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**Agenda Item:** University District Alliance Update

- review
- review/action
- action
- discussion

**Presenters:**
Karen Himle, Vice President for University Relations
Dick Poppele, University District Alliance Co-Chair; Professor, Department of Neuroscience
Arvonne Fraser, University District Alliance Steering Committee member; Senior Fellow Emerita, Hubert Humphrey Institute

**Purpose:**

- policy
- background/context
- oversight
- strategic positioning

To report on the accomplishments of the University District Alliance and the desire for a sustained partnership.

**Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:**

The vitality of the communities adjacent to and interconnected with the University of Minnesota is essential to the quality and safety of our campus. There are trends in the communities adjacent to the UMTC campus in Minneapolis that threaten the quality of our campus and require a partnership response. Through institutional and academic partnership, the University of Minnesota has an opportunity to create a premier urban community with the campus at its heart that is economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable.

**Background Information:**

In 2006, the financing bill for a new on-campus Gopher football stadium included a provision that a report be submitted to the governor and legislature assessing the impact of the University of Minnesota’s Twin Cities Campus on the adjacent communities in Minneapolis.

Following the finalization of that report, the University District Alliance was formed. The Alliance has carried out its work to date through a volunteer committee structure, and with in-kind staff support from the University Office of University Relations; program staff support
from the City of Minneapolis; and expertise contributed by the University’s Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

The Alliance has taken a community development approach to focus on five essential tasks.

- Creating a shared vision for the future of the University District.
- Preserving balance of homeownership and building pride in the community.
- Improving “livability” and rebuilding confidence in the future of the community.
- Engaging students as citizens and scholars.
- Creating a shared identity for the University District, and promoting it as a place to learn, live, work, play, do business, and visit.
University District Alliance

In 2006, the financing bill for a new on-campus Gopher football stadium included a provision that a report be submitted to the governor and legislature assessing the impact of the University of Minnesota’s Twin Cities Campus on the adjacent communities in Minneapolis.

Neighborhood Impact Report, 2007. The report was developed in cooperation among the University, the City of Minneapolis, and the member organizations of the University’s Stadium Area Advisory Group, which included campus area neighborhood and business associations. The report documented changes in residential patterns in the adjacent neighborhoods and trends of concern regarding property conditions and loss of home ownership. The report recommended the creation of an alliance among the University, the City, the neighborhoods, and other stakeholders to jointly plan, manage programs, and initiate projects in the district “to preserve and maintain a vital, safe, and attractive community that will be a premier destination and choice of a place to live, learn, and work.” The report further recommended funding for the initiative of $500,000 for start-up costs, $5,000,000 for capital costs to reverse neighborhood decline, and $25,000,000 for an endowment to provide sustained funding for alliance initiatives. The “Moving Forward Together” neighborhood impact report is at http://www.umn.edu/alliance.

In 2007, the MN Legislature provided $750,000 through the University of Minnesota to be used to support one or more demonstration projects to be initiated by the new alliance.

The Alliance organization. The University District Alliance was formed, with a Steering Committee comprised of representatives from each of the member organizations. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by University Vice President Karen Himle and Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association President Dick Poppele. Member organizations include the University of Minnesota, the City of Minneapolis, four neighborhood association, four business associations, the MN Student Association, the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, and Augsburg College. A list of Steering Committee members and other volunteer leaders is attached as Appendix A.

The Alliance has carried out its work to date through a volunteer committee structure, and with in-kind staff support from the University Office of University Relations; program staff support from the City of Minneapolis; and expertise contributed by the University’s Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

Alliance accomplishments. The Alliance has taken a community development approach to focus on five essential tasks. Please also refer to the Alliance’s 2007 – 2009 Progress Report to the Legislature, at http://www.umn.edu/alliance.

1. Creating a shared vision for the future of the University District. See also https://www.myu.umn.edu/metadot/index.pl?id=6413989&isa=Category&op=show
• Worked with Alliance member organizations to identify community priorities. Convened four District-wide workshops to assess assets, areas for preservation and change, and identify opportunities.
• Developed, in consultation with the neighborhoods and business districts, concepts for four transformative project areas: 15th Avenue SE in the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood; 15th Avenue SE/Como Avenue in the South East Como neighborhood; an urban village around the 29th Avenue SE Central Corridor light rail station area in the Prospect Park neighborhood; and using the Central Corridor light rail station area on the West Bank to reconnect the Seven Corners and Cedar Riverside commercial districts with pedestrian and transit oriented space.
• Sponsored the development of Phase I of an urban design framework for the University District, in partnership with the Metropolitan Design Center in the University’s College of Design. A University District Forum on November 8 and a workshop on Saturday, November 20 will further develop the framework.
• On November 8, the Alliance will launch a forum series to bring the District stakeholders together and build a stronger basis for becoming “smarter together.”

2. Preserving balance of homeownership and building pride in the community.
• Developed a homebuyer incentive program that has attracted 15 new owners to purchase and homestead in the District.
• Developed an options program for elders who are considering transitioning out of their homes, to keep those properties in owner-occupancy.
• Purchased three homes, with a nonprofit partner, that were otherwise threatened with conversion to rental property, for improvement and resale to long-term owner-occupants.
• Created a “Live Near Your Work” campaign to promote living in the University District to U employees and others who work in and near the District. [http://www.livenearyourwork.net](http://www.livenearyourwork.net).
• The Alliance is sponsoring a University District housing market analysis and survey of metro-area alumni to assess the potential for development of residences for people at a range of ages—both for empty nesters who are currently living in the District, and for others who may be interested in moving to a vibrant urban community close to the University, downtown, and the river.

