



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

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

MINUTES

APPROVED 6/16/83

JOINT SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE / SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER AND ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT PERLMUTTER

Saturday, May 14, 1983
1:45 - 5:35 p.m.
Regents Room, Morrill Hall

SCC members present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe, J. Iverson, A. Hunt, R. Linden, D. Lenander, M. Mattson, D. Pratt, W. D. Spring, B. Sundquist, P. Swan (Chr.), J. Turner, K. Watson.

SFC members present: M. Gorlin, H. Kabat, G. Klement, W. Johnson, P. Schulte, T. Scott, (W. D. Spring, B. Sundquist, Chr.), A. Zahareas.

Guests: V. P. Keller, Assoc. V. P. Linck, Ass't. V. P. for Health Sciences Perlmutter, Rick Bale, Maureen Smith.

AGENDA: To consider the plans submitted by the University's three largest units, the Medical School, CLA, and IT.

SCC Chair Pat Swan convened the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

Vice President Keller said he would prefer not to discuss the Institute of Technology plan because that unit is going to grow rather than be cut and because there are additional matters he wanted to talk about. Swan said the committees had other sorts of questions about IT's plans.

1. V. P. Keller announced the administration's decision on where to take the \$3 million cut imposed by the state last December. The state informed the University this month that if the University did not decide within about two days where it would take that cut permanently, the state would simply take it from the O&M budget. Central administration decided to move most of the cut into the state specials to relieve pressure on the O&M. (The cut for FY 1981-82 was applied both to the specials and to the O&M.) The University has used prioritization to distribute the cuts in the specials, which are absorbing \$838,000 of the cut.

Keller added that the University can make further adjustments by working with the Legislature's anticipated 5% run-up in the '83-'85 University appropriation.

He distributed two pages of data, "Base Reduction Specials O&M 1982-83" showing gross Health Science and Academic Affairs figures, and "Base Reductions for Academic Affairs Specials 1982-83" listing figures for each of 19 specials.

Swan asked what effort there is to integrate and direct planning in units funded largely through specials. Keller said there is some joining in planning; he has been encouraging it. Specials which are seed money grants of course relate to planning. The units with the largest proportions of specials are Agriculture and the University Hospitals.

Keller was asked if he looks at the program of a relatively independent unit such as the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs. He said he looks at the extent to which they are supporting faculty and students. Swan recalled that within the Industrial Relations Center it had not been clear whether the planning criteria were to be applied to certain units. Keller told the committees the University sometimes has little or no choice to reduce a special because the Legislature will force it on the University. Overall, specials are staying about the same. Some get folded into the O&M budget and new ones get added. Of the \$270 million appropriation, \$40 million is for legislative specials (annually).

2. HEALTH SCIENCES PLANS.

Assistant Vice President Cherie Perlmutter distributed draft plan summaries for three units: the Medical School, Pharmacy, the School of Nursing.

A. MEDICAL SCHOOL. The Medical School's plan includes no personnel summary. Not all consultation with and within the Medical School has been completed.

\$1.5 million of the \$2 million retrenchment was described as across-the-board, with the basic sciences retrenching 4% and the clinical units 12%. The other \$0.5 million is in programmatic reductions.

Programmatic.

(1) Reduce class size in Medical Technology Program. Applications have declined. School will look again in about four years; wants to retain the possibility of re-enlarging at a later date.

(2) Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation training program. Some functions have been reduced because of the loss of long range training grants. We will be rethinking how large it should be within the Medical School, taking into consideration its services to the undergraduate medical students.

(3) Phase D, clinical education. Since the Medical School pays on a per capita basis for students placed outside the University Hospitals, it will do fewer of those out-placements. The result will be less costly, but also, for the students, less broad.

(4) University Hospital Tumor Registry. Drop support for this item which dates from the early days of the "War on Cancer."

Reallocation, internal shifts, coordination across the University.

There will be reallocation to the basic sciences, including Microbiology and the programs of neuroscience and human genetics.

Swan said one can see evidence in the plan of thinking in terms of current importance and areas of breakthrough. But are there not on the other hand areas

where inevitably there will be less emphasis? What happens to that which becomes passé or developed to a point where it is ready to be integrated in a new way?

Perlmutter said that since the dean is opposed to starting up new departments where there are new advances, change is a result of the faculty's changing thinking and expertise. Faculty may regroup as, for example, with the number of physiologists developing the neurosciences sector.

