated and was very contentious when the site visit occurred in May 1996. Less than a month before the May 1996 site visit, all faculty received an e-mail saying that there would be a resolution presented at the University Faculty Senate the following day. Engstrand (1998) summarizes what happened:

"It said that the tenure review process had been flawed, the committees had not reported recommendations, information about the need for tenure revision had not been provided, and the faculty had no confidence in the elected leadership (FCC). The resolution called for a halt to the process, dissolution of the tenure working group, and for the established committees to take over. At the meeting the next day, after a presentation by the president reciting events and noting his own strong advocacy of tenure and the protection of academic freedom, the rules were suspended, the resolution was adopted 119-9, and the Faculty Senate promptly adjourned."

**Resolution of Crisis**

Several knowledgeable individuals have provided extensive descriptions and analyses of the chronology of events that eventually led to the resolution of the “tenure crisis.” An article by Engstrand (1998) titled “Tenure wars”: The battles and the lessons” provided the following chronology of the major phases in the process:

- The Regents start the discussion
- Faculty apprehensiveness grows and the faculty divide
- The faculty complete their work (they think); the Regents do their own work
- The Regents strike and the faculty strike back
- The Law School dean offers a “compromise”
- The Regents take action; collective bargaining falters
- The union effort fails and the struggle ends

Another account by Morrison (1997) titled “Tenure Wars: An Account of the Controversy at Minnesota” began “This is the story of the Tenure Wars at Minnesota, told by a soldier in them.” and concluded “Like all wars, this one need not have happened.” Morrison suggested that "the tenure controversy was about employeeization and about the imposition of management styles,
but it was fought on issues related to permanence of tenure, academic freedom, and due process" (p.387).

The new Tenure Code is available for review at www1.umn.edu/regents/polindex. It includes a post-tenure review system that is oriented to improvement rather than dismissal, but it does contain provisions for the possibility of up to a 25 percent salary reduction based on performance issues.

**Rebuilding Trust**

According to Morrison (1997), "Internally, the faculty have been totally alienated from the regents and no longer accept the board's initiatives as in the common interest. The board likewise has been politically damaged…By June 1997, four of the twelve regents who had participated in the September meeting at Morris were gone.” But Morrison also suggested:

"The tenure issue was a catalyst that initiated a reaction to many other grievances, real and perceived. The combustion of those elements—salaries that were low in comparison to other research universities, inadequacy of professional support, university defense and indemnification policies and practices, administrative attitudes, a shift from quarters to semesters, and even the price of parking—continued even after the precipitating catalyst was removed from the mixture" (p 390-391).

In his September 9, 1999 statement to the Board of Regents, Morrison, Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee of the University Senate, commented:

"By working together, faculty, students, administration, Regents, and our public supporters can continue to improve the greatness of the institution. We may have had some unpleasant differences in the past. Based on the leadership of President Yudof and the outstanding leadership of the Regents over the past two years, I am convinced that we can and will work together to build an even greater university.”

Conversations by members of the Focused Visit Team with representatives of faculty governance, administration, and members of the Board of Regents will confirm the above observations and provide examples of the more positive working relationship that has emerged following a period of considerable strife. Board leadership has been crucial in rebuilding effective working relationships and trust in the past few years.

**Faculty and Staff Perceptions**

One of the 14 institutional performance measures is titled Faculty and Staff Experiences, one component of which is a periodic survey of faculty and staff. The *Faculty and Staff Climate Survey* was completed during the spring of 1997 at a time of transition at the University of Minnesota. During much of the past year, faculty had been embroiled in a long and heated discussion of changes in the Tenure Code, and all groups were anticipating a change in
University leadership. Selected results of that survey are presented here to provide baseline information that the University of Minnesota will use in future years to monitor changes in faculty and staff opinions. An overview of results for several key questions confirms that significant numbers of faculty were concerned about University directions in 1996-97, but also indicate positive evaluations about faculty life at the University of Minnesota. A detailed summary of the results is contained in the report *The 1997 Faculty and Staff Climate Survey* accessible at [www.irr.umn.edu](http://www.irr.umn.edu).

Conducting another survey of faculty and staff was not feasible prior to the March 2000 Focused Visit, although discussions are concurrently underway with a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs that will lead to the administration of a similar survey within the next few years.

As the overall results in Figure 6 suggest, approximately one-third (34.2%) of University employees in the spring of 1997 agreed with the statement “I have confidence in the direction the University is heading.” The absence of comparative information for similar surveys conducted prior to the spring of 1997 precludes interpretation of changes in how employees felt about overall University direction before President Yudof began in July 1997.

**Figure 6**
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The specific question was: “I have confidence in the direction the University is heading.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7 compares respondents from each of the four campuses to the question concerning confidence in University direction. As was true for the overall satisfaction, the difference among campuses was statistically significant and substantial, with respondents on the Twin Cities campus responding least positively (32.1%).