3. Improving “livability” and rebuilding confidence in the future of the community.
• The City of Minneapolis conducted inspections on 500 rental properties and cited 2,000+ housing infractions that were subsequently resolved.
• The City and Alliance stakeholders conducted a Zoning, Planning, and Regulatory Review to identify areas for potential policy change. This resulted in regulatory changes to raise standards on rental properties.
• A Strategic Compliance Team, made up of City regulatory agencies, 2nd Precinct Minneapolis Police Department, UMN Office of Student Conduct
and Academic Integrity, and Alliance stakeholders is now addressing some of the most egregious problem properties.

4. Engaging students as citizens and scholars.
   • The University Office for Student Affairs employs 22 Student Neighborhood Liaisons who work with their peers and community organizations in the neighborhoods to build relationships and civic engagement. The Alliance and its member organizations have reached out to faculty and hundreds of students to undertake applied research and class projects in the neighborhoods.

5. Creating a shared identity for the University District, and promoting it as a place to learn, live, work, play, do business, and visit.

Leveraging resources. The Alliance has leveraged the original $750,000 from the legislature with over $557,000 in other funding, and many thousands of hours in volunteer time and in-kind contributions of staff time and expertise. The University has provided $50,000 for homebuyer incentives for University employees, $82,500 in annual costs for the Student Neighbor Liaison program through the Office for Student Affairs, and $250,000 for University District planning. The City of Minneapolis has provided $50,000 for homebuyer incentives, $110,000 in costs for the rental property inspections sweep, and all the staff support for the Zoning, Planning, and Regulatory Review. A more complete description of the uses of legislative funding and leveraged support is in Appendix A of the Progress Report, at http://www.umn.edu/alliance.

Challenges for the University District and the Alliance. While much has been accomplished, there is much to do, and this will of necessity be work for the long term.
   • The market forces driving rental property conversion, property decline, and the exodus of long term residents remain strong, even in times of recession in the housing market elsewhere.
   • Private development activity remains stronger here than in other parts of the city—the challenge to the District will be shaping and influencing the nature and quality of that development—requires concerted collective action. Central Corridor infrastructure investment will bring more transit assets, but also more development pressure—an opportunity and a challenge.
   • Engaging faculty and the centers of expertise at the University to work with the University District community as a living laboratory for the development of economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable community.
   • Continuing to engage students as citizens, stakeholders, and scholars so that living in campus neighborhoods becomes part of their learning and development experience while at the U.
   • Continuing the initiatives to balance home ownership and build confidence in the future of the neighborhoods.
   • Engaging private development capital to help achieve the long-term vision for the District.
   • Supporting the long-term operations of the Alliance and the work of the volunteers.
Lessons from the experience at other urban universities. Before launching the Alliance, we looked at the experience at other urban universities that have found themselves in crisis related to the deterioration of the campus community. At the Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, and at the University of Akron, each was confronted with such deterioration of the neighborhoods adjacent to their campuses that, when they decided to take action, it required a long-term commitment of operating support and eight-figure commitments out of their endowments in order to shore up the urban fabric and get private investment moving in the right direction. In each case, the University committed executive-level leadership to long-term initiatives, and created separate but affiliated organizations to carry out programs in partnership with government, the community, and the private sector. The conditions on the ground at UMTC are not as dire as those at these other example communities, but we want to proactively avoid those circumstances and in fact use the Alliance partnership to build a community of excellence that will match and add value to the quality of education and research of which we are proud at the University of Minnesota.
## Appendix A

### Alliance Steering Committee Members and Other Volunteer Leaders

**University District Alliance Leadership**

**Steering Committee Representatives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arvonne Fraser</td>
<td>Past President, Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Bean</td>
<td>Executive Director, Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Blevins</td>
<td>West Bank Community Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director, Brian Coyle Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Buchel</td>
<td>University of MN Minnesota Students’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Carlson</td>
<td>President, Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Christenson</td>
<td>Director of Community Planning and Economic Development, City of Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Dane</td>
<td>South East Como Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Fournier</td>
<td>South East Como Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Gilyard</td>
<td>Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Gordon</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Ward City Council Member, City of Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Himle</td>
<td>Vice President for University Relations, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Hofstede</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Ward City Council Member, City of Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>West Bank Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skott Johnson</td>
<td>President, Dinkytown Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McLaughlin</td>
<td>Executive Director, South East Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob McMaster</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Menken</td>
<td>President, South East Como Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Peacock</td>
<td>Director of Community Relations, Augsburg College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Poppele</td>
<td>President, Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Rose Pribyl</td>
<td>President, Stadium Village Commercial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Swanson</td>
<td>Office of Budget and Finance, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota
Doris Wickstrom  West Bank Community Coalition
Lindsey Wollschlager  University of Minnesota Graduate and Professional Students’ Assembly

Other program leaders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merrie Benasutti</td>
<td>UMN Center for Integrated Leadership; West Bank CHANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Buchanan</td>
<td>UMN Office of Student Affairs; Student Neighbor Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Capecci and Bev Bachel</td>
<td>Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association; Capecci Communications; Idea Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haila Maze</td>
<td>City of Minneapolis Department of CPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Nelson</td>
<td>UMN Center for Urban and Regional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Parisi</td>
<td>City of Minneapolis Office of the City Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Tucker</td>
<td>Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendre Turonie</td>
<td>UMN Office of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agenda Item:  Measuring Faculty and Staff Satisfaction: Results of 2010 Pulse Survey

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☒ discussion

Presenters:  Theresa Glomb, Associate Professor, Carlson School of Management
Leonard Goldfine, Assistant Director, Office of Institutional Research
Susan Rafferty, Assistant Director, Office of Human Resources

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☒ background/context  ☐ oversight  ☒ strategic positioning

To provide members of the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee with an update on the results from the fourth administration of the Pulse survey, a biennial on-line survey measuring faculty and staff satisfaction and engagement.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

The 2010 Pulse survey represents the highest response rates in the survey’s history; reveals remarkably stable, relatively strong employment satisfaction levels despite reorganizations and economic downturn; and embodies an important source of data to inform University decision making to increase employee satisfaction and engagement and thereby further our University strategy to engage and retain exceptional faculty and staff.

