



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 16, 1985
12:30 - 3:00
626 Coffman Memorial Union

AGENDA

Approx. time

- 12:30 1. Minutes of April 26 (distributed on May 2) and May 2 (FCC and SCC, enclosed).
2. Reports:
- A. Student Chair.
 - B. Chair.
 - C. Finance Committee
 - D. Pre-Accreditation Self-Study Committee
 - E. From Regents' meetings.
- 12:45 3. Nominations and appointments of faculty members to
Planning Committee (1)
Finance Committee (1)
Recreational Sports Board of Governors (1)
President's Student Behavior Review Panel(1).
Please bring names to propose.
- 1:00 4. Governance: reports of the subcommittees.
- 2:30 5. Legislative update: Professor W. Phillips Shively,
FCC's legislative liaison.

(Senate and Assembly meetings follow at 3:15.)



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee
210G Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES
SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
May 16, 1985
626 Campus Club
12:40 - 3:00

APPROVED 5/30/85

Members present: Cathy Birk, Shirley Clark, Beth Emanuelson, Charles Farrell, Phyllis Freier, Sue Gruenes, Joseph Latterell, Douglas Melby, Cleon Melsa, Jack Merwin (Chr.), Irwin Rubenstein, David Shope, Frank Sorauf, Deon Stuthman, Wesley B. Sundquist.

Guests: John Aune, Tim Pratt, W. Phillips Shively, Maureen Smith, John Turner.

1. The FCC minutes of May 2 and the SCC minutes of April 26 were approved as distributed. The SCC minutes of May 2 should indicate Bruce Williams' attendance; a new corrected page 5 will be distributed to those who received the draft minutes. The SCC May 2 minutes were approved with these changes.

2. Reports.

A. SSCC Chair. Mr. Melby.

The Student SCC has made some committee appointments.

Mr. Melby and Mr. Shope commented on changing the mechanism for funding certain student services. Because there would be inequities in simply incorporating certain fees into tuition, as had been recently considered, a new proposal has been set forth. It calls for student fees collected for certain services to be deposited in the 0100 budget instead of, as now, the 0500 budget. The services being so considered are regarded as instruction-related. The charges handled in this way would be reimbursable by the state, at 2/3 or at 100%, if the legislature agreed they were instruction-related. The proposal to treat support for the debate society and the marching band, and fees for the Health Services in this way, has not aroused opposition. But the proposal to include recreational sports and the unions is controversial because some students anticipate it would remove a large degree of control students have exercised in these realms.

Mr. Shope pointed out that, at best, students would see a reduction in their payments two years hence; even then, any reimbursement might get lost in the shuffle.

B. SCC Chair. Professor Merwin.

(1) Professor Howard Bowen's visit. Professor Merwin listed the three questions forwarded to the Graduate School, at Myrna Smith's request, which SCC would like to raise with Professor Bowen: they regard (a) the relative merits of the semester and quarter calendars, (b) how to use a re-accreditation site visit and the preparation therefor to the University's advantage, and (c) effective ways of organizing the faculty/student/staff components of the academic community for governance.

(2) Senate business.

(a) SCC members are requested to read the committee annual reports printed in the Senate and Assembly dockets.

(b) Professor Merwin, with Mr. Shope's agreement, will report to the Senate this afternoon that the SCC will direct that any future governance system consideration on the semester vs. quarter question will take place in the University Senate, and that Mr. Shope has withdrawn his May 2 motion calling for a student survey on the question.

(c) Professor Merwin read the set of three questions submitted by student senator Jeffrey Moser to the President; SCC had no objection to their going forward.

(d) New business: A senator has submitted a motion urging the Board of Regents to divest itself of investments in companies engaged in business in South Africa. Campus interest in the subject runs high. SCC discussion noted that President Keller's special committee is due to advise him, prior to the Regents' annual review of investments in June, on possible alternative University actions. SCC favored permitting the Senate to benefit from any additional information that committee's report would yield.

There emerged a clear SCC consensus to have Professor Merwin move in the Senate, on behalf of the SCC, that 30 minutes be allocated in the May 16 meeting for debate on the question, and that a special meeting of the Senate be scheduled for June 6 for further debate, with the benefit of the report of the President's special committee, and for a vote at that time, which would precede by a week the Regents' meeting.

