



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

ALL UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 30, 1982
12:45 - 3:00 p.m.
626 Campus Club

AGENDA

1. Fix agenda.
2. Minutes and Conversation of September 16 (enclosed)
3. Report of the Chair (enclosed).
4. Report of the Student Chair (oral).
5. Committee Reports:
 Finance (Sundquist).
6. Monitoring University-industry policy development (Freier).
7. Report of Task Force on Human Services.
8. (Assembly Steering Committee). Discussion paper
 on student pay plans (Lenander).



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition Building
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 10/7/82

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

September 30, 1982
1:00-2:30, 626 Coffman Union

Members present: Ronald Bonaguidi, Virginia Fredricks, Phyllis Freier, Dawn Hull, Barry Hogen, Anne Hunt, Julie Iverson, Dennis Kronebusch, Dave Lenander, Rick Linden, Marv Mattson, W. D. Spring, W. B. Sundquist, Pat Swan (Chair), John Turner, Vernis Ziegelmann.

Guests: Maureen Smith, Don Jacobson, Julie Bates.

Professor Swan welcomed the new student SCC members, who introduced themselves: Ronald Bonaguidi, Crookston, and Dawn Hull (rep.) and Vernis Ziegelmann (alt.), Duluth.

1. The agenda was approved without change.
2. The minutes and record of conversation of September 16 were approved with one correction: the total Senate Budget award to the Summer Sessions Committee is \$470 (top of p. 2 in Minutes).
3. Report of the Chair. Pat Swan.
 - a. Managing the circulating file. Professor Swan requested that materials to be included be given to the secretary before the meeting, so it will be clear what materials everyone has had an opportunity to see. Because the file contains our only copy of most of its contents, it will circulate only at the meeting. It will be returned for the next meeting when necessary.
 - b. The SCC meeting of October 7 will be preceeded by a social hour. SCC members present on September 30 filled out short information sheets about themselves which will be copied and distributed in the next meeting packet.
4. Report of the Student Chair. Dave Lenander.
 - a. The Student SCC will review what appears to be the existing Constitution of the Student Senate.
 - b. Naming student representatives to the Board of Regents is a heavy burden on the Student SCC. Lenander would like to see the system changed.
 - c. The Edwin O. Siggelkow fall leadership retreat will take place the week-end of October 8-10, with many MSA and SCC members participating.

Julie Iverson extended the students' cordial invitation to all FCC members to attend any part of the retreat, and particularly the Friday night dinner. Professor John Turner will address a session on Saturday.

d. The document "Student Involvement in Collegiate Planning," compiled by the Office of Student Affairs, will circulate in the file on October 7. The document "University of Minnesota Student Pay Rates Discussion Paper" will be copied and included in the October 7 packet.

5. Committee Reports: Senate Finance Committee.

Professor Sundquist reported that the SFC held its first meeting of the 1982-83 year on September 23. Four meetings per quarter are scheduled; there will be more or fewer as needed.

On September 23 Vice President Keller outlined and commented on the 1983 biennial budget request. The Finance Committee felt strongly that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs should give attention to the issue of the three-part faculty salary increase proposal.

Vice President Keller asked the SFC to address as a future agenda item mechanisms for increasing flexibility in reallocation of funds in support of programmatic priorities.

The committee identified five continuing items for this year's agenda:

- a. monitoring the implementation of programmatic retrenchment and reallocations agreed upon for each collegiate unit;
- b. financial implications of the Rajender consent decree;
- c. tuition policy at the University and the legislature;
- d. policies with respect to funds held centrally or by collegiate units;
- e. guidelines on faculty workloads, especially as they relate to cost efficiency. SFC hopes not to work only from pre-determined data and questions but also to give the subject some creative thought.

Possible new agenda items include attention to "inloading" in terms of effective use of University resources, programmatic planning, and faculty compensation.

Professor Sundquist repeated Professor Spring's remarks to the SFC on the need for caution in posing "illustrations" of possible financial alternatives. The examples the University cited last winter when it faced the threat of a \$57 million cut from its biennial appropriation included the possibility of closing a coordinate campus. Publicizing that example appears to have had a lingering effect. Professor Spring told the Consultative Committee that the mode of hypothesis is not understood by the general public, including high school counselors. Morris suffered a large drop in inquiries about the college, while receiving numerous queries about its "closing" in the three months following the announcement. Morris's enrollment dropped significantly this fall.

Professor Swan observed that the question of how to demonstrate what the consequences for the University would be of catastrophic budget cuts produced the greatest disagreement in discussions last year. The University refused to comply outright with the governor's order to submit a plan on how it would take a \$57 million cut; the Finance Committee encouraged the administration to give examples of the kinds of cuts and eliminations which it would have to inflict.