Background Information:

In 2004, the University began an ongoing, system-wide effort to monitor employee satisfaction with the overarching goal of attracting, retaining, and developing top talent. This is the second time survey results have been presented to the Board, the first being on November 9, 2006.
Measuring Faculty and Staff Satisfaction: Results of 2010 Pulse Survey

Designed to help the University of Minnesota better understand the work experiences of its faculty and staff, the Pulse survey is an on-line employee satisfaction and engagement survey developed and administered exclusively at the University. The 2010 Pulse survey, the fourth administration of this biennial assessment tool, represents the highest response rates in the survey’s history; reveals remarkably stable, relatively strong employment satisfaction levels despite reorganizations and economic downturn; and embodies an important source of data to inform University decision making.

High Survey Participation

The 2010 Pulse survey overall response rate of 45.6 percent is higher than those for the prior surveys in 2004, 2006, and 2008. For the 2010 survey, 18,719 invitations were sent to all employees at all campuses who were on the spring payroll snapshot and were employed at least 50 percent time on that date, and 8,539 employees completed it during the surveying window from April 19 through May 14. Efforts to shorten the survey length, ensure relevancy of all questions, and communicate more effectively to employees about use of survey results likely contributed to the higher response rate.

Seeking to improve survey administration, reporting, and usability of results, the Pulse Steering Team (comprised of a faculty researcher from the Carlson School of Management and administrators from the Office of Human Resources, Office of Institutional Research, and University Relations), began a comprehensive review of the Pulse survey instrument, data collection tool, and reporting mechanisms in 2009 in anticipation of the 2010 survey launch.

Because few other survey instruments can reach nearly all University employees, the Pulse has grown to be a repository for a wide variety of questions from many University offices. To increase the response rate and better respect the time of those who complete the survey, the Steering Team examined every question on the survey—to determine its relevance to the primary focus on satisfaction with the workplace experience and employee engagement; whether similar information is, or could be, gleaned elsewhere; and whether the wording of each question could be improved to facilitate comprehension. In addition, several questions were reworded and/or added to allow for benchmarking against other universities through the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). This labor-intensive effort resulted in a streamlined survey that was 28 percent shorter than the 2008 version for faculty and 25 percent shorter for staff.

Another key improvement in the 2010 survey was the blending of separate faculty and staff instruments into a single online survey that would steer respondents around inapplicable
questions (e.g., Civil Service employees being asked about the tenure process). This further improved the survey instrument’s efficiency and now allows for greater ease of comparison between faculty and staff groups on identical questions.

The results of these improvements were substantial. The combined response rate of faculty and instructional Academic Professional and Administrative employees (“instructional P&A” chiefly holding positions classified as teaching specialists and lecturers) rose from 35 percent in 2008 to 37 percent in 2010, and to 39 percent for faculty alone. The staff response rate rose from 45 to 49 percent in 2010. While these increases might seem small at first glance, the raw numbers add up to almost 1,000 additional respondents (178 additional faculty and instructional P&A and 783 additional staff).

Not only is the response rate high, but the demographics of survey respondents are generally representative of the faculty and staff community overall in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and academic rank (applicable for faculty and instructional P&A). On the whole, the survey population reflects our regular employee population.

**Overall Employee Satisfaction Holds Relatively Strong and Steady**

Unlike the relatively consistent circumstances present during the three previous Pulse surveys, the drastic shift in the global economy and the budgetary pressures facing the University poses a significantly different landscape for the 2010 survey. At the time the 2010 survey was administered, a wage freeze was already in effect at the University, and discussions about furloughs and temporary pay reductions were nearing completion. Thus, the 2010 survey results are reflective of our current economic realities. While there are some notable shifts in employee satisfaction on a few issues, overall satisfaction indicators hold relatively steady.

Responses to three questions designed to gauge overall and total satisfaction with employment at the University – “Overall, I am satisfied with my employment at the University,” “If I were doing it again, I would accept a position at the University,” and “Would you recommend employment here to a friend or colleague?” – showed little movement from previous surveys. These three indicators reflect core indices used in employee satisfaction surveys at universities and corporations nationwide.

Favorable responses to the question about whether employees would recommend employment at the University decreased compared to 2008, with 2010 data showing 73 percent of staff and 65 percent of faculty answering “Yes” to this question, compared to 2008 when 77 percent of staff and 71 percent of faculty responded positively. Aggregate results indicating agreement or strong agreement with the statement about whether employees would accept a position at the University again remained relatively constant with 81 percent in 2010 compared to 83 percent in 2008.

Some other notable survey findings include:

- The existing wage freeze and discussions of temporary salary reductions and furloughs in effect at the time of the survey are reflected in the responses to satisfaction with most recent raise. For faculty scores to this question dropped from 2.96 in 2008 to 2.54 in 2010 on a 5-point scale. For staff scores to this question dropped from 2.81 in 2008 to
2.50 on a 5-point scale. Responses to other pay satisfaction questions, however, are largely unchanged. Employee satisfaction with benefits, an integral component to the total compensation picture, remains very high.

- The economic landscape also may have impacted a substantial increase in degrees of agreement with the question *I Know How My Job Contributes to the Mission of the University*. It is possible that the economic downturn has resulted in greater self-reflection on exactly what faculty and staff members do and how their roles are essential to the University’s overall mission. Results to questions pertaining to how employees understand the importance of their jobs and find satisfaction with their work shows an increase for all employee groups; questions about immediate interpersonal relationships (with responsible administrators and coworkers) remains consistently strong in comparison to prior surveys.