C. Senate Finance Committee. Professor Stuthman.

At the May 2 SFC meeting:

(1) Professor Shively reported on the contents of the House and Senate appropriations bills for the University, and

(2) SFC discussed the budget principles which the Regents approved a week later.

At its May 30 meeting, SFC will:

(1) Hear Vice President Murthy's presentation on a scenario regarding budget allocations, based upon the known appropriation, and

(2) See a table of central administration's distribution of the indirect cost recovery funds. SCC members are as always welcome to attend.

Professor Freier remarked that there will be considerable faculty interest in how central administration will use the \$12 million rank adjustment (which appears in the House bill) if it is appropriated.

D. Pre-Accreditation Self-Study. Professor Rubenstein.

The Committee is pleased with the tentative list of site visit team members. The visit will take place in April 1986, perhaps in the week of April 14. SCC will receive the Self-Study Committee's draft report in October and determine whether other Senate committees should also review the draft. The last focus group meeting, this time with graduate students, was to take place this same afternoon.

E. From the Regents meetings, May 9-10, at the Morris Campus.

Professors Latterell and Merwin summarized the business of each of the committees. UMM made presentations: (1) On its financial aid situation: Grants have not increased as the cost of education has gone up significantly, and so student debt is much larger. (2) Dean Blake reported that the campus regards its part in the Commitment to Focus as a welcome challenge, and one which is along the very lines UMM has sought. (3) There was a report to Physical Plant and Investments.

Professor Latterell noted that the most interest was shown in Mr. Potami's report on Guidelines for University-Industry Interaction. Mr. Potami told the Regents he thought the SCC would be asked to review in detail next fall the recommendations in the report.

Personnel items from the Committee of the Whole: (1) A new Regents Professor has been approved, but the name has not been made public; (2) Patricia Mullen was named Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity; (3) Donald Sargent was named Provost (immediately to be redesignated Chancellor) of UMC.

In addition, the President discussed with the Regents his intentions regarding administrative organizational changes.

3. Appointments and nominations.

SCC members discussed names proposed for three bodies where there is a faculty vacancy, and agreed upon the people Professor Merwin will ask to serve.

4. Governance: Reports from SCC's two subcommittees, and discussion.

The faculty subcommittee's written report was distributed. The student subcommittee reported orally; a written report will be sent within a few days.

Mr. Melby and Ms. Emanuelson recommended, on behalf of the student subcommittee, that SCC appoint two committees to make recommendations to the SCC about governance system changes. This year's experience has indicated that SCC does not have the time to explore the restructuring of governance all on its own. One committee should consist of people not engaged in governance and should include membership from areas such as political science. The other should consist of people inside of the governance structure. SCC should aim to be

ready to report to the Senate at the fall quarter meeting. Other SCC student subcommittee positions:

- It is not in the interest of the University nor of the constituent groups to eliminate the University Senate. Some new body would emerge to assume the power relinquished by the University Senate.
- A smaller Senate is a workable possibility. Mr. Melby said the students would be amenable to having fewer positions to fill.
- Student senators should be required to serve on committees of the Senate.
- The best way to improve the effectiveness of governance, including influencing the central administration, is to strengthen the Senate's most important committees. In addition committees, especially SCC, need to involve themselves earlier in decision-making processes.
- Individual SCC members should be assigned responsibility for keeping informed on each of the major committees; networking generally should be increased.

Professor Clark reported for the SCC's faculty subcommittee. Their starting observations were these:

- The Senate is too large.
- Committees are made up mostly of non-senators. Senators for the most part are not informed on the committee work that comes before the Senate.
- The degree of participation in the Senate's work varies greatly among units.
- Student government efforts seem to have come together rapidly: Student Committee on Committees has filled all student positions on Senate and Assembly committees; the Jodl task force is at work.

This subcommittee offered two alternative models for consideration:

1. Cut the Senate size by about one-half; perhaps eliminate or combine some committees. Reduce business done in the Senate and Assembly by asking SCC to handle certain pro forma tasks.
2. (With or without reducing Senate size.) Each campus establish a Campus Assembly. The Assemblies would conduct most governance business. SCC would increase its coordinating and steering functions. A somewhat more decentralized system than at present would result.

