



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 5/19/83

JOINT MEETING OF SENATE CONSULTATIVE/SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEES  
WITH VICE PRESIDENT KELLER (1:00-5:00) AND VICE PRESIDENT VANSELOW (3:00-5:00)

Tuesday, May 3, 1983  
Regents Room

PROGRAM PLANNING AND BUDGETING IN THE COLLEGIATE UNITS

1:00-3:00

Consultative Committee members present: P. Freier, J. Howe, J. Iverson, D. Lenander, M. Mattson, D. Pratt, B. Sundquist, P. Swan, J. Turner, and, by telephone hook-up to Morris, B. Hogen and W. D. Spring.

Finance Committee members present: A. Bailey, W. Johnson, H. Kabat, P. Reynolds, I. Rubenstein, P. Schulte, T. Scott (B. Sundquist)(D. Spring by phone).

Guests: Shirley Moore and Charlotte Striebel (EEOWC), Mary Jane Plunkett, Maureen Smith, Dick Ericson.

SCC Chair Pat Swan convened the meeting at 1:10 p.m.

She reminded the group that Vice President Keller will take to the Regents on May 12-13 a summary of plans, without dollar figures, for a subset of 8 to 10 colleges. The SCC office is establishing a file of one copy of each complete college plan which it will lend for circulation. Finance Committee may also use SCC's set. SCC does not yet have a copy of every plan.

In several cases, said V. P. Keller, Academic Affairs has returned the plan to the college as being, in its view, not sufficiently responsive (some plans were in contradiction to the unit's priorities; some called for substantially increasing the number of faculty).

Swan asked Keller how one should read and sort out the documents. Keller distributed copies of a cover memorandum Associate Vice President Linck has sent to each collegiate dean with the draft statement summarizing and commenting on that college's retrenchment/planning statement which V. P. Keller tentatively planned to present at the May Regents meeting. The memorandum asked for comments and corrections.

Summaries of 9 units under Academic Affairs were in the packet to SCC and SFC. The summary shows the 1982-83 0100 base, the dollar figure at the upper end of the unit's percentage retrenchment range, describes the thrust of the retrenchment and of planned reallocation, and states the major planning issues, the affirmative action impact of the plan, and the current personnel roster (male and female count in faculty and P/A positions and in civil service positions).

### Savings

We have done some analyses on what dollar changes would follow next year and the following year, said Keller. Swan asked Keller to comment upon

- (1) what dollars we will need next year and
- (2) what the deans were told about the need for money.

Keller said we gave each dean a target. We told the deans that the program plan was what we needed most, and then to know how much money the program plan would save if there were no constraints upon carrying it out. Next, we tallied how many dollars would be available in 1983-84.

In some cases the plans submitted provide us neither with dollars nor with an intelligible plan for the future. For instance, a plan for a college to save money by reducing teaching and advising is not programmatic, he said; it is distributing the pain. Some units are taking non-programmatic cuts in the first year.

He said we will not know how many dollars we will need until the Legislature makes its appropriation. We will calculate that together with the already known deficit, recurring retrenchment, and known recurring needs to determine how much is needed to balance the budget. To the extent there is a shortfall we will go back to the old ways of across-the-board retrenchment. He told the committees we might get our recovered money up to about \$7 million: up to possibly \$3.5 million from Academic Affairs units and about \$3 million in support services.

Keller said that no more than 10-15% of the aggregated plans could be effected per year given the constraints we have now. Voluntary separations might enable us to double that. We might get down to a need for a 3% retrenchment in the first year, 1.5% of which would be selective and 1.5% across-the-board. He called inloading, or increasing workload, the keys to a large amount of money.

There are a lot of strengths in these plans, Keller said. We are trying to keep the colleges strong and to help them build upon their strengths.

### Quality of the plans.

Turner, acknowledging that there are criticisms about the idea of planning, applauded the planning process. He compared a 1979 planning group visit to UMD in which he had participated with Duluth's current plan, saying they have come a long way and their document demonstrates how planning can be used to strengthen programs rather than weaken them. On the other hand, Turner had read another college plan which was not a plan at all.

Keller stated that pressures are now being brought to bear to save particular programs and, he asked, can the Board, the faculty governance committees, the administration, hold the plan together?