- Satisfaction with advancement opportunities is low across all employee groups, consistent with previous years and indicative of the work that remains in this important area.

The relative steadiness of these results, when viewed against the current economic backdrop, is positive news for the University. Our faculty and staff remain content with their work and relatively satisfied with key terms of employment and work relationships despite the economic challenges facing our University community.

**Leveraging the Results**

The Pulse survey provides a venue for faculty and staff to voice their opinions regarding their workplace experiences and provides administrators with valuable insights into employee perceptions in key items such as job satisfaction, pay and benefits satisfaction, job stress, support from supervisor/responsible administrator, satisfaction with department support, support for scholarship and teaching, satisfaction with University and department characteristics, workgroup, University compliance landscape, job intentions, negative experiences at work, and life outside of work. These survey items measure not only satisfaction with key items but also a picture of employee engagement, that is satisfaction with and commitment to work at the University.

Institutional and campus/college/administrative support unit-level reporting from the 2008 Pulse survey showed broad-based interest in survey results and an increased understanding of how those results can inform improvements in the workplace experience. Despite a solid overall survey response rate in 2008, the number of responses within units sometimes was too small to permit reportable results that maintained the University’s commitment to individual respondent privacy. This problem largely is eliminated for the 2010 survey reporting, and unit level reports will be provided to campus/college/administrative support unit leaders in the coming month. Further reporting and analysis also will occur with administrators responsible for system-wide policies and practices in areas such as compensation, benefits, faculty affairs, compliance, and equity and diversity over the next several months.

Improvements to the institutional and unit level reports include break down of responses by employee group thereby allowing administrators to better understand and tailor actions designed to improve satisfaction. Based on feedback from 2008 reporting, the 2010 faculty report
separates results from instructional P&A and faculty respondents. Likewise, the staff report separates the results from P&A who are academic administrators (such as deans and directors); from P&A who are non-instructional academic professionals (such as counselors and fellows), from Civil Service employees (such as accountants and supervisors), and from represented bargaining unit respondents (such as principal office and administrative specialists and mechanics).

The increased survey response rate and higher levels of interest in the 2010 survey results creates a need for additional accountability for acting on the results to improve workplace experiences of all faculty and staff members. Strategies to distribute reports on results and work with leaders to develop and implement strategies to improve workplace elements are designed to increase employee satisfaction and engagement and thereby further our University strategy to engage and retain exceptional faculty and staff. The employee engagement picture revealed by the 2010 survey results will be discussed further at the committee meeting.
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Agenda Item:  Targeting Communications Strategies for Faculty, Staff & Students
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Presenters:  Karen Himle, Vice President for University Relations
             Ann Freeman, Director, University Relations

Purpose:

☐ policy       ☒ background/context       ☐ oversight       ☒ strategic positioning

Successful implementation of the university’s strategic goals requires an informed and engaged university community.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

University Relations began a strategic internal communication function in 2007, and has since led, coordinated, and collaborated on a variety of important communication initiatives, such as budget communications, H1N1 pandemic, and the upcoming university winter closure. A recent system wide survey of faculty and staff established baseline information about internal communication preferences and effectiveness among faculty and staff.

Background Information:

The strategic internal communications function is in part an outgrowth of the work done by the culture task force during the university’s strategic positioning process.
Creating a Strategic Internal Communications Function
At The University of Minnesota

I. Overview
In early 2007, University Relations—under the leadership of vice president Karen Himle—embraced a charge from President Bruininks to address and improve internal communications at the University of Minnesota.

This need for improved internal communications was underscored by the striking similarities between the recommendations of the Strategic Positioning Administrative Culture Task Force and the findings of an internal communications audit, both completed in 2006. Highlights of both are outlined below.

Administrative Culture Task Force findings:
- “Top 3” goal is well understood, but not embraced
- Silos and boundaries are counterproductive but deeply entrenched
- The University uses a top-down decision making process
- Communications (internal and external) must create community around a common purpose and build a cohesive sense of identity

Internal Communications audit findings:
- “Transforming the U” goal is well understood, but “how” and “why” are not
- Too much communication becomes a barrier to effective communication
- Administrative communications are perceived as top-down and one-way
- Face-to-face communication opportunities lead to trust and community

In July 2007, University Relations formed an internal communications department charged with developing and implementing strategies to improve internal communications and issues management, and to provide direct service and consultation to a variety of University departments and initiatives. While a focus on internal communications is common in the private sector, such initiatives are rare in higher education; as such, detailed models are few, and the work of the internal communications group has developed heuristically.

II. The Reinventing Internal Communications Initiative
In March 2008, University Relations established the “Reinventing Internal Communications” (RIC) initiative to further define and advance the role of strategic internal communications at the University. A broad-based, cross-functional steering committee and group of executive sponsors were formed to lead this initiative.

The steering committee developed mission and vision statements and identified four implementation goals. This group also conducted extensive consultations with University working and governance committees to obtain feedback and solicit participation in the implementation process.

In fall 2008, membership in the RIC initiative was expanded and four work teams comprised of staff from across the University were formed to develop recommendations to meet the identified implementation goals. These teams, in turn, completed short-term recommendations by January 2009. Final recommendations and emerging best practices were completed in June 2009 and are summarized below.
Recommendations
The recommendations define an internal communications infrastructure that comprises people, technology, and measurement. Embracing and utilizing this infrastructure at every level of the organization will serve to better connect faculty, staff, and students to each other and to the mission and aspirations of the University.

The department of internal communications within University Relations is leading the implementation of these recommendations, in coordination and collaboration with a variety of University departments.