The faculty subcommittee addressed several subsidiary issues: (1) a sunset clause and assessment requirement for any alternative model the University tries; (2) a model enabling the President to offer input into matters before a Senate meeting although he is the body's presiding officer; (3) a request to limit participation at the quarterly FCC-Regents dinner meetings to members of those bodies.

Discussion.

Reducing the size of the Senate. Mr. Shope argued that overall it would not be easier to recruit students for the Senate if there were fewer positions. In several colleges, including CLA and IT, interest already greatly exceeds the number of positions, so in a smaller Senate even fewer would-be senators could serve. Yet in colleges where there is minimal student interest, largely the professional schools, the current problem would continue. It was his opinion that reducing the size of the Senate would not make it better.

Professor Sorauf told the meeting he had come to the conclusion that it would not make a lot of difference to the quality of the work of the Senate to make it smaller. He spoke in favor of the decentralizing option with more responsibility falling to the SCC. SCC would call meetings of the All University Senate only on an ad hoc basis when there were genuine all-University issues requiring discussion.

Professor Rubenstein said that in a smaller Senate a higher proportion of senators would be serving on committees and hence better informed. He noted that in the normal legislative mode senators entirely constitute committee membership.

Professor Sundquist supported combining decentralization and a reduced Senate size, which should serve to make senators more involved and active. He noted that some all-University issues do not require committee work background. But others do, and some require information on the University's budgets as well.

Mr. Shope argued that, with between 250 and 300 faculty positions on University Senate and Campus Assembly committees, there is no apparent reason why reducing the number of senators would improve the problem of the shortage of senators on committees. Although it is now a requirement that student senators serve on committees, that requirement may be waived because student governance wants to avoid assigning students to committees where they do not want to be. SCC, he said, should focus on the highest priority committees, that is, the Committees of the Senate. It is more important that they function well than that less busy committees be eliminated.

Professor Stuthman observed that information on the recent campus elections has just indicated there is no overabundance of office-seekers. The election process in most cases amounts to filling slates instead of providing choices.

Mr. Shope and Professor Sorauf pointed out how current inequalities in Senate/Assembly representation would be aggravated if (1) the size of the Senate were reduced and (2) the principle were retained of representation from every unit regardless of size. There are two units with only a single faculty senator; there are 12 units with only a single student senator. Hence the skewing of student representation would be greater than that of faculty representation, and the ratio of students to faculty would increase.

Senate agendas. Professor Sundquist said to keep interest strong Senate meetings need to be on important topics. Professor Sorauf commented that perhaps SCC needs to do more to stipulate what kinds of questions require Senate attention.

5. Legislative update.

Professor Shively distributed data on the contents of the House and Senate appropriations bills for the University (previously shared with FCC and the Finance Committee). The conference committee, he reported, has agreed to full funding on graduate student tuition fellowships, and it has turned down the repairs and betterments item but otherwise has not yet acted on the list.

Ms. Emanuelson asked whether the principle of adhering to an average cost funding formula is being altered. She noted the President's argument that it was incompatible with the Commitment to Focus. Professor Shively said it will continue, but he added that the current budget shows that in practice the formula yields a place to start. The legislature goes way beyond that formula. The senators, he said, like ACF as a starting point for discussion, but don't feel slavishly bound to it. A part of President Keller's argument with ACF, he said, has been that the funding cells were too low to start with.

Professor Shively told SCC that some of the important changes in ACF are being made in this session, and some are not.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant

Motion to be read to the University Senate, May 16, 1985

Whereas the Board of Regents will meet on June 13-14, 1985 to review University investments in companies which do business with South Africa;

Whereas University President Keller has appointed a commission to assess the current, and to propose alternative strategies of investment with respect to South African Apartheid;

Whereas the Senate has previously demonstrated their support and commitment to this cause as reported by the Social Concerns Committee on April 20, 1982 ;

Be it resolved that the University Senate supports these initiatives to strengthen our divestment policy. We call upon the Board of Regents to include on their agenda of June 13-14 the university community proponents of divestment.

Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the Senate that the Regents should divest out of all corporations and financial institutions directly or indirectly doing business in or with the Republic of South Africa.

JAY COGGINS
Senator

May 13, 1985

Report of the FCC Subcommittee on Improving University Senate Governance
Structures to the SCC on May 16, 1985

Membership: S. Clark, P. Murphy, I. Rubenstein, and F. Sorauf

The FCC subcommittee met on May 7 in response to the request of the SCC chairman, Professor Merwin, at the special meeting on April 26. The two subcommittees of SCC were asked to bring into the SCC discussion on May 16 two to four models of governance structures. Our deliberations were guided in large part by ideas and concerns which were discussed at the SCC meeting on April 26. What follows here is a brief and open-ended account of the discussion of issues and of possible alternative models.

General issues. The first issue which we discussed is that of size. From information provided by Martha Kvanbeck, Office of the Clerk of the Senate, we learned that there are 239 members of the University Senate at present. Of this total 152 members are faculty (specifically, 149 are faculty and 3 are P/A employees) and 82 are students. The rules governing representation and election of Senate members are found in the Senate Constitution, Article III, and in the Bylaws, Article I and, regarding P/A representation, in the Minutes of the University Senate of May 5, 1983. The total size is larger than the legislative bodies of some states. The extraordinary size of the Senate is problematic, we believe.

A related issue is that committees of the Senate structure have non-Senators as the majority of their members, although structural revisions of recent years have assured some representation of Senators on many committees. Since the committees are composed largely of non-Senators, the Senate bodies may not be thoroughly familiar with nor invested in policy proposals which come to Senate bodies for action. Members of the Senate are not "trained" to run a complex system. We understand that revisions in the governing structure of CLA have improved the quality of governance of the University's largest college, but requirements of elected representatives serving on the major committees of a body put an extra burden on those elected representatives. This doubling of duty might be more acceptable to participants if an automatic respite (year

or years off after a period of service) were built into the system. It also is the case that at the collegiate level, people are better acquainted with the issues and this is at the base of collegial responsibility.

While the observations bears some checking, it appears that certain units, even departments, contribute disproportionately to University governance, while others contribute relatively little. This is unfair and possibly exploitative. There are no extrinsic rewards to individuals or to aggregates for responsible governance participation. On the other hand, it seems clear from reading the annual reports that some committees do relatively little, and some seem to be engaged in administrative work for which the administrators themselves should be held accountable.

Yet another issue which has received and continues to receive attention is that of student participation in governance. Student government does not seem to be in good health. What rewards do students receive for responsible participation? Would student interest increase with perquisites, and what could these be?

Alternative model 1. In order to address the issues related to too large a size, the Senate size could be cut in half. Membership ratios, which in general are: 1 faculty representative for each 20 regular faculty members and 1 student per each 1,000 full-time students, could be adjusted. The faculty ratio could change to 1 per 40, and the student ratio to 1 per 2,000 or even 3,000 or 4,000, depending upon desired adjustments in proportions. We could keep the rule of the minimum of 1 Senator per unit, in order to assure inclusion of the small units of the University. The ex officio (non voting) membership would remain the same, although its composition, too, could be examined.

In addition to reduction in overall size, modifications of committee structure should be considered. Perhaps some committees, especially some Assembly committees, could be eliminated or combined with other committees.

A careful inventory, to include what the bodies of the Senate actually do and have done, might reveal that certain bodies are unnecessary, that the case for having both an Assembly and a Senate is not strong, and that further streamlining/simplification should be considered.

Alternative model 2. This model, with or without miniaturization, proposes

that each campus establish a Campus Assembly. In fact, such bodies may be in existence at the present time. We noted that the Twin Cities Campus Assembly is the only one of the assemblies of the various campuses which is in the University Senate. Campus Assemblies would conduct most of the business of governance, with an expanded University-wide Consultative Committee serving coordinating and steering functions. The Senate Consultative Committee would decide when to convene the University Senate (the Senate, we assume, would meet less frequently than it does at present), the FCC would convene the Faculty Senate and the student members of the Consultative Committee (SSCC) would convene the Student Senate. Assemblies would elect a subset of their members to serve as Senators. It would be important to work out a clear and specific division of labor among the bodies to determine as far as possible in advance what issues would require the convening of these bodies. Toward the goals of improving and streamlining University governance, each Campus Assembly could have a consultative or steering committee to deal with routine business, as well as more important matters. As a general suggestion we would prefer that the Business and Rules Committee and the Senate Consultative Committee regularly and rigorously screen Senate agendas to remove pro forma matters requiring trivial votes. Pro forma matters could be added to the list of responsibilities of the Senate Consultative Committee.