One department, she said, retains three chemists the department has grown away from. Their program isn't needed. Rather, we need to retrain them. Turner asked how long the three have been suffering from the change in leadership (which shifted the direction of the department) and how they are being used now. Perlmutter said she has not known of the situation long enough to be able to answer. The faculty are near to early-retirement options. Turner asked if the redundancy situation is idiosyncratic or common in the health sciences. Perlmutter said she thought this was an unusual situation. Swan asked why this situation isn't dealt with up-front? Perlmutter said each department will determine in its own way its share of the across-the-board cut.

Pratt stated a concern about integration and administrative structure of similar programs. Anatomy's emphasis on the cell biological approach has considerable overlap with programs in the College of Biological Sciences. He pointed to Microbiology as one of the better models regarding integration. You don't want to restrain scientists in the basic sciences from doing the best job they see as needing to be done and are doing, for example, in cell anatomy.

Keller said the University's commitment to CBS when the college was established was not complete and was never established in its entirety. To change the structure would jeopardize the academic freedom of the researchers. He called this a major planning question which has not yet been addressed.

Perlmutter said Biochemistry and Genetics are the two areas the administration is addressing in terms of University response. A task force is examining the common denominators of the two biochemistry programs. Genetics as a program was identified in 1979 and in the First Planning Cycle. There is a plan to recruit a director and integrate the genetics program, but it has not moved very far.

Turner asked whether, when a new chair comes, it is common for him to be able to fill four or five faculty positions. Perlmutter said that is just not possible now. Sometimes people are shifted internally to meet the needs of the research program of a new chair coming in. Turner asked if such infusions will be handled by internal reallocation.

Keller said there is general broad agreement Microbiology will get a new infusion with the new head. The decision about reallocation to the unit is one for central administration.

Sundquist explained that the committees are bothered by meeting the term "across-the-board" after all the emphasis on programmatic planning. Perlmutter reminded SCC and SFC that each Medical School department must exist in the integrated program. Each department will decide for itself how to take its percentage cut.

Swan noted that while Health Sciences have made the judgment that each department will be treated equally, in fact they intend to give money back to at least one department (Microbiology).

Fredricks asked whether the ultimate plan will indicate what the college and departmental plans were, and Perlmutter said they would; the Health Sciences plan was made up from the individual plans.

Howe asked whether the decisions have been made on who will have net losses and net gains and also how much flow there will be across college boundaries. Perlmutter answered that they are looking in the planning process at University-wide priorities, and Keller added we are considering all of the college plans. There are no decisions yet on the overall plan for dollars within Health Sciences.

Lenander asked how much the units intend to make up their cuts by adding new research projects. Perlmutter said it varies and some units have a better opportunity than others to do that.

Gorlin asked whether matching residencies is a criterion but not an overriding one, and Perlmutter answered yes.

Swan reported that two Medical School professors have indicated anger because the dean took to the vice president his recommendations, which were different from the Planning Committee's. Perlmutter corrected that impression. We did see the planning committee's statement, she said. The School does have a plan although not everything is worked out. Not everyone is playing by the same rules, she said. The Planning Committee wants to differentiate and have one unit take a larger proportion of the cut than the rest of the School. The dean has a different viewpoint on how that ought to be done. The School's long range planning committee meets again on May 17.

Swan remarked that if the planning committee could make one distinction among the 16 clinical and 6 basic science departments, varying greatly in size, it could make others. Howe added that many units in the University are making hard choices between their programs and that the Consultative Committee believes it is in the best interests of the University for that to be done in as many units as possible. Perlmutter said we share that attitude.

Turner asked what proportion of UMD medical entrants go into family practice. Perlmutter said 80%, but that she could not say how many go into rural locations.

B. SCHOOL OF PHARMACY.

Programmatic.

- (1) Setting aside development of Nuclear Medicine.
- (2) Supporting the S&E budget which is in deficit: high priority.
- (3) Slating Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy for reallocation and mergers.
- (4) Planning other administrative mergers and enrollment limits.

Turner asked where the greatest research funds are. Perlmutter said they are in Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy. Medicinal Chemistry has been the School's flagship and the intent is to protect it. It will not be cut back.

Nuclear Medicine program, said Dr. Kabat, has not had time to become fully established. He thinks there is the potential to do something very good here, but they are retrenching it to protect other very good programs.