- People: Create a formalized, U-wide internal communications network.
- Technology: Develop a shared, web-based toolkit for internal communications, and a single web interface for faculty and staff.
- Measurement: Establish benchmarks to measure the progress and success of strategic internal communications.

Emerging Best Practices
Through research and hands-on learning, the following emerging best practices for internal communications at the University have been identified:

- Provide clear and honest communication. "Successful internal communication" is not always communication that everyone agrees with. It is, however, appropriately transparent, timely, accurate, and honest. How a message is communicated has the potential to be more important than what is communicated.
- Engage in internal communications strategies that are audience-focused, coordinated with other internal messages, and that provide opportunities for multi-modal and multi-directional communications (including face-to-face).
- Timeliness is essential. The U community should learn about important news first, from its leadership, and not from the media or other external sources. Share as much information as is known as soon as it is known.
- Communicate with staff and faculty regularly, even daily. Update content accordingly. People will feel less inundated if they trust and rely on the information, and if they are the correct audience to receive it.
- Engage faculty. Faculty can serve as messengers of key information for their colleges and departments.
- Provide many ways to access information, including email, news feeds, blogs, videos, podcasts, faculty/staff web pages, etc.

Expanded Capacity Under Way
A number of strategies are already established or under way to expand the U’s ability to effectively communicate with and among internal audiences. The internal communications department within University Relations is leading the following efforts.

- Strategic internal communications planning and implementation for emergent topics, including the U’s budget challenges, H1N1 Influenza, and other emergency communications.
- Multi-unit collaborative internal projects and their associated internal communications such as TXT-U, the SAFE-U initiative, the opening of TCF Bank Stadium, and the upcoming University winter closure.
- Improved strategies for coordination and delivery of internal mass email have been established, most notably the change from the outdated, ineffective "Deans,
Directors, and Department Heads” (DDD) email listserv to the dynamic, customizable “Administrative Email Lists” (AEL).

- The Internal Communications Network (ICN), established in early 2010, hosts monthly forums to discuss issues of interest to the University community. All meetings are open to faculty, staff, and students. The topic of the last ICN forum was graduate education transformation and the November topic will be the Biennial Budget Request.

- Employment of a client service model, assisting University departments, colleges, and units with internal communications needs.

- A faculty/staff website is under development. Its objective is to provide a comprehensive, accessible, easily used website with aggregated content for faculty and staff. A collaborative work team with representation from a variety of University departments and units is developing the site. This work will inform a planned home page redesign which will provide customizable content for faculty, staff, and others.

III. Establishing a Baseline: Systemwide Internal Communications Survey

Summary

- The internal communications department within University Relations worked with Padilla Spear Beardsley to conduct a systemwide survey during February and March 2010 to evaluate communication preferences of faculty and staff and to provide recommendations for future programming.

- Faculty and staff reported communication from college-level leadership as the most trusted and relied-upon source. Also, faculty and staff rely upon interpersonal communications for University information (i.e., staff meetings and word of mouth) more than various University electronic, print, and website sources.

- Despite the reliance on interpersonal communication, there is a positive relationship between the extent to which faculty and staff feel informed and their use of University electronic, print, and website sources, particularly Brief. The more they rely on these sources, the more informed they feel.

- Respondents rated highly the importance of community. They feel fairly connected to the University and very loyal to their place of work. However, overall, they described the University’s sense of community in neutral terms—neither warm nor cold.

Research Objectives

- Determine the most effective ways to communicate with staff and faculty.
- Assess audience satisfaction with Brief and learn about other communication vehicles preferred by internal audiences.
- Examine the ways communications can help staff and faculty make connections with one another and the University.
- Determine the ways strong internal connection and community can align with the University’s teaching, research, and outreach mission.
Method

• Participation involved a random sample of 8,993 University of Minnesota staff and faculty from Crookston, Duluth, Morris, Rochester and Twin Cities campuses—47 percent of the total population.
• Participants received an email with an invitation and link to the online survey, which began February 8, and ended March 15, 2010.
• A random drawing from email addresses to win one of five $25 University Bookstore gift card was provided as incentive for participation.
• Of those sampled, 3,542 (39 percent) responded to the survey; of those who responded, 2,758 (78 percent) fully completed the survey.
• Of the total University of Minnesota faculty and staff population (N=19,198), 14 percent of staff (n=2,081) and 15 percent of faculty (n=584) participated.

Key Findings

• The most effective ways to communicate with faculty and staff are through leadership and staff meetings. Faculty value emails from department heads or deans more than staff do, and staff value emails from the president and other University administrators more than faculty do. However, both groups place a similar value on staff meetings and word-of-mouth communications.

• While respondents feel a strong sense of trust in the information received from their supervisors, there is a sense that information shared may be limited or incomplete—this is especially true for staff. Respondents, in general, feel University communication could be more thorough.

• Beyond these more interpersonal communications, Brief (second only to department or college electronic publications) represents the most relied-upon vehicle for University communication. A majority reads Brief weekly and finds it to be accurate, trustworthy, useful, easy-to-read, and replete with interesting topics.

• Respondents rely on department or college electronic communications twice as much as department or college print publications for University information.

• An evaluation of Brief indicates other strengths, including the focus on information over visual content, the provision of the same news for all readers and the mix of University-wide and campus-specific news.

• The four most popular University topics are financial decisions; workplace technology; research and discovery updates; and notices of events, seminars, and workshops.

• While the most popular topic is finance decisions, results suggest an opportunity to improve this area by: (1) better explaining the University's decisions; and (2) providing faculty and staff an opportunity to share ideas to address these challenges.