Sundquist also commented on the variance in the qualities of plans. Some units have a better plan and give a sense of better ability to implement their plans. One document he read was a compilation of department plans and not a consolidated unit plan. Keller reported he has three meetings scheduled this week to work with units on that kind of consolidation.

Cutting faculty and alternatives, if any.

Freier asked what we are going to do about the people in programs planned to be cut? Fingering individual faculty members publicly, identifying a program as being of low priority, makes the faculty uncomfortable, she said. Keller responded that the administration will make the affected faculty aware of the plans for voluntary separation. If the faculty aren't willing to make that choice, we will cut across-the-board. There are not other choices than to cut the faculty, he said. The only choices are about which proportions to cut. Should T.A.'s be cut by 40%? He added that even if there were a change in the Tenure Code providing for programmatic terminations, that still would not be sufficient for all situations.

Johnson, observing that different colleges are using different techniques and means to save, asked whether a unit such as IT can reconsider its plan and perhaps conclude that inloading would be a better way to save. Keller said it certainly can. The process is iterative and ongoing. Among the approaches are (a) to convert appointments from A to B, (b) to seek additional research money, and (c) to inload CEE credit courses and the summer session.

Johnson said many of his colleagues indicate they would be willing to look seriously at other ways of saving money in order to save a colleague's position, when they realize that is what is on the line. Keller named the option of (d) increased teaching loads.

Mattson asked if the plan is going to shape the "tree" of the University as they want it, and Keller said there is still the possibility of success for that prospect.

Mattson asked if there could be a clash if the Regents' priorities differ from those of the administration. Keller said the Regents generally have not gone into the details of the plan. If they had a different view, he would want their plan to have consistency.

University-wide priorities.

Howe asked Keller to discuss the Budget Executive's sense of University-wide priorities. Keller replied that his questions to the units give a sense of his priorities and overarching views. Swan asked how one overarches when looking at ten excellent, but different, programs.

Keller specified these considerations:

- (1) Look for programs of high scholarly quality.
- (2) We are a major research university which integrates teaching and research.
- (3) We are a land-grant university with a mission of responsiveness to agriculture and technology, and with unique professional schools.
- (4) We are a metropolitan University with a metropolitan constituency to serve.
- (5) We are a social institution serving, for instance, affirmative action goals.

Swan added that the University is a generator and keeper of knowledge, and Howe asked if all kinds of knowledge are equally valuable.

Keller made these further points:

- (1) We turn inward to develop the help we need for programs the legislature does not see as obvious to support.
- (2) The University responded to societal demands of the Sixties.
- (3) Whatever the motivation of students when they come in at the door, and it may be purely vocational, it is our job to educate students broadly. When Howe suggested that perhaps the University does that too quietly, Keller replied that that way is sometimes more effective.

Howe expressed his sense that we haven't done a very good job of giving the colleges a better sense of what we want them to do. Keller remarked that the range of quality within a college exceeds the range of the averages of all the colleges.

Bailey noted that given that those programs which are weak and/or in low demand here are likely also to be weak and/or in low demand at other universities, those faculties will have the least opportunity to find jobs elsewhere. How likely, therefore, are they to be willing to leave? (See Keller's remarks reported on middle of page 2.)

Inloading; buy-outs; impact on affirmative action.

Johnson remarked that it seems not right for the University to be paying extra to some faculty for evening and summer teaching while at the same time dropping some faculty out of the University.

Keller said he now has a plan for inloading. Deans Gardner and Lukermann will begin working with their faculties on it. Part of the plan is that below a certain workload faculty would not be paid extra for summer session and evening teaching.

Johnson recommended we look at a broader part of the faculty for buy-outs since many are interested and would be willing to reduce their work and compensation. Keller pointed out that the broader offering would not be programmatic. A buy-out makes sense if a department has been identified as one which will shrink.

Scott asked whether a college could decide that its six largest departments could be reduced; Keller said it could. Scott suggested everyone in the University could be eligible for special buy-outs. Keller said he would accept any special buy-outs that made sense in terms of planning and where there is the clear understanding the position in question would then remain retrenched.

Sundquist reminded the group that in last year's retrenchment there came buy-out applications which were really across-the-board and in some high priority areas. We must be careful not to let that happen again, he warned.

In response to Charlotte Striebel's question, Keller said the affirmative action impact assessment takes into account only women and not minorities because it is more useful to keep track of minority faculty individually; their numbers are small enough that a statistical account by unit is not very helpful.

Shirley Moore asked if there is a way to calculate the impact on women and

minorities in the "superordinate University" approach.

Keller said we have made some gains in affirmative action. We will in an orderly way examine the first cuts in terms of their effects on women and minorities. We can (a) choose not to do what will have a heavy impact on women and minorities, or we can (b) seek to cut an all-male program to balance losses of women and minorities. While we are doing some of both (a) and (b), mostly, the choices should be based on other criteria. Our best affirmative action should be to move women into fields which are more highly valued.

Moore said we have a unique problem right now of academic values versus people values. I believe in programmatic cuts, she said, but it would be very unfortunate to jeopardize our progress in affirmative action and set it back by years. Keller and Moore agreed that programmatic cuts could be less detrimental to affirmative action than "across-the-board last hired, first fired" cuts.

Keller said one question is on what level of aggregation to examine the impact. His intuition has directed him to look at the college level. It doesn't always feel good to be eliminating a graduate program while keeping a program for the reason that most of the faculty are women.

Howe reasoned that it should be possible to cut programs which don't fit within the University's mission while at the same time deepening and reaffirming the University's commitment to affirmative action in all that is central to it. But, replied Keller, we will be judged on the immediate impact.

#### Opportunities for new hiring.

Spring asked, since the actual plan will probably be a compromise of programmatic and across-the-board cuts, whether anyone has an analysis of what the impact will be on hiring junior faculty right out of graduate school? He asked whether Keller could indicate to the units what kind of flexibility they will have regarding new hiring and re-hiring? Keller commented that normal attrition is about 3% of the faculty members (varying from 50 to 100 per year) and is random.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 for a short break.

The meeting reconvened at 3:15 with Vice Presidents Keller and Vanselow.

SCC present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe, J. Iverson, M. Mattson, B. Sundquist, P. Swan, J. Turner, and, by telephone, D. Spring and B. Hogen.

SFC present: W. Johnson, H. Kabat, I. Rubenstein, P. Schulte, T. Scott, (Sundquist)  
(Spring by phone).

Press: Dick Ericson, Maureen Smith.

Sundquist announced that the Finance Committee will hold additional meetings to discuss finance specifics of the plans on May 17 (4:30 to early evening) and May 20 (11:00 to 1 or 1:30).

Kabat asked if there are programmatic plans for the support units. Keller said there are "functional plans," which have been analyzed in terms of their effect upon academic units. The support units were given budget targets.

Swan suggested that the questions of "priorities" and "program" are getting mixed up. For example, inloading is not always programmatic. Faculty colleagues wonder how to dovetail their thinking with that of Morrill Hall.

Keller called inloading a program of delivery rather than a program.

Swan said departments struggle with the question of what is the program and what the priority. She asked if it is not the case that some of the college plans Keller calls not programmatic have in fact, not been sorted by priorities.

HEALTH SCIENCES: Summaries of program plans from Schools of Dentistry, Public Health, and UMD Medicine.

Vice President Vanselow said these three were plans which came in early and which are fairly acceptable to us. We have further questions on the remaining units, or have still to study them with the deans (Nursing, Pharmacy, Twin Cities Medicine).

It is relatively hard to close off a department in the Medical School because of the integrated program and all students taking virtually the same courses.

Duplication?

Turner asked if Vanselow has encountered any areas of duplication and overlap from which the University could achieve savings. Vanselow replied that it was a matter of point of view and definitions. Some faculty, including those of the basic sciences, teach in several of the colleges.

Nursing and Public Health Nursing? Vanselow described Public Health Nursing as a master's degree training program for nurses. The School of Nursing does not have such a program. A number of other universities have the same pair of programs.

Medical School and School of Public Health? Vanselow thinks no duplication. Medical School orientation is toward one-to-one health care while Public Health's is toward community care.

Can any of the units possibly be combined, asked Mattson? Vanselow answered that many university medical schools have a small community health department instead of a school, but said he is proud the University of Minnesota has the School. They bring in more research per capita than other units. Moreover, in the future we expect greater emphasis on public health--attention to lifestyles and preventive habits.

Shifts?

Howe asked if there will be any significant shift of funds between Health Science units and Academic Affairs units. Vanselow said the Budget Executive hasn't ruled that out, but there is no decision yet. Howe asked what about among the Health Sciences?

School of Public Health.

A high priority for reallocation in the Health Sciences is to get more money into Public Health which has the lowest ratio of 0100 funds by far. We

assigned Public Health no retrenchment, Vanselow told the committees, and asked for 3% reallocation priorities. The unit has been successful in getting grant money. Some departments have less than one person on 0100 funds, yet 40% of faculty time is in teaching.

The plan includes reallocating \$60,000 from the Health Psychology program, effective for FY 1984-85. We will make every effort to get University Hospitals to take the program, he said. It is a one-to-one clinical practice having little to do with teaching or research. It is the home of the clinical psychology internship. Vanselow expects the money would be reallocated to provide a hard money base to some soft funded positions but will make no firm decisions until the new dean of the School of Public Health arrives.

Three assistant professors on T appointments in the program are slated for termination. Vanselow told the committees that these practitioners, as clinical psychologists, have more options for other employment.

Termination notices. There followed some discussion of different understandings people have of the kind of notification being given these faculty members. Vanselow said that to his knowledge no notices were given for July 1, 1983 terminations. The plan is to retrench for 1984-85. However, Pratt was personally aware of a case that he said bears investigation. One of these three persons, a University employee for 15 years, contends he has received a termination notice for June 30, 1983.

Swan said we have a concern about these kinds of terminations even though they are of people on T appointments. There is a sense that those who have been here a long time have become part of this University. Fredricks added that the Judicial Committee has heard the cases of several such people who believed they had become essentially permanent.

Vanselow acknowledged the department has a major job to sort out these cases; some people are on real T appointments; some have been given promises of future hardening of positions.

Freier implored Vanselow to give a year's notice wherever there is the money to do so, partly in order to save the Judicial system from a breakdown.

#### School of Dentistry.

The school has the highest percentage reduction target within Health Sciences--10.5%. Nationwide there is a surplus of dentists and applications have declined markedly. The cuts are a mixture of programmatic and otherwise.

1. Dental School class size. Proposal to reduce the size of the entering class from 145 to 104. There is a procedure set up to follow before the President makes the decision. The retrenchment plan presupposes this reduction. There are five vacant faculty positions which will not be filled.

Fredricks asked if the five retrenched positions are in line with needs and priorities. Vanselow said the dean will close them as they become vacant, and will move people around to match priorities.

Howe asked how reducing class size affects budget. Vanselow said the

budget is not reduced by as large a proportion since there are things you can't do without, whatever the size of the program. The University loses in three ways by reducing class size: (a) less tuition income, (b) fewer patient fees, and (c) reduced legislative appropriation. There is a Catch-22 downward spiral and the administration is looking very carefully at those costs.

Also regarding income he informed the committee that the University of North Dakota is pulling out of its contract with Minnesota. (Montana still has such a contract for the education of dentists.)

However, the school has a huge number of applicants for the general practice residency and is seriously considering increasing the number it accepts. Doing so would permit the school to take more patients and hence raise clinic income.

2. Reduce the Dental Hygiene class size from 50 to 20. Keep the certificate program and mothball the baccalaureate program which prepared teachers.

Why should the University train any dental hygienists? (a) We want to continue to do team teaching of dental students and hygienists together without having to hire hygienists; (b) the hygiene students follow the patients longitudinally, which is important to the clinic.

The program at UMD should continue because hygienists are needed in that part of the state.

Swan observed that a large proportion of women are affected because the dental hygiene program is composed largely of women. Vanselow said it is a programmatic change. You are going to have some uneven effects unless you completely protect those fields which have traditionally been the women's professions (Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Nursing, Dental Hygiene).

3. Almost all the units have commented on proposed shifts from A to B appointments. It appears the shift will have to be done voluntarily and that only a few will do it.

The workload is changing, he said. Since class size is being reduced, Dental Science will retrench the money it has paid to Anatomy and Pharmacology for teaching.

Freier noted that one-third of the Dentistry budget is in civil service salaries and asked why they are not cutting civil service in the same proportion as the faculty. Vanselow said he would try to get the answer, but supposed it was because of the support employees needed for the clinical aspects of the school.

#### UMD School of Medicine.

Retrenchment is low because the mass is small. You can't get much smaller than that and still run a medical school. A certain number of disciplines have to be represented. There is very little they can do on a programmatic basis.

Rubenstein asked how well the UMD students are prepared compared to those prepared on the Twin Cities Campus. Vanselow said they do as well as Twin Cities students on both parts I and II of the national boards and are indistinguishable

from those who have taken their first two years here. A goal of the school's establishment was to get rural students into rural medicine, and that has been borne out. 60% of the students go into rural medicine. The school intended to accept a somewhat different kind of student from what the Twin Cities campus accepts.

Turner asked, hypothetically, what would happen if we phased out that school and absorbed it here, beyond increasing class sizes in the basic sciences. Vanselow said they could be absorbed. (A committee is looking at Twin Cities medical school class size with a view to reducing it.) But the UMD school was started because not a lot of Twin Cities graduates were going to rural practice. There are still a lot of state communities that could support a doctor but don't have one.

Turner suggested we could expect the legislature to develop a different incentive system to affect the distribution of practicing physicians.

Freier and Turner voiced concern about cutting tenured faculty in positions we consider critical to University education while maintaining two medical schools. We shouldn't consider the second school a sacred political cow, Freier said. Vanselow commented that it is easy for us to sit here and tell the state what its policy should be, but the situation looks quite different to people in northeastern Minnesota.

Mattson asked about the possibility of one medical school with two campuses, but Vanselow said that would not save money.

#### WEIGHING OVERALL UNIVERSITY PRIORITIES.

Scott distinguished between "lockstep" programs, such as the dental and medical school, and flexible programs. The first kind are down to bare bones because of absolute requirements. Therefore, do we have to face the prospect down the road of having to cut important programs where there is not a lockstep curriculum, if fiscal conditions keep going the way they are now?

Keller replied that we will have to ask if we should maintain all our professional schools, and may reach a point of saying Minnesota cannot have all of its own professional schools. Vanselow told the committees that Michigan has been singularly unsuccessful at closing any professional school.

Keller said the Budget Executive has discussed other duplication. UMD, for example, has a good American Indian Studies program. But to eliminate the Twin Cities program would be to deprive local residents of the opportunity to live at home while taking that program. Freier suggested special scholarships, similar to our reciprocal tuition arrangements.

Swan asked whether UMD's Medical faculty has been doing the planning that would allow them to contract, and whether damage will be done by cutting a position in Microbiology and one in Behavioral Sciences? Do we have to wipe out some programs so as not to damage others, she asked?

V. P. Vanselow said he doesn't think we can go too much farther without seriously damaging the quality of the University if we have not in fact already done some damage. Swan then asked, if UMD Medicine is down to its bare bones, don't we have to wipe out something else to keep it going?

Vanselow said all the University's programs have a constituency and it

is very hard to eliminate one of them.

Swan asked if it defuses the political aspect to say clearly what the alternatives are. Vanselow replied that very few universities have been successful in accomplishing vertical retrenchment (eliminating programs). What sounds rational turns out to be very difficult.

Swan said the implication then is that everything we do in the University is of equal importance. But, said Vanselow, we are not cutting equally across the board. We have in fact assigned different budget goals.

Swan, recognizing that UMD Medicine is cutting two positions from the core because they are the only ones available at present asked if they have done the planning to know where the permanent retrenchment should lie whenever those cuts can be shifted.

0100 proportions. Turner asked whether the 80% of Public Health's budget which is soft money is a similar proportion to the Medical School. Vanselow answered that the Medical School does not have a much higher proportion of 0100 funds, but is in a much better position because of its clinical income in addition to its research money.

More on shifts. Turner recalled that at one time the University took money from its other units to harden slots in the Medical School. He hypothesized that this "starvation of other programs" contributed to their subsequent decline. Fredricks recalled that that transfer of funds generated a great deal of faculty hostility and said people are rumbling about the prospect of that happening again.

Vanselow told the committees that the Health Sciences bring in half the research funds that come to this university. Don't kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith Poppele*

Meredith Poppele, Executive Assistant