Turner inquired about the Pharm. D. program. Perlmutter said it continues to grow and stay healthy. The college has decided generally its program should be a Pharm. D. program with a strong clinical component, although some of the faculty still believe what that provides is beyond what the community needs. Pharm D. has been an option since 1972. Initially the Medical School took the 12 students a year for the clinical portion of the program, and the Medical School still takes a total of 24 Pharmacy students while Pharmacy provides a similar clinical experience for the rest of the Pharm. D. students. Kabat added that the cost per student is higher for the graduate students than for the professional degree program.

He noted that Pharmacy has found it can reduce its yearly telephone service by \$15,000.

Howe asked for some clarification on the use of the word 'program'. The Medical School calls its undergraduate degree a 'program' and its graduate degree a 'program'. Perlmutter defined a single, integrated program as one to which a degree comes. Howe stressed that nevertheless each is made up of components, which Perlmutter acknowledged saying the point was well taken.

Kabat said Pharmacy's undergraduate faculty also teach the graduate students and that the college would need those faculty as part of the critical mass to support the remaining program even if it dropped the graduate program. We are doing a cross linkage and attempting to improve our critical mass, he said.

Fredricks raised these questions: Do we need this number to teach well? Is it a programmatic change to let someone go? Are programmatic shifts made as retirements occur? Lenander asked if accreditation is an issue? Kabat said it is. The Association comes every six years to be sure the college is offering the whole required curriculum. Swan added that schools meet their accrediting requirements in different ways.

Turner asked if there is yet a glut of pharmacists. Kabat said the market is pretty healthy, especially for the Pharm. D.'s, although distribution is a problem.

Perlmutter said, regarding the question of shifting resources from clinical sciences to basic sciences, that in Pharmacy the clinical part of the education is much more important. But, as Kabat added, Pharmacy has a number of volunteer clinical advisers and the clinical faculty has 50% of its support from research funds.

Swan asked about response to inquiries in Health Sciences on shifting from A to B appointments. Perlmutter said all faculty were asked. The change can only be made on a volunteer basis. Three faculty have requested it.

SCHOOL OF NURSING.

Turner asked whether, as the School moves into more graduate work, it is enriching its research resources compared to 1979. Perlmutter said the School is both getting there and has a long way to go. In 1972 it received no research grant money; last year it had \$232,000. About 20 faculty members have grants. The activity is reflected in publications. Also, we are attracting two superstars to the School who are bringing research programs with them (one's research is in Nursing, one's in Physiology).

Turner asked if it is possible in the Health Sciences now, especially in the Medical School, for a person on soft money to get tenure? Perlmutter said it is, but that the School has to cover the dollar amount of the salary. Turner recommended that in a retrenchment period the unit's own reallocation funds be used to harden up soft money positions rather than taking money for that purpose from other parts of the University.

In conclusion to this discussion on Health Sciences' plans, Swan asked Perlmutter to tell Vice President Vanselow that the SCC and SFC look for evidence of retrenchment other than across-the-board, and that the phrase makes the committee members nervous.

3. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS RETRENCHMENT ITEMS BY COLLEGE.

Vice President Keller distributed sets of spread sheets. (The sheets, one page per college, list programmatic items, non-programmatic items, dollars per item, amount available 6/30/83, amount available 6/30/84, and amount unavailable 1983-85. Each sheet also shows the unit's base budget and retrenchment.) The sheet breaks out the dollar figures a unit says it could retrench. This use of the figures does not mean Academic Affairs has accepted either the figures or the plan.

The sum of what is listed as available in the next fiscal year totals about \$2 million. Keller said we think we have to actually get that to \$3 million. Gorlin asked where central administration will get the other million. Keller said not all units are yet represented in the totals. No one is going to be cut more, he said. Some units will be hit in part across-the-board.

We think there is a good faith effort and that units are working in a programmatic way, he told the committees.

A. IT PLAN.

Academic Affairs has not accepted the IT plan submitted. However, some parts of it go in the right direction.

Swan said there are things in the plan that disturb us. She first asked, who identifies areas of research as "program" areas and how are they identified? What expertise is needed to answer these questions? She has assumed the department faculty make some recommendations; it takes some convincing to persuade one that the dean or faculty of other departments are in a better position to judge.