**Figure 7**

*Overall Satisfaction with Employment (by all employee groups combined)*

- Strongly Disagree: 3.8%
- Disagree: 13.2%
- Neither: 17.3%
- Agree: 51.6%
- Strongly Agree: 14.1%

The specific question was:
"Overall, I am satisfied with my employment at the University."
The results in Figure 8 contrast the responses of the six employee categories to the question about confidence in University direction. The six employee groups differed in their responses to the question. For example for faculty respondents 23.4 percent agreed and 2.8 percent strongly agreed with the statement. As the more detailed results for each employee group suggested, this particular item was one for which faculty members were least positive when asked in the spring of 1997. Again, note that the survey was conducted during the time period after there had been considerable strife concerning the proposed revisions in the Tenure Code.

**Figure 8**

Confidence in University Direction (by campus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crookston</th>
<th>Duluth</th>
<th>Morris</th>
<th>Twin Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The specific question was: 
"I have confidence in the direction the University is heading."
Role of General College

Another issue at the time of the May 1996 site visit concerned a March 1996 administrative proposal to close General College. Polarized opinions about the wisdom and timing of such a proposal led to further concerns about the relationship between administration and governance. Since its inception in 1932, General College had played a crucial role in providing access to the University of Minnesota–Twin Cities for students whose preparation for university study differed from that of students enrolling in other freshmen-admitting colleges.

In the period since May 1996, reevaluation of the role and mission of General College has provided the foundation for its continuing role and support within the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. Two relevant reports completed within the 1997–98 year have implications for the University’s role in assisting under-prepared students in the metropolitan area, which is central to the mission of General College. The Board of Regents enthusiastically endorsed both reports at their monthly meeting on May 7, 1998. The following two sections briefly summarize those reports; the final section provides an overview of the enrollment management plan as articulated in the Compact Planning Process for General College.

Report of the External Review Committee

An external review of the General College was initiated to provide an evaluation of the role and contributions of General College and to suggest possible areas for change and improvement. Also presented at the May 1998 meeting of the Board of Regents was the Report of the External Review Committee of the University of Minnesota’s General College. The review was conducted in response to a request from the Board of Regents for a task force to identify and assess programs designed to assist under-prepared students at the University of Minnesota. The committee concluded that General College has and will continue to play an important role within the University and the state of Minnesota. It is the center of programs dedicated to student access, learning, and academic support. The recommendations that are most relevant to the role of General College as part of the University’s overall metropolitan strategy were as follows:

- A commitment from the University to provide a period of stability for planning and program implementation.
- Commitment to enacting a systematic plan for assessing student learning, including providing a faculty position to support assessment activities.
- Providing senior faculty leadership for research activities in the fields of developmental and multicultural education.
- Commitment to a thorough review of the curriculum and its delivery, including the necessary faculty development needed to support implementation of the curriculum.

Report and Recommendations of Task Force on Under-Prepared Students

The primary recommendations in the Report of the Task Force on Under-Prepared Students, chaired by Professor Shirley Garner, Chair of the Department of English Language and Literature, were as follows:
• The Regents and President should affirm the importance of admitting a diverse student population, in order to fulfill the University’s missions of including the range of the state’s constituencies and of generating and disseminating new knowledge.

• The Regents and President should affirm the University’s responsibility to include the range of the state’s constituencies, continually renewing the linkage between the University and the community.

• The Regents and President should affirm their support for admitting under-prepared students as part of the mission and responsibility described above.

• The Executive Vice President and Provost should assign responsibility for analyzing the success of admitted, under-prepared students, so as to identify and enhance effective measures.

• The President should allocate resources or secure additional funding for this crucial part of the University’s work.

• The Regents and President should continue to work closely with the MnSCU leadership, cooperating to enhance service to under-prepared students.

**Enrollment Plan**

The current enrollment plan for General College is consistent with efforts during the past decade, including the *University Strategic Plan*, to refocus the priorities for admission to freshman-admitting colleges on the Twin Cities campus. Enrollments in General College currently account for about one-sixth of the total freshman enrollments on the Twin Cities campus, and about one fourth (28.7 percent) of the new freshmen in General College are students of color. As part of the Compact Planning Process for General College, an enrollment target of 875 new freshmen and 1,500 total students has been established. More detail about General College may be accessed at [www.irr.umn.edu/compact/compact99/](http://www.irr.umn.edu/compact/compact99/).

The students served by General College represent a fraction of those students in the metropolitan area who are not well prepared for postsecondary education. The University of Minnesota–Twin Cities cannot and should not directly serve a larger number of those students, but it has a role in helping other institutions to better serve the needs of such students. In partnership with the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities has articulated an overall Metropolitan Education Strategy, one goal of which is to communicate more broadly the particular role and contributions of General College.