Sense of Community and Engagement

Respondents value community, but describe the University’s as lukewarm.
• Three-quarters of respondents reported that feeling a sense of community on their University campus is important.
• Also reported as quite strong was respondents’ rating of how connected they feel to the University.
• However, respondents were more neutral describing a sense of community on their University campus, with the majority reporting in the middle of the cold to warm scale.
• In a significant-difference finding, staff more than faculty described the sense of community on their campus as warm.

A majority of respondents feels loyal and satisfied with the University:
• This majority feels loyal toward the University and would recommend it as a good place to work.
• Two-thirds reported their jobs provide the opportunity to do their best every day.
• Most respondents reported the University responds well to the needs of faculty and staff.
• Staff reported significantly higher agreement than faculty to the statements of loyalty, recommendation, and the University’s responsiveness to the needs of its faculty.

Conclusions and Recommendations
In terms of receiving University information, the top two communication methods preferred by faculty and staff are face-to-face communication and email.
• When deciding between these two, match the purpose with the method.
• Use face-to-face communication to convey complicated information, to build trust and relationships, and to provide opportunities for feedback.
• Use email to be efficient and transmit factual information in a timely manner.

Recognize communication preference differences between faculty and staff, and use an audience-focused approach.
• Topics: faculty—honors and profiles; staff—technology, community news, work-life tips
• Sources: faculty—email from chair, print publications. staff—web sources and meetings
• Trust: staff tends to trust University information more than do faculty
• Budget information: staff reports receiving more of it
• Community: staff reports a “warmer” atmosphere
• Loyalty: staff members say they are more loyal

While the majority of faculty and staff value working at the University, many mention the following as areas of discomfort:
• Being “too busy” to build community
• Feeling out of the decision-making process
• Perceptions of fragmentation described as “silos”
• Staff feeling underappreciated

When asked how communications might improve the University atmosphere, faculty and staff said they wanted more:
• Communication—in terms of amount and preferred method
• Detail—especially on budget and finance decisions
• Transparency—the full story
• Opportunities to provide feedback
For more information, see the full survey report.
Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee       November 11, 2010

Agenda Item:  Board of Regents Policy: Conflict Resolution Process for Employees
☑ review       ☐ review/action       ☐ action       ☐ discussion

Presenters:  Senior Vice President Robert Jones
              Carolyn Chalmers, Director, Office for Conflict Resolution

Purpose:
☒ policy       ☐ background/context       ☐ oversight       ☐ strategic positioning

To review proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: Conflict Resolution Process for Employees.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

To review proposed amendments to Board of Regents Policy: Conflict Resolution Process for Employees. Modifications include:

1. Removing the requirement for review every five years. This requirement is now in the administrative procedure.
2. Adding a prohibition on retaliation for using the conflict resolution process.
3. Administrative policy and administrative procedures have been developed to implement the Regents Policy. Procedural guidelines were not previously in the administrative policy and procedure format.

Background Information:

The Board of Regents Policy: Conflict Resolution Process for Employees was adopted July 12, 2002, and last amended on February 11, 2005.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends that the Board of Regents adopt amendments to Board of Regents Policy: Conflict Resolution Process for Employees.
CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROCESS FOR EMPLOYEES

The University of Minnesota shall have an internal process for the good faith review and resolution of employment-related conflicts.

Subd. 1. Scope. The conflict resolution process shall apply to the employment conflicts of faculty, academic professional and administrative staff, civil service staff, and student employees, including graduate student teaching and research assistants. The process also shall apply to complaints of faculty emeriti in accordance with the terms of the administrative procedures implementing the policy. This process shall not otherwise apply to non-employees or to employees represented by labor organizations.

Subd. 2. Delegation of Authority. The following delegations shall govern the administration of this policy:

(a) Except as provided in subd. 2 (b), the Board of Regents (Board) delegates to the president authority to administer this policy. The president, after consultation with the University Senate and the Conflict Resolution Advisory Committee, is authorized to adopt and amend administrative procedures to implement this policy; and

(b) Complaints alleging that the president personally engaged in a challenged action shall be referred to the chair of the Board, who shall determine whether the conflict resolution process must be adjusted to ensure fair consideration of the matter.

Subd. 3. Review. The administrative procedures implementing this policy will be reviewed every five years pursuant to provisions established in those procedures.

Subd. 3. No Retaliation. Retaliation against any person for using the conflict resolution process is prohibited.
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Agenda Item:  Consent Report

☐ review    ☒ review/action    ☐ action    ☐ discussion

Presenters:  Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☐ policy    ☐ background/context    ☒ oversight    ☐ strategic positioning

As required by Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority, the administration seeks approval of the appointment of one senior administrator.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

Items for Consideration:

• Appointment of Kathryn F. Brown as vice president for human resources, effective June 1, 2011.

Background Information:

Board of Regents Policy: Reservation and Delegation of Authority calls for items, such as senior administrative appointments, bargaining unit contract approvals, tuition and fees policies, and appointments of certain trustees and board members, to be brought before the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee for action.

President's Recommendation for Action:

The President recommends approval of the Consent Report.
Personnel Appointments

Pending approval by the Board of Regents, Kathryn F. Brown will be appointed to the position of Vice President for Human Resources, effective June 1, 2011.

Vice President Brown has served in a number of leadership roles at the University of Minnesota for the past 18 years, including her current tenure as Vice President and Chief of Staff to the president for the past nine years, interim associate vice president in the Office of Multicultural and Academic Affairs, and associate general counsel in the General Counsel’s Office, where she specialized in employment and labor law and issues, including education. Prior to coming to the University, she represented both private and public sector clients on employment and education matters at the law firm of Squire, Sanders & Dempsey in Columbus Ohio. Vice President Brown earned her B.S. at Ohio State University, M.Ed. at Miami University in Ohio, and J.D. at University of Toledo College of Law.