Keller said he also believes it should be done by the department's own faculty but that the faculty (in the department alluded to) have refused to exercise that responsibility. They say they cannot distinguish one program from another. He called it a stonewalling process, and said they do make those distinctions in hiring. In other units, he said, far superior faculty protect mediocre faculty because they do not want to surrender power. The faculty do not have the right not to distinguish stronger from weaker programs, he said.

Sundquist commented that a college faculty planning committee may find itself unable to prioritize. Keller remarked that when faculty and student groups will not make the decision it is unfair to criticize another level in the University for then making the decision.

Swan and Howe said letters from the units should record the level at which the decision was made and why it was made there. Keller said the record does not show that as much as it should.

Swan asked whether the record shows to what extent the Chemistry Department has been consulted (regarding cutting 3 non-research faculty). She and Sundquist said they do not see in the plan how Chemistry will staff its courses, especially the basic service courses on which so many other units rely. The plan needs to say how they will accomplish their workload with the reductions they are electing to take.

Vice President said the record does not show what consultation took place, but added he would inquire about it. Swan asked whether Keller considers consulting with the department head to provide sufficient faculty input? Keller said in this round it does not. He did have a two-hour meeting with an IT consulting group; it occurred during spring break and only about one-third of the members attended.

Swan said it is important that the record show who participated, and what questions were raised. The Consultative Committee is concerned about the kind and amount of consultation that has occurred.

Fredricks commented it could well be true that a department has not been consulted on the ultimate college plan but that the college could still judge priorities.

Turner addressed the general problem of declining resources. Cuts must be made. SCC has opted for shaving weaker programs as opposed to taking across-the-board cuts. Some units have taken the exercise seriously and can as a consequence improve, while some units play games and do not take the charge seriously. By and large, he said, the planning process is working out and will help the University over the next four to five years. Departments have many options from which they can choose what fits best to their units. We have to pay attention to the instances of sabotaging. In some cases, some faculty members are saying things that aren't true. In some cases a unit administration might not have engaged in the necessary activities. It is significant that IT, cut the least (zero) and probably getting the biggest reallocation, cannot make the necessary decisions and choices. We have to face the problems we now have, he said, or we're done for as a respectable research University.

DEFINITION OF 'PROGRAM'.

Howe said he found in the IT plan some planned reduction for which there seemed no programmatic basis. One professor, who has not been doing research, is to be retrenched; the funds are to be shifted to another program where a professor will do some research. He said that approach seems to be changing the rules of what is meant by 'program'.

Keller said there is flexibility in the definition of 'program' but that we must make sure not to slip and consider an individual instead of a program. Some IT departments cost more to operate and do less teaching. We can identify a department and say on the basis of its total activity it is overstaffed for what it delivers.

Johnson said that the Physics department doesn't identify its areas of undergraduate study as 'programs'. The research areas are the department's 'programs'. Hence, what might look non-programmatic to some is what they regard as programmatic. Furthermore, people shift their research focus.

Swan gave the perspective of another department. We judge what courses we need, and we can talk about the productivity of research. But we back off from questions of what research is central to the field because that treads on academic freedom.

Keller told the committees the voluntary situation can provide us with broad flexibility. A faculty member may have support for research dropped because it is sub-critical for achievement, and can go on to teach beyond his or her own narrow specialty. But, whenever that person leaves, we do not fill the vacancy.

WORKLOAD DATA BASES.

Lenander said he has understood in the past that decisions are made on the basis of teaching load and research productivity, and he asked Keller if they are studying relative loads a lot. Keller said they are, but not with the intention of making the loads uniform. He studies the data closely and reads the explanations as to why the faculty time should be spent as it is. He is interested in all the ways and time a person spends in didactic teaching and in research productivity (M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s produced, grants received), to compare with like departments. If a comparison shows grave differences we have to examine the data again to see what factors we may have overlooked.

Kabat said individual units may encounter errors in their workload data base. For example, Pharmacy discovered errors with a factor of two. Keller said he wants to know of those discoveries. They are not using those data in any formulaic way, he said.

Howe said it is very important to the legitimacy of the process that our decisions be programmatically grounded and explained, as we have been saying since we began this planning process several years ago. Plans that do not do that are grievously inadequate.

Sundquist said the SFC is not in a good position to evaluate data bases other than those of any member's unit. Swan and Keller explained that the data base for each unit went to that unit's dean along with an aggregate of the bases of all the other units. Both also went to the planning groups with which Keller met. Sundquist recommended urging deans to publicize the data. Faculty hear that data bases are being used but do not know what they are. Keller reported that he has had over 50 individual meetings, totaling over 100 hours, with individual units, working to get such messages out.