Subsidiary issues. In the course of our deliberations several subsidiary issues to the matters which Professor Merwin charged the committee arose. On each of these issues we offer a collective opinion.

1. If an alternative governance structure is developed, adopted and implemented, there should be included a sunset clause requiring assessment and specific action to readopt or to replace the governance structure after a period of time, e.g., six years.

2. At a recent meeting of the FCC President Keller proposed that a method be worked out to enable the President to offer input into matters before the Senate while the Senate is in session. Since the President serves as Chair of the Senate, questions arise about how greater input from the President might be accommodated. We feel that it is important that the President continue to serve as Chair of the University Senate, and that President Keller should be encouraged to experiment with ways to enter into the discussion. If the President's input is informational, he might attempt to work it in while staying

in the chair; however, if his comments are more extended, argumentative or policy-oriented, then the President should not hesitate to turn over the chairing function to the Vice Chair (who could sit center-front with the Clerk and the Parliamentarian); the Vice Chair would finish out the item. Once the vote has been taken or the deliberations on the item concluded, the President would resume the role of Chair. We feel that within reasonable limits, the presiding role should accommodate to a particular President's style.

3. The last issue relative to improvement of governance which we addressed concerned the quarterly dinner meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Board of Regents. These meetings are the only institutionalized occasions that faculty members with governance responsibilities have to meet with the Regents. We do not feel that the President or other administrators should be present on these occasions. Faculty governance will be strengthened by defining those occasions as exclusive opportunities for the FCC and the Regents to interact on issues of common interest and concern.

Shirley Clark,
Subcommittee chairwoman

Wisconsin 5/16

May 2, 1985
Office of VP,
Inst. Relations

COMPARISON OF BIENNIAL BUDGET INCREASES - UNIVERSITY REQUESTS, GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS, HOUSE BILL, AND SENATE BILL
(All figures in thousands; \$867,699.0 = \$867,699,000)

	<u>UNIVERSITY REQUESTS</u>	<u>GOVERNOR'S BUDGET</u>	<u>HOUSE BILL</u>	<u>SENATE BILL</u>	<u>CONFERENCE COMMITTEE</u>
1. To Stay at the Same <u>Budget</u> Level (FY85 times two).....	\$ 867,699.0	\$ 867,699.0	\$ 867,699.0	\$ 867,699.0	\$ 867,699.0
2. To Stay at the Same <u>Work</u> Level.....	\$ 100,395.8				
a. Deficits - Costs Exceeding 83-85 Appropriations..	\$ 4,153.4				
(1) Faculty Retirement.....	\$ 960.0	Ave. Cost Funding	\$ 960.0	\$ 960.0	
(2) Fuel and Utilities.....	3,072.7	Ave. Cost Funding	3,072.7	3,100.0	
(3) Hazardous Waste Disposal.....	120.7	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	120.7	
b. Legal Requirements.....	\$ 4,811.4				
(1) MERTKA.....	\$ 131.8	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	\$ 131.8	
(2) Hazardous Waste Cost Increases..	679.6	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	544.1	
(3) Civil Service Comparable Worth..	4,000.0	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	-0-	
c. Other Fixed Cost Increases.....	\$15,763.4				
(1) Fuel & Utilities (Beyond Infl)..	\$6,511.5	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	-0-	
(2) Debt Service, Fuel Budget.....	1,008.5	\$ 1,008.5	Base Adj	\$1,008.0	
(3) Operation of New Space.....	8,243.4	Ave. Cost Funding	Base Adj	7,500.0	
d. Average Cost Funding Formula.....	\$ 3,918.0	\$ 3,918.0	\$ 3,918.0	\$ 3,918.0	
e. Inflation Adjustments.....	\$71,749.6	\$ 49,899.3	\$ 40,965.5	\$ 48,575.8	
(1) Salary Increases (5.5%/5.5%)...	\$53,753.3	Includes 3.5%/4% on all salaries & SE&E budgets	Incl. 3%/3.5% on all sal. & SE&E budgets	Incl. 3.5%/4% on all sal. & SE&E budgets	
(2) Supplies, Expenses, Equipment..	17,996.3				
		\$ 22,249.9 (Carryforward)	-0-	-0-	
			\$ 7,000.0 Base Adjustment (House Proposal)	-0-	