Vice President Brown has a wealth of knowledge, and experience in, resolving some of the most complex challenges in human resources, organizational development, and employment law; a deep and broad understanding of the University and leading a complex organization with multiple governance structures and constituencies; effective working relationships with key constituencies both within and outside the University community; a demonstrated record of promoting and supporting principles and strategies related to equity and diversity; and a deep appreciation for the value of our faculty, staff, and student employees to the University’s education, research, and public outreach mission. Kathy is a widely respected, visionary leader, and her professional experience, foresight, and sound judgment make her the ideal candidate for this important leadership position.

The President recommends the appointment of Kathryn F. Brown to the position of Vice President for Human Resources. The President has the highest confidence in Vice President Brown’s extraordinary skills and abilities, and believes that the leadership and experience she brings to the Office of Human Resources will benefit, support, and serve the University well.

submitted by:
Robert H. Bruininks
President
November 11, 2010
### ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn F. Brown</td>
<td>Vice President for Human Resources</td>
<td>Vice President for Human Resources</td>
<td>06/01/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kathryn F. Brown’s 100%-time, "L" type appointment, and annual salary for this appointment is set at $218,000.
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Agenda Item: Information Items

☐ review  ☐ review/action  ☐ action  ☑ discussion

Presenters: Vice President Carol Carrier

Purpose:

☐ policy  ☐ background/context  ☑ oversight  ☐ strategic positioning

To inform committee members of noteworthy items, administrative actions, and local, regional, and national policy-related issues affecting University units and departments.

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

• Personnel highlights
• University highlights
• Faculty and staff activities and awards
• Student activities and awards

Background Information:

This report appears as a regular item on the Faculty, Staff, and Student Affairs Committee agenda.
This report does not capture and record a complete listing of the significant awards and activities of the University community, but instead makes note of unit reported items in these areas. It also highlights reports and activities at the local, regional, and national level in the area of faculty, staff, and student affairs.

Personnel
None

University Highlights
“Tourism in Minnesota, Ideas at Play,” won a regional Emmy award for Outstanding Business and Consumer Program Special from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. The 30 minute film, co-produced by the University of Minnesota Extension and Twin Cities Public Television, highlights the role of tourism in Minnesota’s economy.

Parking and transportation services was named Transit System of the Year by the Minnesota Public Transit Association. In 2009-10, the U transported more than 3.9 million riders and sold more than 41,000 U-Passes to students, reducing vehicle miles travelled by an estimated 50,000 per day.

Faculty and Staff Activities and Awards
William Angell, housing studies, received the American Association of Radon Scientists and Technologists’ Award for his work within the radon community. He also received the Health Physics Society North Central Chapter’s Wissink Memorial Lecture Award for his presentation on radon risk, risk communication, and radon risk reduction strategies.

Eray Aydil, chemical engineering and materials science, has been appointed editor-in-chief of the Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology, the flagship publication of the American Vacuum Society.

Richard Braun, UMD center for economic development, has been selected as the 2010 State Star of the Minnesota Small Business Development Centers Network (SBDC) for being an outstanding performer, making a major contribution to the SBDC program, and showing a strong commitment to small business in Northeast Minnesota.

Jon Christianson, health policy and management, has been appointed to the Institute of Medicine’s Committee on Geographic Adjustment Factors in Medicare Payment, which will evaluate the accuracy of the geographic adjustment factors used for Medicare payment.
Chemistry professors Chris Cramer, Tim Lodge, and William Tolman have been elected Fellows for the American Chemical Society for 2010.

Jeffrey Edleson, social work, has been appointed to a National Academy of Sciences Committee on Global Violence Prevention.

Kari Ekenstedt, veterinary clinical sciences, received an oral presentation award at the Fifth International Canine and Feline Genomics and Inherited Diseases Conference.

Brian J. Isetts, pharmaceutical care and health systems, is one of 15 members recently appointed to the new National Health Care Workforce Commission, a group charged with advising policymakers on ways to improve the health care workforce.

Volkan Isler, computer science and engineering, and his research team recently won a Clearpath Robotics competition and for the next year will have use of a Clearpath Robotics Huskey A100 (a weather-resistant, all-terrain, unmanned vehicle) to assist in their research project.

Julie Jacko, institute on health informatics, was named one of the top ten most influential informatics professors by HealthTechTopia, a blog devoted to issues of health and technology.

Douglas Johnson, fisheries, wildlife, and conservation biology, received the 2010 Aldo Leopold Memorial Award from The Wildlife Society. The award recognizes distinguished service to wildlife conservation and is the highest honor bestowed by the society.

Juergen Konczak, kinesiology, was inducted as a Fellow in the National Academy of Kinesiology.

Satish Kumar, chemical engineering and materials science, has received the 2010 L.E. Scriven Young Investigator Award of the International Society of Coating Science and Technology, recognizing his achievements in the area of liquid film coating.

Digiquilt software designed by Kristin Kaster Lamberty, UMM computer science, received the Award for Outstanding Educational Impact in the 2010 Learning Challenge, sponsored by Disney Research. The software was chosen for addressing key knowledge concepts to promote creativity and social collaboration in young learners.

Tom Luo, electrical and computer engineering, was awarded the G. Farkas Prize from the INFORMS Optimization Society for his contributions to the field of optimization.

Ryuta Nakajima, UMD art and design, received a Merit Award for his drawings “Philosophy of Squid #1 and #7” which were selected for the 2010 Great Lakes Drawing Biannual, held at Eastern Michigan University.

Fionnuala Ní Aoláin, law school, has been selected for the Irish Legal 100, an annual listing by the Irish Voice newspaper and Irish America magazine to honor the Irish in the legal profession.
Mo Perry, office of human resources communications, was voted Best Twin Cities Actress of 2010 by City Pages.