SAVINGS THROUGH REORGANIZATIONS?

Lenander asked how all the needed money can be realized within the biennium given the colleges' varying abilities to take planned cuts within a few years. He asked whether the colleges are organized in the best way for achieving savings; e.g., could University College be combined with General College and CEE? Keller indicated that indeed programs which are valuable in themselves may not be usefully aggregated at present. For example, UMD includes very small colleges (one of 12, one of 24, faculty); Forestry is very small. It is worth our continuing to consider other aggregations of units, he said.

DEANS' PERFORMANCES. Turner asked Keller if central administration is at a disadvantage because of having to rely on its deans to communicate to the

faculty. He asked if merit increases are given to deans. Keller replied yes; deans' increases vary from about half the average to about 150% of the average.

OVERALL PRIORITIES AND VULNERABILITY.

Fredricks asked about protecting the essentials of the University. Keller said he thinks the professional schools, not being integrated with other programs, are more vulnerable to elimination. Other considerations for preservation are quality, uniqueness in the state, and importance in terms of access to the University. We have to look at the individual program to find out where it is on the scale. At the top of the scale would be an integrated program which is at the core of the University's mission, such as Agriculture. The University's mission has lots of pieces to it.

Any organizing principle, he said, might rationally omit certain units for which we have in fact good reason to retain, e.g., Child Development, which has a high national reputation.

Fredricks asked if the governor's priorities become an overriding priority of the University. Keller said no, but that on the other hand we do not turn our backs on the state's needs as, for example, for high tech.

Keller said where a unit has good plans but the savings are indicated as unavailable between 1983 and 1985, we'll try to help them achieve their plans as soon as possible. We don't want to interfere with a well-defined programmatic process. But where we see no clear indication why the money might not be available within 1983-85, or any indication of when it would be available, we will try to get a change in the plan.

"Unavailability" reasons include tenured faculty lines and inloading plans, among others.

Lenander recalled IT's 1981-82 program priorities statement as containing a warning to Chemistry that it was ripe for retrenchment. Therefore, he said, if people slated for cuts are surprised, we should find out why.

B. CLA PLAN.

(1) Eliminate the Library School.

(2) Move the dollars and credit hours of the School of Social Work to the College of Home Economics.

(3) Reduce the scope of some programs. There are programs which are overstaffed for what they now deliver. Options include buy-outs, which save some money, and transfers of effort. Transfers are a good way of retaining and stabilizing a program which is very small but which you want to keep. He said cross-listing of courses and joint appointments also work to stabilize a program. Howe cautioned that existing joint appointments are collapsing and Keller said we have to work to make those stay.

Keller said he believes the University has an overriding commitment to the minority programs and that central administration favors transfer of effort here. We are more favorably inclined toward them than toward programs which have

had the opportunity for graduate research and haven't availed themselves of it (e.g., the language faculty of South Asian and Southwest Asian Studies, which graduate reviews show to have been lakadasical).

Howe cautioned the administration to be careful in transferring effort that people don't get pulled completely away from their main area. Keller agreed, saying we don't want this process to lead to the elimination of those programs.

Fredricks asked what the administration will do about the young tenured faculty involved in some of the programs scheduled for reduction. Keller said CLA will have to move more forcefully on inloading and on not filling open lines (a non-programmatic saving). He said there are many soft money centers that don't appear in the plan. We'll ask them if they can run on less for a few years. The programs that show up here for reduction are those which have not been significantly affected by retrenchments of the last three to four years. He said he believes CLA has a history of programmatic planning.

Scott asked whether, if there is an all-University obligation to retain the minority program, the financing of them is an all-University obligation? This seems to have a parallel in the decision on the Library School.

Keller said we have to hold colleges to priorities which depend not only on their own interests but also on the value of their programs to the University. We look at programs across the University which colleges say now are of low priority to see if some of them are of higher University priority. So also in reallocation we will consider the all-University perspective as well as the college perspective. He told SCC/SFC that he thinks if we had judged the Library School to be high among the University's priorities, we would have insisted the college continue to support it.

Swan announced the SCC would save some time at its Thursday, May 19 meeting for more discussion on the CLA plan, as well as a look at the Morris Campus plan.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant