Although, as one of the associate deans suggested, the survey may reflect nothing more specific than a generalized opinion of the University, the survey may have a secondary outcome of influencing the public’s opinion. If so, then the specifics presented to the respondent matter and a balanced reference to the many professional components of the University (not just medical school, but also engineering, law, etc.) seems appropriate. If you are concerned about the survey length, a randomized selection could be used.

Some of the language seems dated. Using 4-H for outreach services for example is very narrow, given the reach of the U’s land grant mission into many aspects of both urban and rural life, statewide, and even internationally.

The items seem specific to the Twin Cities campus. Highlights or focus of the other campuses (UMM sustainability, for example) would be worthwhile, unless they are surveyed separately.

Instead, or perhaps in addition to, a question of general feelings toward the U, we would argue for a question that approaches impact, such as “How has the university touched your life, or the life of your family?”

The goals of the university for education are stated broadly (high quality, good value) but the research goals are stately narrowly and very specific (top 3, discovering cures). We think there should be more parallel in how the separate goals (education, research) are handled.

There also seems to be a mix between questions that elicit performance vs attainment – “Providing a high-quality education” (performance) vs “Being one of the top . . .” (attainment) or “Being a good manager” (attainment) vs “managing financial resources effectively” (performance)

Graduate education does not seem to be included in any context. The education questions (funding, jobs) seemed target to undergraduate. One of the problems we have as an institution is the public’s lack of understanding of the importance, contributions, and distinctiveness of graduate education.

“Education at the UMN is mostly paid by 2 sources: state taxes and student tuition” – that is true for undergraduate education & should be stated as such.

Item 8 under Public funding the Driven to Discover campaign – the 4 randomized items (cures, solutions, economy, education) should be expanded to include reference to quality of life, arts, culture, etc.

Item 9, same subheading, West Nile & avian flu are very specific, and how were zoonotic diseases selected over, renewable energy or higher crop yields, for instance? Again, these could be randomized alternatives.

Under demographics, why were the questions on “aspirin use” asked?