David Pui, mechanical engineering, was named president of the International Aerosol Research Assembly and received the organizations’ highest award for aerosol research, the Fuchs Memorial Award.

Craig Shankwitz, intelligent vehicles lab, received the Management Innovation Award from the Minnesota Public Transit Association for his work on the Bus 2.0 driver-assist system, part of a state project to improve traffic flow on I-35W between downtown Minneapolis and the southern suburbs. He won the award with Michael Abegg from the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority.

Roberta Sonnino, medical school, has received the 2010 Women in Medicine Leadership Development Award from the Association of American Medical Colleges. The award recognizes contributions to advancing women leaders in academic medicine.

Marla Spivak, entomology, is among 23 recipients of this year’s MacArthur Foundation “genius grants,” awarded for creativity, originality, and potential to make important contributions in the future. This is only the second time in University of Minnesota history that one of the U’s faculty has won this award. Spivak is an expert on honeybees.

Erica Stern, occupational therapy, received the Minnesota Occupational Therapy Association's 2009 Communication Award for “enriching the occupational therapy profession through education, research, and authorship.”

Marshall Stern, animal science, has been awarded the Distinguished Teacher Award from the American Society of Animal Science.

Mary Story, public health, has been elected to Institute of Medicine, one of the highest honors in the fields of health and medicine. Election recognizes individuals who have demonstrated outstanding professional achievement and commitment to service. Story’s expertise is in childhood obesity prevention and child and adolescent nutrition.

The Peripheral Arterial Disease Coalition presented its 2010 Best P.A.D. Research Award to Diane Treat-Jacobson, nursing. The award honors the work of investigators and acknowledges the creation of new research that is relevant to the understanding of peripheral arterial disease.

Vernon Weckwerth, professor emeritus of health policy and medicine, received a Regent’s Award from the American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE) in recognition of his work with international executive education programs (more than 3,100 alumni in 45 countries), as well as service to ACHE.

Student Activities and Awards
Peder Cedervall and Brandon Goblirsch, graduate students in biochemistry, molecular biology, and biophysics, won the Pauling Poster Prize and the International Union of Crystallography
Poster Prize, respectively, at the Annual Meeting of the American Crystallographic Association. Their posters were among more than 300 competing for only 12 prizes.

UMC student Mike Field, who is double majoring in horticulture and golf and turf management, was selected by the Professional Landcare Network, the national organization for the landscaping industry, to be a student ambassador for the 2010 Green Industry Conference.

UMD pharmacy student Rena Lettsome was selected to serve as a member of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy StuNet Advisory Committee for 2010-11.

Civil engineering graduate student Keith Palmer is the winner of the 2010 George D. Nasser Award given by the Precast/Prestressed Concrete Institute for his paper “Factors Affecting Web-shear Capacity of Deep Hollow-Core Units.” The paper was co-authored with his advisor, Arturo Schultz, civil engineering.

Steven Schmidt, law school, is this year’s recipient of the Minnesota Justice Foundation (MJF) Law Student Volunteer Award for the University of Minnesota. MJF selects one student from each Minnesota law school each year to receive the award.

Pharmacy student Nick Schutz was selected to serve as a member of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy (ACCP) Organizational Affairs Committee for 2010-11. The committee will advise how ACCP might play a key role in the development, implementation, evaluation and dissemination of clinical decision support systems and their applications.

UMD senior Jonas Swedberg, mechanical and industrial engineering, won third place in the 2010 ASME Student Mechanism & Robot Design Competition for his “path finding track vehicle.”

UMM teams “Reptilian Agenda” and “Magical Flying Carp” placed first and sixth out of sixteen teams at the 2010 Digi-Key Collegiate Computing Competition. The event sponsor, Digi-Key, is an international distributor of electronic components serving a broad range of industries.

A team from the college of food, agriculture, and natural resources sciences placed second (behind UW Madison) in the 90th Intercollegiate Dairy Cattle Judging Contest. Representing the U of M were Megan Herberg, Caitlin Kasper, Mikayla Krause, and Abby Udermann. Individually, Herberg was third individual overall, Kasper was fourth overall and Udermann was seventh overall.

A team from the Carlson School took home third place from the National Association of Women MBAs (NAW MBA) Case Competition. The students worked on a live case for a non-profit organization, taking into account culture dynamics. Specifically, the case revolved around building a five-year strategy program for high school students in the Navajo community to graduate and move on to secondary education. Members of the team include MBA students Esra Kucukciiftci, Huyen Le, Minh Ha Pham, and Elizabeth Woodwick.

The U of M college of pharmacy student team, made up of Camille Beauduy, Ramy Elshaboury, and Lacy Ternes, won the first annual American College of Clinical Pharmacy Clinical Pharmacy Challenge. The competition, with an original slate of 94 teams, included a rapid fire
round, clinical case round, and a jeopardy-format round involving topics such as infectious diseases, oncology, biostatistics, and endocrinology.

A team of Master of Urban and Regional Planning students won a 2010 American Planning Association Minnesota Student Planning Award for the “Opus Station Area Sustainable Development Plan.” Their project seeks to balance economic vitality, environmental and resource conservation, and community well-being for the proposed Southwest Light Rail Transit line that will run from downtown Minneapolis to Eden Prairie.

UMM music majors Donovan Hanson, Matthew Torgerso, and Alexandra Weber were honored by the Music Educators’ National Organization (MENC) with its Professional Achievement Award. The three were chosen for exemplary chapter activities and member achievements, serving as role models for other collegiate chapters, and recognizing their contributions to the music education profession.

The University of Minnesota, Morris women’s golf team won their second straight Upper Midwest Athletic Conference title on October 2. The Cougars shot a 366 in the final round of the three-day tournament, and won the title by 102 strokes.