Mr. Hogen suggested such illustrations can bring about the end they are intended to prevent by causing periodic drops which eventually make Morris so small people will believe it should be closed. Professor Turner observed that the studies showing the high quality of the Morris program work in its favor, since preserving quality is a criterion in program prioritizing.

Mr. Ziegelmann asked some general questions about the budgeting process. He wondered just who determines campus budgets and whether they are determined on a percentage basis. Present and past Finance Committee members present explained that percentage is not the basis. Professor Spring explained that the University determines incremental and decremental changes to the established budgets every two years for the request to the legislature. The Budget Executive, which constructs the budget, is in direct contact with the provosts and the deans, and in consultation with the Senate Finance Committee. Professors Spring, Swan and Sundquist said that enrollment changes are not immediately reflected in the budgets, but that the University tries to provide funds to meet unexpected enrollment bulges. Over time, if a program's enrollment continues to decline, or a program is identified for phasing out or down, its budget will decline.

Professor Turner stated that an effort was begun in 1979 to make University planning direct the budget decisions. He recalled increases scheduled in at that time to assist UMD's Business Administration program which was growing rapidly.

6. Monitoring University-industry relationships.

Professor Freier noted that many faculty members have opinions about the issue and that there is much wider experience in the faculty about these problems than will be represented on the task force. She recommended a communication to alert the faculty to the task force work getting underway to develop the University's policy. She suggested a letter from Vice President Keller to all faculty members announcing the formation of the task force and the target dates in its work, and inviting those who wished to testify to the committee. She noted that most members of the Physics faculty have been there long enough to have witnessed drastic changes resulting from the steep growth of federal funding.

Discussion turned to the most effective means to reach the faculty. Brief is a successful medium for broadcasting information. Maureen Smith, editor of Brief, indicated that the news sheet could certainly carry the announcement. Professor Freier agreed in addition to discuss with Vice President Keller, on behalf of the SCC, what he has in mind for public communication on the task force's establishment.

7. The Report of the Task Force on Human Services has been officially transmitted to the Consultative Committee (see below).

8. Student pay plans. At Vice President Wilderson's request, reported Mr. Lenander, the staff of the Office of Student Affairs prepared a discussion paper on five options for pay plans. It has been circulated for comment to MSA and other groups, and has implications for the coordinate campuses as well as the Twin Cities campus. Mr. Lenander will request the Twin Cities Campus Assembly Steering Committee to refer the paper to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs for comment (there being no Senate Committee on Student Affairs).

It was moved, seconded, and voted without dissent to postpone discussion on agenda items 7 and 8 to the meeting of October 7 when the SCC members can have the relevant materials.

9. Other new business: P/A class participation in the Senate. Mr. Lenander pointed out that, in the light of Vice President Keller's announcement that all future library appointments would be in P/A categories, and the fact that the same has become true for the Office of Student Affairs and for Continuing Education and Extension (excepting its adjunct faculty), the proposal brought to the SCC for information last spring providing P/A employees eligibility for standing for election and voting for Senators, but not as counting in determining the number of Senators to which a unit was entitled, will result in no Senate representation from those three units when the current generation of faculty in those units have retired. Mr. Lenander argues that those are groups with a legitimate claim to Senate membership.

Professor Swan urged Mr. Lenander to write his concern to the Committee on Business and Rules, which is collecting different perspectives on the question.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant,
Senate Consultative Committee



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
164 Food Science and Nutrition
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
Telephone (612)373-3226

Report of the Chair for September 30, 1982.

1. Phyllis Freier will make a recommendation on how central administration can move to invite faculty participation in the development of University-industry research relationships policy.

2. Human Services - academic organization. The report of the task force was circulated at the September 16 meeting and will be available again on the 30th. We need to decide if we wish to refer this report to SCEP and if there is any other consultation that should occur on it.

3. The discussion paper on student pay plans will also again be in the circulating file. Vice President Wilderson has asked for comment on it. Dave Lenander will move the Assembly Steering Committee steer the paper to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs for study and comment.

Report of the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee to SFC on September 30, 1982

An initial 1982-83 meeting of the SFC was held on Thursday, September 23. An additional eleven meetings have been scheduled (see attachment).

Don Spring commented that discussion of the kind of alternatives which were mentioned in the event that the University had to take a \$57 million cut (earlier in this biennium) had adverse impacts on Fall, 1982 enrollment at Morris. Thus, extreme future caution is important even when financial alternatives are posed only as "illustrations".