	<u>UNIVERSITY REQUESTS</u>	<u>GOVERNOR'S BUDGET</u>	<u>HOUSE BILL</u>	<u>SENATE BILL</u>	<u>CONFERENCE COMMITTEE</u>
3. To Improve Programs in the Operations and Maintenance Budget.....	\$ 90,845.9				
a. Salaries.....	\$14,454.9				
(1) Restoration of Faculty Purchasing Power (Add'l 1.5%/yr)...	\$9,571.1	Ave. Cost Funding	*FF/Base Adj	\$ 9,571.1	_____
(2) Faculty, Market & Retention....	4,224.2	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	4,224.4	_____
(3) Skilled Trades (Add'l 1.5%/yr).	375.5	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	-0-	_____
(4) Supplemental Medical Benefits for Retirees.....	284.1	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	-0-	_____
b. Tuition and Fellowships.....	\$23,049.2				
(1) Medical/Dental Fellows.....	\$7,225.4	Ave. Cost Funding	\$ 6,390.9	-0-	_____
(2) Grad Tuition Fellowships.....	2,500.0	Ave. Cost Funding	1,500.0	\$ 2,500.0	_____
(3) Profession Colleges Tuition....	11,353.8	Ave. Cost Funding	-0-	-0-	_____
(4) Reciprocity Offset.....	1,970.0	Ave. Cost Funding	<u>1,970.0</u>	<u>1,970.0</u>	_____
c. Equipment and Facilities.....	\$17,105.7				
(1) Instructional Computing.....	\$4,000.0	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	\$ 4,000.0	_____
(2) Equipment Amortization.....	4,000.0	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	4,000.0	_____
(3) Program Accommodation Remodel..	2,000.0	Ave. Cost Funding	-0-	-0-	_____
(4) Major Repairs Supplement.....	6,446.6	\$ 6,446.6	\$ 3,200.0	-0-	_____
(5) Library Acquisition Above Infl.	659.1	Ave. Cost Funding	FF/Base Adj	-0-	_____
d. Funding Rank Adjustment.....	\$21,946.1	\$ 19,403.0	\$ 12,000.0	-0-	_____
			**"Focus Fund"		
e. Special Incentives.....	\$12,500.0				
(1) Permanent University Fund.....	\$2,500.0	\$ 2,500.0	\$ 2,500.0	\$ 2,500.0	_____
(2) Reduction of Indirect Cost Recoveries Offset.....	10,000.0	**\$ 12,210.7	\$ 7,848.6	\$ 7,848.6	_____
f. New UMD Engineering Program.....	\$ 1,790.0	Ave. Cost Funding	\$ 1,790.0	\$ 1,790.0	_____

** \$23,848.6 reduced by \$11,637.9 recommended by the Governor as "off-budget" funding for certain Specials, using Indirect Cost Recovery funds.