Vice President Keller outlined the 1983 biennial budget request and indicated that increases were smaller, percentage-wise, than for other units of higher education in the State and that increases were strongly justified by back up data on planning and priorities from collegiate units. Also, the University can cite specific administrative actions already taken in support of the budget proposals. He suggested that the committee address (as a future agenda item) mechanisms for increasing flexibility in reallocation of funds in support of programmatic priorities. He explained the reasons why a specific item for faculty salaries had not yet been developed. Suggestions were made to develop alternative terminology to "uncontrollable expenditures" which might be more quickly comprehended by legislators and others. Finally, suggestions were made that the Committee on Faculty Affairs should give attention to the issue of dividing faculty salary increases into categories for merit, retention and specialty groups.

The following items were identified as carry over items for future committee agendas:

1. Monitoring of the Implementation of Programmatic R & R's agreed on for individual collegiate units.
2. Financial implications of the Rajender Consent Decree
3. Tuition policy at the University and the Legislature
4. Policies with respect to funds held centrally (or by collegiate units)
5. Guidelines on faculty workloads, particularly as they relate to cost efficiency. We may want to initiate some thinking on this topic rather than just responding to questions and/or assessing predetermined data sets.

A request was made for new agenda items and the following one was suggested by Rubenstein: How does one proceed to view the process of "inloading"? Among the issues are a) effective use of University resources, b) programmatic planning and c) faculty compensation. Other agenda items are invited.

WBS
9/30/82

Tentative Meeting Schedule, Senate Finance Committee, 1982-83

September 23	Regents Room
October 21	202-206 St. Paul Student Center
November 4	606 Campus Club
December 2	606 Campus Club
January 6	Regents Room
January 20	606 Campus Club
February 3	Regents Room
March 3	Regents Room
March 31	606 Campus Club
April 14	Regents Room
April 28	606 Campus Club
June 2	606 Campus Club

All meetings scheduled for 3-5 p.m.

Differing Values in Academia and Industry

Many universities are examining searchingly their relations with industry. The basic reason is financial. The academic community is nervous about federal funding of research. Some universities report that they have retained a satisfactory level of support, but half or more have not. Apprehension about federal support has been coupled with other financial problems of the universities brought on by recession and inflation.

In this environment it has become fashionable to look to industry as a possible source of funds. Already a number of universities have entered into contracts involving substantial sums, and additional arrangements will doubtless follow. In general, industry has not been devoting a sufficient sum to basic research within its own laboratories or elsewhere. It was treated to a lesson when a large number of companies were caught flat-footed by academic developments in molecular biology. Other sectors of industry have become concerned about future supplies of personnel trained in computer-related fields.

Despite an apparent basis for close cooperation between academia and industry, the likely outcome is far from a cure-all for the financial ills of the universities. The money spent by industry at universities is unlikely to top 10 percent of the federal funds they now receive. Close cooperation between universities and industry could lead to harmful tensions induced by competing value systems. Universities already have their share of such differences. The humanists look down on the engineers and vice versa; the various science departments usually have little interaction. However, the faculty share common goals in the pursuit of knowledge and in fostering the education of the young. Most of the faculty place these goals above that of attaining personal wealth.

The value system and the mode of conducting research and development in industry are quite different from those of academia. To survive, a company must make a profit. It must evolve with the changing times. And it must be well managed, with a clearly defined chain of command. The bankruptcy courts are very busy these days. Only the strong and nimble remain viable.

In industry, the pressure of the bottom line inevitably dictates policies with respect to R & D. The goal is not pursuit of knowledge; it is the attaining of proprietary advantage. Accordingly, research results obtained at industrial laboratories often go unpublished or are released slowly in the patent literature. In the university, fast publication of scientific findings is eagerly sought. Much of the activity in industry is conducted by interdisciplinary teams whose members are arbitrarily assigned to tasks. Projects may be suddenly terminated. Only a favored few in the typical industrial laboratory have the privilege of personally choosing a research area and sticking with it through discouraging phases of effort. This frenetic tempo is incompatible with the tempo of graduate training in the natural sciences. In their thesis research, it is essential that students pursue a line of inquiry patiently and in depth.

These examples of differing values and procedures make it obvious that close collaboration between academia and industry is likely to create new problems and tensions. That is not to say that cooperation is undesirable. One time-tested method of cooperation is that of consultation, preferably conducted off-campus. Professors spend at most an average of a day a week at this. They bring their expertise to industry and in turn learn of new developments and new job opportunities for their students.

However, some of the new arrangements between universities and industry come close to inserting an industrial enclave into the campus. It would be unfortunate if such examples were carelessly multiplied. Rather, emphasis should be placed on avoiding relationships that might damage the universities and their ability to carry out well their essential functions of undergraduate and graduate education.—PHILIP H. ABELSON