	<u>UNIVERSITY REQUESTS</u>	<u>GOVERNOR'S BUDGET</u>	<u>HOUSE BILL</u>	<u>SENATE BILL</u>	<u>CONFERENCE COMMITTEE</u>
4. To Improve Programs in the Special State Appropriations for Research and Service.....	\$ 21,787.0				
a. Agricultural Programs.....	\$7,000.0				
(1) Agricultural Extension.....	\$3,000.0	*ICR	\$ 1,385.0	\$ 400.0	_____
(2) Agricultural Research.....	4,000.0	ICR	1,000.0	650.0	_____
b. Health Sciences Programs.....	\$ 785.0				
(1) Institute for Human Genetics...\$	785.0	ICR	\$ <u>785.0</u>	\$ <u>785.0</u>	_____
(2) Center for Biomedical Ethics (For Discussion Only)					
c. Natural Resources Programs.....	\$1,845.0				
(1) Geological Survey.....\$	608.0	ICR	\$ 225.0	\$ 600.0	_____
(2) Mineral Resources Research Ctr.	912.0	ICR	-0-	900.0	_____
(3) Sea Grant.....	325.0	ICR	325.0	-0-	_____
d. Other Research and Service.....	\$12,157.0				
(1) Biotechnology Research.....\$	490.0	ICR	-0-	\$ 490.0	_____
(2) International Business Educ....	1,116.0	ICR	-0-	-0-	_____
(3) Microelectronics & Info. Sci...\$	1,350.0	ICR	-0-	-0-	_____
(4) Productivity Center.....	395.0	ICR	-0-	-0-	_____
(5) Supercomputer Institute.....	6,800.0	\$ 6,800.0	\$ 6,800.0	2,050.0	_____
(6) Intercollegiate Athletics.....	2,006.0	2,006.0	2,006.0	1,552.0	_____
5. Other Programs Not Requested by the Board of Regents					
a. Talented Youth Programs - Mathematics			\$ 175.0	\$ 207.3	_____
b. Software/Courseware Institute		\$ 1,500.0	-0-	-0-	_____
c. Wilderness Valley Research		793.0	-0-	-0-	_____

* Governor proposed UM flexibility to fund from Indirect Cost Recoveries.

MPIS 5/3/85

	University Request		Revised Governor's Recommendation		House Bill		Senate Bill		Conference Bill	
	Gross	Net	Gross	Net	Gross	Net	Gross	Net	Gross	Net
Per Red Book and Bills	\$1,079,073.6	\$817,246.1	\$970,997.4	\$723,487.7	\$936,844.7	<u>\$709,357.9</u>	\$965,046.9	<u>\$704,668.4</u>		
Carryforward	(\$22,249.8)	(\$22,249.8)								
ICR Offset	\$10,000.0		\$23,848.6		\$7,848.6		\$7,848.6			
PUF Offset	\$2,500.0		\$2,500.0		\$2,500.0		\$2,500.0			
Prof.Colleges Tuition Offset	\$11,353.8									
Reciprocity Offset	\$1,970.0				\$1,970.0		\$1,970.0			
CEE Noncredit Instruction					\$19,078.0					
Debt Service on Fuel Budget			\$1,008.5	\$1,008.5	\$1,008.5	\$1,008.5				
Adjusted Comparable Appropriation	\$1,082,647.6	\$794,996.3	\$998,354.5	\$724,496.2	\$969,249.8	\$710,366.4	\$977,365.5	\$704,668.4	\$.0	\$.0
Bases (including DEED, excluding 85 Retirement Supplement)										
Biennial Base	\$857,375.4	\$597,254.1	\$857,375.4	\$597,254.1	\$857,375.4	\$597,254.1	\$857,375.4	\$597,254.1		
FY 85 Doubled	\$867,699.0	\$608,282.8	\$867,699.0	\$608,282.8	\$867,699.0	\$608,282.8	\$867,699.0	\$608,282.8		
Increases										
Over Biennial Base	\$225,272.2	\$197,742.2	\$140,979.1	\$127,242.1	\$111,874.4	\$113,112.3	\$119,990.1	\$107,414.3	\$.0	\$.0
Over FY 85 Doubled	\$214,948.6	\$186,713.5	\$130,655.5	<u>\$116,213.4</u>	\$101,550.8	<u>\$102,083.6</u>	\$109,666.5	<u>\$96,385.6</u>	\$.0	\$.0
Relative to:										
U Request			(\$84,293.1)	(\$70,500.1)	(\$113,397.8)	(\$84,629.9)	(\$105,282.1)	(\$90,327.9)		
Gov Rec	\$84,293.1	\$70,500.1								
House Bill	\$113,397.8	\$84,629.9	\$29,104.7	\$14,129.8						
Senate Bill	\$105,282.1	\$90,327.9	\$20,989.0	\$19,827.8	(\$8,115.7)	\$5,698.0	\$8,115.7	(\$5,698.0)		